THE INTRODUCTION

How to Use This File
Management Instructions for This "File Structure!" - 0. Play Me First.mp4

1. **SECTION A:** - **Master Chronology Introduction** – Pages: 1-3
2. **SECTION B:** - **What this file is set out to prove** – Pages: 1-3
3. **SECTION C:** - **A Short Important Note with Dated Summery** – Pages: 1-3
4. **SECTION D:** - **Master Chronology** – Pages: 131

1. SECTION A: MASTER CHRONOLOGY INTRODUCTION

This chronology has not been compiled from memory.
It has been compiled from records disclosed by public authorities themselves, including council records, police records, medical records, SAR disclosures, FOI disclosures, housing files, emails, court records, and associated exhibits held in the name of Mr. Simon Cordell.
The purpose of this chronology is not to prove a single event.
The purpose is to demonstrate how information concerning Mr. Simon Cordell developed overtime within official systems and how that information was later relied upon by multiple authorities.
By following the events in date order, the reader can identify:

1) What Information Existed at The Time.
2) What Information Did Not Exist at The Time.
3) What Officials Knew at The Time.
4) What Later Appeared Within Records.
5) How Later Decisions Came to Rely Upon That Information.

The chronology therefore allows the development of the official history to be examined using the authorities' own records rather than retrospective opinion.

2. SECTION B: - WHAT THIS FILE IS SET OUT TO PROVE

I and others made complaints regarding the ASBO application developed by officers of the Metropolitan Police and staff of Enfield Council. Despite those complaints, a further series of court applications were subsequently issued against me by the same public authorities.
I allege that the allegations relied upon by the Enfield Council in the original ASBO application they fabricated themselves internally as council staff. Rather than investigating the evidence I provided in support of my complaints, then the Council and Police Officers continued with more legal proceedings they developed and deployed against me by using the same false intelligence and allegations to support those applications, instead of following protocol and rectifying the issues I raise. This was all due to the ASBO and me contending the guilty verdict with findings of their own corruption. While my appeal was in process the police and Council made the guilty verdict public through newspaper reports, which originated from information published through the Metropolitan Police's website, then afterwards their readers created further rumours, and inaccurate information about me that they spread. This occurred whilst I was legally contesting the case through the appeal process, as I maintained that the decision was unsafe because it was based upon incorrect and unreliable information.
The second application created by the Enfield Council took the form of a Housing Possession Order and was as I was going to appeal the Asbo. The Enfield Council never attended the Asbo Court Cases and maintained that they had no involvement in it, I and other persons all contained against this fact as the Asbo Bundle itself was developed by them as signed by them in its development and Steven Elsmore who created it is based or was based in the civic centre B Block but the complaints were ignored when exhibited.

The Enfield Council Housing Possession Order they created by them but due to members of my neighbours abusing me due to the news report about the Asbo and their attached fake rumours. My mother reported their alleged wrongful actions to the Enfield council, and they allowed for them to continue. This continued until they believed I had retaliated but I had not as I had spoken to my mother and asked for her help and she told me to listened to her orders by not retaliating to their evil taunts and victimisation of myself all while she would intervene by contacting the correct authorities about it and logging a complaint, hence the emails she wrote to Dawn Allen and Co.
The council officers started to fabricate a negative history about me, and this climbed from 1 to 12 to 31 allegations when the real correspondence prove this would not have happened in the manner the council officers discased the materials nor according to their own accounts or other staffs' internal checks this list is not exhausted.
The allegations the Council Officers built up from the very same persons that me and my mother had reported first for close to a year in advance. The allegations we reported we had both suffered and witnessed and we were not alone while they happened. I had told my mother, and she had come and visited me and witnessed the events and I had also had mutable other friends who feel victimisation to what was being done to me while visiting me within my home attacking me while we was within our homes on a daily basis. The surrounding Neighbours flats attached to mine had continued to deliberately hit the walls and floors while slamming he taps on and off above my head. This included slamming windows and creeping floorboards so I could not even sleep or legally defend myself for the cases the council, police, Mental Health Departments officers and themselves the neighbours were pursing me with.
The Enfield council Housing possession order contained 31 separate allegations all separate from the Asbo allegation that I allege are of the same frauded kind. The council meet the people we complained of after a year and developed the allegations by making them up and backdating them.
I maintain that the Enfield Councils Staff entirely fabricated those 31 allegations, as demonstrated by the original correspondence and documentary evidence exhibited below.
The second application was an injunction order and they as the Council never managed to proceed to a court trial to obtain a trial determination. Instead, the Judge withdrew the case from the Enfield Council during hearings and abandoned that claim, this happened because the Enfield council failed to comply with his orders while we did and after the dismal the Enfield Councils staff subsequently requested for the case to be reopened but this was refuted by the Judge as a no!
The Enfield Council officers later returned to court seeking to have the proceedings reopened. The court refused the request again and made it clear that the council could not simply relitigate the same allegations.
My Evidence later obtained through a Subject Access Request confirms this position.
But within days the Enfield Councils Officers still managed to refile the same allegations as a second injunction order application in the same Court with a new court case number.
That second injunction claim that the Enfield Councils Officers developed and pursued against me the judge also ultimately disposed of before trial in my favour as well but after a lengthy period in which Court conditions had wrongly gotten imposed upon me.
During these proceedings, the Judge of the Court ordered for Enfield council to rehouse me. I contend that it refused to do so. Instead, rather than complying with that requirement, the council initiated another housing order possession Claim again me. In that further claim, the original 31 allegations were again relied upon, together with additional allegations which I also maintain the council officers also fabricated.
That the presiding Juge disposed of the housing possession claim likewise before trial.
What is significant is that the court application the Enfield Councils repeated pursued such as the housing possession orders and Injunction Orders were all being pursued at the same time as I was attempting to challenge and appeal for the original ASBO decision that they developed and I

challenge as fabricated. In my view, the effect of these successive proceedings was to keep me occupied defending multiple claims, thereby preventing proper scrutiny of the original ASBO application and the allegations upon which it was based.
I further allege that authority officials fabricated a mental health narrative that they then developed concerning me through the joint involvement of council and police personnel. They together used to undermine my credibility and discourage or discredit my complaints regarding the alleged fraud within the original ASBO proceedings.
The original ASBO proceedings remained in effect for approximately eight years. During that period, and for several years thereafter, further court applications based upon the same allegations continued to be issued. I contend that each application formed part of a continuing pattern whereby allegations that were unsupported from the outset were repeatedly repackaged and presented through different legal proceedings.
The purpose of this file is to demonstrate how staff internally created allegations against me repeated and then escalated them through multiple court applications despite lacking proper foundation. The documentary evidence exhibited herein by me, I have supplied with the intention to demonstrate beyond reasonable doubt that the staffs' allegations they developed are intentionally frauded from the outset and that the same claims are afterwards throughout the years continually recycled across different proceedings over a prolonged period of time as planned to deprive me of my wellbeing and life. Jawing this time the Enfield Councils Managers also barred me from being able to telephone them for assistance, while neighbours attacked me.

In short, this file is set to prove that:

I had no mental health or negative council history.
The complainants were switched around.
Council created a fabricated Asbo Application and then continued to make other court applications that were maliciously made as well against me.
Allowed neighbours to attack me and helped them try to get away with it.

3. SECTION C: - A SHORT IMPORTANT NOTE WITH DATED SUMMERY

This important note starts before the chronology findings timeline begins.
I appreciate that there is a substantial volume of evidence in this matter and that it may take time for a reader to work through all of it. For that reason, I have prepared a shortened timeline containing what I consider to be of the most important dates, records, and disclosures. This timeline should be read together with the supporting exhibits, emails, council records, disclosure material, computer logs, complaint records, and other evidence.
I will leave readers to reach their own conclusions from the wider evidence. However, before reading the Findings Sheet, I invite readers to keep the following points in mind

DRAFT NOTES

1. **Abstracts from the Colterol History:** Housing History: Simon Cordell vs Enfield Council & 115 Burncroft Avenue
   - **A. 2014**
     - **1)** Anti-Social Behaviour Orders were Developed by the council and police alone!
     - **2)** Complaints Begun.
     - **3)** Government Media Sources were wrongly used!
     - **4)** Simon and mother complained about what they would call the aftermath neighbours at 111, 113, 115, 117 Burncroft Avenue and the Enfield Council Officers ignores them all for one year. Complaints included banging on the floors directly at him. Waking him up by banging above him. Hitting the walls all day and night with intent to hurt him. Squeaking floorboards to mental have a negative effect on him, slamming windows when he entered his back garden.
   - **B. 2015, 2016**

1) Council Continue to refuse to respond!
2) **Geofrey Man Team Leader, of housing management South Mall Enfield Councils team Dawn Allen, Louse Brown Jakie Guby,** stay accused as responsible.
3) The Enfield Councils own release notes show. My mother asking for emergency assistance to protect me from **111, 113, 115, 117 Burncroft Avenue occupants and others 95 97.**
4) Due to A known Mental Health User with Serious Acholic issues and her children taken away from her who lived alone and above me in 113 who we reported about first, making a complaint to the Council with her health working being present the council could no longer allow everything we reported to them to continue to me. We reported complaints about 113 long before she complained about me. We keep email the Enfield Council and making them aware of what 113 was doing while drunk and soba.
5) The Enfield Councils Staff become actions become transparent due to letting Debra and other attack me and because Debras Andrews care worker got involved due to me walking next to Debra on the way out like I had done for years before her guilt sunk in for what she was doing to me while I was in my own home and by use of her own home and accused actions, so the Enfield Councils staff all "Flipped The Real Narrative Around The Wrong Way!"
6) Council finally respond from same emails we were ignored from, but treats Simon as the perpetrator, not victim.
7) The Enfield Council Realised that me and my mother had already sent an email that included what happened on this date to them that they never responded to.
8) The Council officer promise my mother to drop the case and investigate what she has been saying to them, she even describes going to Debra Andrews door herself and Debra acting very unwell Mentally, while deciding to talk to her through a letter box. Debra is much older than Mr. S. Cordell.
9) Doctors' notes and police note released through SRA all state they also contacted Dawn Allen & Co around the same time as they went to visit Debra and she would not open the door to them and was acting very unwell mentally.
10) Dawn Allen arranged a meeting with my mother at my home with all of us to be present to investigate our claims.
11) Instead, she can be seen being two faced and building a negative profile against me as in the release note she messages the doctors on the 23/9/2015. To get to this stage of an enquiry she has clearly checked internal Council records and came up with a none. She asked the doctors if I'm known to mental health services. While making us wait to give our official statements. She had never met me. The doctors return with a none as well.
12) The doctors pass personal notes of mine to dawn Allen and Co without my legal consent.
13) Dawn Allen attends 115 Burncroft Avenue in her release notes and makes a statement with Debra Andrews about me.
14) Geofrey Man Team Leader, of housing management South Mall Enfield Councils team Dawn Allen, Jakie Guby, arranged with the doctors without ever meeting me for a mental health warrant to be issued against me. They all arranged this while me and my mother awaited out meeting with Dawn Allen
15) They arranged a rendezvous point across the road from my home at Shaftsbury Avenue.
16) Dawn Allen, Jakie Guby nor Team Leader, Geofrey Man turned up to meet them as arranged.
17) Louse Brown was sent instead as my mother would have been present and asked the correct questions to dawn Allen and Jackie Gubby who she had been messaging for around 2 years for help to protect me.
18) The doctors agreed they was nothing wrong with me after a mental health assessment was made to happen against my free will.
19) My mother wrote emails upset with Dawn Aleen and Jackie Jubby and they said they will attend the meeting that sorts our concerns. Mother stated she was not available on the date they have

and asked for them not to attend mine unless she is present as she is my appropriate adult, they agreed.

20) When my mum was in the hospital on the date, she was not available for, Dawn Allen or Jakie Gubby turn up at my front door with a police officer, and I allowed them into my home. I told them about what was going on and they left. Then they both went back to the offices and created notes about my printers in my home and wrote to my mum starting that I am starting a communal business from within a council flat and they want to take my tenancy away from me for it.

21) Mother had a go at them for attending behind her back.

22) A council Housing Officer named as Sarh Flexure receives a letter of one of the neighbours 117 top floor above me that we was complaining about first. The letter they sent stated a malicious unfounded claim that holds no truth Saying, "I'm a drug addict." The claim was backdated prior to my mother complaint and is easily checked by the received date. This is the second piece of evidence they used unfairly against me.

23) Sarh Flexure done internal Council record checks and stated that none existed about me.

24) Sarh Flexure then arranged a meeting at the council with 117 where they was allowed to backdate mutable cases that weren't true to be used against me rather than be prosecuted for what me my mother and other reported.

25) Geofrey O/Man the team leader responds to my mothers' prior complaints and states that she is wrong that I have been brought to their awareness once before other than the Asbo the prior teams were involved in. The other case away from the Asbo he was referring to is the Debra Andrews case that they told me, and my mother had been dropped. They used this to start a history in my name.

26) This meant two manipulated incident and one Asbo case they denied having involvement in but then openly admitted to.

27) Debra Andrews was moved out into a hotel due to the issues by the Council then allowed to move back in and start on me till she gave up and was moved out.

28) Each neighbour after that who was moved in that I spoke to made me and become aware of their selected Mental Health colterol history.

29) Me and mother obtained access to the flat 113 during this time, and he was smoking crack without electric and support, he had a troubled upbringing due to his own action that led him to long term prison sentence where he was transferred from the prison as an adolescent to a mental hospital and he then latter broke out to finally be re captured. His offence is published in the local newspapers where he went into our local post office and brandished a gun while robbing the place. What made matters worse was he knew the local post office owner, wore no balaclava to cover his identity, and after robbing the place i.e. the till, realised that he was in a post office, and it had a safe in the back. He never timed his actions and as he re-entered to find out if he could access the safe and then it took for an old age pensioner to apprehend him by taking him to the ground in fear of what was going on. The flats conditions had not been changed since Debra Andrews had damaged it, as she weaponised it against me. Ambrose became board the floor was cut like a the piano out of the film big, me and my mother took pictures of this. There is much more colterol history behind Ambrose as I have also gathered in hard evidence about the other occupiers who I could be sure was still hurting me on more than one occasion once asked to stop but that is to be keep in the main file "214 & afterwards" for case review!

C. 2017

30) **Lemmy** Newbusi had just started working for the Enfield council in August 2016 as a ASB Team Member. He took over the prior staffs dealing with the issues raised of our concerns and continued to "Flipped The Real Narrative Around The Wrong Way!"

31) He Helped staff evade my mother emails not being Faily addressed to protect me and their obligation to monitor Debra Andrews, while also protect me and other residence.

32) He as the ASB Council Officer intentionally avoiding the real issues and decided to add to those issues even further not only by covering those past errored issues up but by fabricating even more! It is said that Lemmy started to clearly manipulate the true events to help other staff avoid justice from what we alleged they done wrong to us.

1) To do this they left the neighbours attacking me in knowing that Mutable different Staff had already prior to this date done mass internal checks to see if I was known to the Enfield council housing or Asb Systems for any related housing tenancy breaches to do with my tenancy but I was not until on the 24/09/2016 when Geoffrey Man the Team Leader declared the one alleged incident that was created by Dawn Allen & unfairly as she has already said no truth had been found in Debras Complaint to us.

2) My Mother Put an SRA Into the Council for My Personal Data

3) The Enfield Council Staff demand a meeting with me at their office over 12 undisclosed allegations through my mother.

4) Mother refused for me to attend with her until the SRA was released. Mother also refused to attend with me until the 12 Allegations had gotten disclosed to us as Complaint A, B C, perrons name, date, time, location, allegation! So, we did not go.

5) Then Enfield council staff Lemmy meets up with the neighbours. The ones we been accusing of months of hurting me and asks them for negative history about me but only cases I prior had won in a criminal court was given. This case should not have been reused as they did!

1) Lemmy the council officer reattends the Council Offices and reallocates to “B Block” where he is based, he then afterwards creates a false Enfield Council History with the use of the intel of the “Police No Further Actioned Criminal Case” and uses the collected random allegations he obtained with no fair prominence of them gaining a fair guilty conviction and deploys them. He done this by using Dawn Allen case to do with Debra Andrews that I proved I was innocent in and by collectively added the case Sarah Flexure Handled to do with 117 Burncroft Avenue as to do with the alleged backdated letter claiming an unfounded drug allegation and the additional claims, she met them afterwards at the Enfield Councils Office to allowed more backdate offences to exist!

2) Lemmy placed all these enters it into my council history internally within their systems afterwards.

3) The Councils Automatic Internal Digital Systems includes meta data, and management protocols of its uploaded intel and this proves that the allegations Lemmy filed were filed after my mother complaints and when reviewed prove that we complained for a year none stop first.

4) The internal systems handling causes recorded human submitted input of files to be in a chronological order.

5) Which raises a major Issue as the entries Council Staff Lemmy put in the Enfield Councils internal systems are after my mother’s complaints and this also shows that they were deliberately backdated before her complaints.

6) The 12 incidents were sent to my mum before her SRA was released, as A, B, C and body full of the complaint but they failed to identify any of the different alleged victims so they could be called to the court.

7) My mother managed to keep me away from the Enfield Councils staffs desired meeting to protect me for over a year, until otherwise was wanted!

8) Lemmy & Co threated to put a housing possession order against me if I never attended. I can prove this form the emails and SRA, FOI obtained and the court applications they filed against me.

9) The Same 12 incidents continued to be used while communications continued between them all and no new incidents mentioned. I was not aware of any of this.

10) A housing possession order was put on my front door, and I became aware for the first time about everything. This created 31 allegations against me that I never committed including the first twelve.

1) I demand all correspondence from my mother and put it all in the council's diary format they gave me to fill-in so, I could understand what had happened to me to be able to defend myself from what I had not done.
2) My Mothers SRA was released to her and after I compiled it within the diary alongside the other relevant Government departments obtained official documents about myself she request for.
3) The first Housing Possession order placed on my front door never got put before the court.

D. 01/06/2017

1) ASB Officer Lemmy Newbusi File Notes after he made the 31 allegations.
2) Notes show different tenant at 115 - someone with mental health issues who asked to be rehoused. This appears to be actual secure tenant.

E. 2018-2019

1) **Five Years of Court Proceedings**
2) Council brings 3 possession orders and 2 injunctions using same discredited allegations against me.
3) Rebbecca O'Hare moved into 115 Burncroft Avenue Around Here!
4) **The First** is the **Housing Possession Order** I found stuck on my front door at 109 Burncroft and was also sent o my mother by email.
5) **The Second** application was a **1st Injunction Order** where the Judge residing the case at the Edmonton lower county court ordered that the alleged allegations must not be reused that were submitted in hearings for the first application after he disposed of the case due to failure from the Enfield council Officers to be able to respond within the court time frame given by him as an order of the law.
6) **The Third** case was what I titled as the **2nd Injunction Order,** same 31 allegations same court somehow but a different case number and I introduce the possibility of a different company credit card also being used to file the application. This also never made it to trial and kept heavy bail conditions on me restricting me from attending my home of 109 Burncroft Avenue. I allege that this was an abuse of process. The Judge was asked by the Enfield Council Solicitor and Lemmy Newbusi to order a mental health assessment against me. This was just before trial and as I was realising evidence that proved the truth. The judge refused to order it as an order at his sole request and rather ordered it at the Enfield Councils request. An Assessment took place I raised all the issues of my concern in it. On this day I was not detainable. I recorded and transcribed the meeting afterwards. To me it proved I was being abused but was well of mind and health but at the court the report stated that the Reviewing doctor on her own at my home said I lacked the capacity to litigate. The Judge ordered that the case be dismissed and said to Lemmy to stand up as well. He ordered Lemmy to comply with the Enfield Council by Rehousing me into a like for like home regarding park facilities as well as schooling for children and gardens. He said I can have whoever I like to be my career to live with me and this will be a 2x bedroom home and not 1 as I have got.
7) Lemmy refused and the Judge Made his orders to Lemmy again by stating I have made order like this before, and the Enfield Council has no other option but to comply the same as the rest did and then we was all dismissed. Ludmilla Lyavoo their hired in solicitor was present.
8) **My Mother contacted Lemmy and Ludmilla Lyavoo** about the court order and the first emails of them proves the court order as to what they say.
9) Ludmilla Lyavoo and Lemmy Newbuisi both gave my mother the run about. Eventually they treated the court order as something other than an emergency and put it at the next monthly panel rather than call on an emergency general panel meeting due to my housing and safeguarding concerns.
10) The order to be sealed at the lower court was served to us and amended to be of the Judges orders. As it failed to reflect what was said

11) The Enfield Councils Position wrote in the order was that my mother must make sure I seek medical help for mental health reasons. No Judge would order this as she is not me and the emails sent afterwards prove the real order anyways.
12) During the amended exchange of the sealed order being amended the council decided to amend it to their own wording stating my mum must force me to seek mental health treatment or no new home after what they had allowed and avoided.
13) The council sealed the order according to what they wanted and not what the Judge ordered as is easy to believe due to the incompetence in the directions they sealed.
14) We Questioned what they had done by sealing he order demanding my mum to admit me into mental Health before I'm rehoused, and I telephoned the council and recorded the conversation but instead of a fair response offering a safe home I was contacted by the police who arrived at my home with another council court order. I ripped the paper up and spat at it as the police walked of and they turned around and went for me; I evaded the police but hand myself in afterwards. They detained me to a mental hospital where I was reviewed and released without diagnoses.
15) The Enfield Council left me incapable of believing I have the capacity to litigate and demoralised my word at every given word otherwise to cover up the council history they created and used against me in knowing that they fabricated it and demanded the actions that I now suffer!
16) **Then fourthly**: the 2nd Housing possession order to the 3rd housing possession order. This is where a council solicitor who was hired in as a new employee to handle my case during the start of the 1st Injunction order turned the reused 31 allegations into 46 rather than the 31 as she refused with other staff to follow the Judge's order and rehouse me after losing the case.
17) We waited and asked at the end of each month as they went past. And asked if I was being rehomed as the Judge Ordered but was told it never got put before the panel.
18) Then My mother became so ill that I had to stay with her anyways more than ever and as i was already registered as her overnight carer with the Enfield Council it made sense just to stay with her.
19) I was left with no other option but to comply.
20) My Flat was left decommissioned.
21) And the council changed their narrative as mum pursed them for breaches of GDPR,
22) None reach trial. First possession Order don't make it to court, then the 1st injunction order where Edmonton lower county court ruled that the allegations must be wiped as discontinued and never re submitted. This was not just said at the court on the day as the Enfield Council reses notes also prove they keep going back to the court and asking for the case to be re-open, this was denied. Then the 2nd Injunction Order and the 2nd Housing possession order to the3rd housing possession order.

F. 2020, 2021, 2022, 2023, 2024

1) Continued
2) I returned diary sheets to the council.
3) The council retained those records.

G. 01/02/2-25

1) Doors Changed by Council.

H. 08/08/2025

1) Set up by Rebbecca

I. 2019-2026

1) Continued Reliance on Mother's Home

2) Council fails to re-house. Simon continues living with and caring for mother at 23 Byron Terrace.

J. **07/04/2026**
1) Found mum dead in bed, uncared for laying cramped sideways in the bed, rock solid for hours, she was lifeless but heart still beating, hospital made it look like she could recover but knew otherwise. I observed all the doctors just chatting outside of her room, like it was a normal day until I turned up.

K. **08/04/2026**
1) Miss Lorraine Cordell passes away. Simon applies for tenancy succession.

L. **29/08/2026**
1) mum funeral forced to trial.
2) Refused for case to be put off. Refused access to a solicitor other than 36/38 Appointed.

M. **14/10/2026**
1) Land Registry Discovery
2) Simon obtains Title NGL307570 confirming 115 Burncroft Avenue is council-owned, not private. Rebecca O'Hare's status questioned.

N. **Present**
1) Criminal Appeal
2) Simon appealing conviction based on allegations from Rebecca O'Hare. Defence: she is not legal tenant, had no standing to make allegations.

DRAFT NOTES

- The **Asbo Ian Davis** before he was the Chief Commissioner, he was in charge of environment and health. Which I the Asbo Department? **On the 03/11/2016** Quoted by **Kaunchita Maudhub:** "We are aware of Simon Cordell as Steve/Pat obtained an ASBO against him for illegal raves E.g." Pat and Steve made the Asbo by the councils' own admissions. The Council Denied this Mutable Times. Steve referred to Is steven Elsmore whose name is all in the Asbo and Amended the real police officers' internal notes to reflect what was not really wrote by them and now due to Steven is in the Asbo Application. The Councils Staff placed **Steve/Pat in a SAR within 111 Burncroft Avenues council History for Stain Curtis.**

1) There was no indexed officially served with the first Housing Possession Order! So, I created one. I used mothers' email, to understand the Walkin to what and why it was happening to me.

- **<Dir>** Possession Order (1) INDEX
- **Look for**: "*Email Book Walking to the 1st Housing Possession Order INDEX.pdf*"

- "The Community Safety Officer was **Louise Brown** a 0208 379 4467."
- "The resident upstairs is apparently under the care of our **CSRT a Bola is** the care coordinator."
- Anti-Social Behaviour officer
- Community Safety Unit
- Regeneration & Environment Department

I ask readers to consider these dates together with the evidence relating to Dawn Allen, Debra Andrews, Sarah Fletcher, Geoffrey Mann, and Lemmy.
One of the questions I eventually found myself asking was this:
If council records showed only one complaint on 22/11/2016, how did a history containing twelve allegations appear shortly afterwards and come to be relied upon in council proceedings, disclosure material, possession proceedings, and injunction applications? This evidence proves 11 more claims were made up during the 22/11/2016 and the 11/02/2017!
This is not the only issue identified within the evidence. However, it is one of the simplest ways for a reader to begin understanding how the chronology developed and why I say the later history relied upon against me did not exist in the form presented when earlier checks of council systems were conducted.
I therefore invite readers to follow the chronology beginning with **23/10/2015**, then **17/10/2016**, **20/10/2016**, **11/11/2016**, **22/11/2016**, **11/01/2017**, **24/01/2017**, **10/02/2017** and ending with **19/06/2017**, before reaching their own conclusions from the wider body of evidence.

1. MASTER CHRONOLOGY INTRODUCTION

LOG DATE	INTEL	FINDING
DOCX Answers File "The Start Walking to 2014!" June 2012 to April 2013 This is a striped down version of the issues relevant out of the main diary as a Microsoft Word	**Finding 1:** The Original Diary Was Split at The Council's Request	**The Start Walking To 2014!** At any persons first glance, dates on this findings table may appear empty. However, that is not always the case. The reason no entries may appear within certain sections of this chronology is because the **"Original Diary"** was created after the council instructed Mr. Simon Cordell to begin recording incidents, concerns and events affecting him which he, and others, stated were being deliberately caused by his neighbours to him. When the diary was later provided to Enfield Council staff, they refused to act upon its contents and instead instructed me to divide the diary into separate case files. It was explained that neither Enfield Council nor I would be able to properly address the matters or obtain justice unless the material was separated into individual cases. I explained how difficult and time-consuming this task would be but was told: *"It will take you as long as it takes you, just bring it back when you have finished."* I pointed out that it could take years to complete. The conversation was recorded and is referred to elsewhere within this document. During this period, Enfield Council and others continued to pursue further allegations based upon matters that had already been raised previously. As a result, the volume of documents and evidence continued to grow significantly. The council therefore requested that the diary be separated into individual case files dealing with different subjects, and I have been undertaking that process ever since. This file, ***"01. Claim-2014-and-Onwards",*** is one of those separated files.

365 Docx File **Docx Diary Link If Needed** June 2012 **PDF Answers File** "The Start Walking to Intro **And** April 2013 **Diary Intro Start PDF** Intro 2012 **Diary Exhibits Start** 08/04/2012		The absence of entries between **June 2012** and **April 2013** therefore does **Not** mean nothing was happening. Quite the opposite. The original diary contains further material relating to: **1)** Council Actions, **2)** Police Involvement, **3)** Neighbor Disputes, **4)** Victimisation, **5)** Housing Matters, **6)** And Other Connected Events. Those entries were moved into separate case files because they related to different subjects. This distinction is important because a reader looking only at this file might incorrectly assume there was no relevant activity during this period. The evidence shows otherwise. The activity existed. It may simply just appear in the main diary elsewhere within the larger chronology because the original diary was broken apart into separate evidence files at the council's request. This file therefore begins at the point where the events relevant to this claim start becoming important. The Answers File is created to demonstrate through evidenced exhibits what happened wrongly to me due to being victimised and how Official records got fabricated in my name to destroy my life deliberately due to certain Neighbours attached to 109 Burncroft Avenue Enfield EN3 7JQ and due to the police and Enfield Councils negligence and gross misconduct in civil and criminal law. The data used to create the**" The Answers File"** was extracted from the claimant's diary and other available resources and then compiled into a chronological order for defense reasons and for this reason the file starts in **April 2013**. The **07/04/2013** is the first entry we submit and is due to an Anti-Social Behaviour order that the Enfield Council and Metropolitan Police Applied for together after developing it! The Asbo itself is being contended against by me as the clamant in these proceedings. **"The Answers File:** is exhibited to demonstrate the wrongful actions of those people involved & therefore shows their continued reckless actions towards me as they continued to then afterwards fabricate further Court Orders while I and others formally logged complaints about the Asbo being developed in such a frauded manner and then had to complain again about the other court order applications being developed in the same manner of intentional misconduct as well!
DOCX Answers File Link 07/04/2013	**Finding 2:** Asbo Events were Manipulated when developed	**The Asbo** **A SUNDAY** **WHEN I WAS GOING OUT ON MY OFF-ROAD MOTOR BIKES** **IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE LAWS** This Driving Event had nothing to do with illegal raves and was won as a separate case by me but was added to the Asbo by the developers wrongly with intent and used to convict me for the Asbo.

Diary Link If Needed 07/04/2013 **PDF Answers File Link** 07/04/2013 **Diary Link If Needed** 07/04/2013	against me.	The events on this day were later relied upon by Enfield Council and the Metropolitan Police during the ASBO proceedings against Mr. Simon Cordell, where it was alleged that he participated in organising illegal raves. The ASBO bundle contained 6 separate cases, many of which involved the same organisations, staff, and allegations. The chronology identifies incidents later referred to as: **1)** Hyde Park **2)** Ponders End Police Station **3)** White Hart Lane **4)** Progress Way **5)** Falcon Park **6)** Carpet Right **7)** Alma Road **8)** Mill Marsh Lane These incidents were subsequently introduced as part of the evidence relied upon during the ASBO proceedings by Enfield Council and the Metropolitan Police. **This Case Has Its Own Case Files Exhibited Here:** **1)** **<Dir>** 04. Asbo-Files10-09-2023 -15-10-23 However, this matter has also been included within **"This File Because It Helps Explain the Criminal Motives and Civil Negligence Behind the Actions Taken by the Council and Other Organisations Involved."** Our Exhibits demonstrates what was proved about the conduct of staff involved in developing the ASBO bundles and latter applications it also magnifies a border understanding to complete ongoing by use of police internal intelligence that relate to Acro & PNC matters that were raised by us as a formal complaint to be rectified as amended but stays till date as avoided, causing another Motive for their wrongful actions that based on a longstanding time prior to everything else occurring. It is said that all cases of which became the subject of separate complaints and proceedings. The evidence shows a pattern of agencies relying upon the same allegations, information and records they fabricated against me while also protecting one another while we report their mistakes, inaccuracies or wrongdoing as identified by us! This Asbo case is also important because it provides historical context and shows how that history was created whilst Mr. Cordell remained subject to bail conditions and was repeatedly refused support by the same organisations involved in compiling and relying upon that material. I have been asked to keep the files separate even aloe they establish a case of **"Joint Circular**," So please read the pre–Action Conduct Letter and statements in the Asbo Folder Exhibited for a better understanding of the complete Case Files!
DOCX Answers File Link 25/06/2013	**Finding 3:** Official Records Contained Informatio	**The Gazebo Case** The police arrested me and this is a separate case. **The Case Files Are Exhibited Here for It:** <Dir> 02. Police Gazebo Case The outcome was that **I Won this Case**. . .

Diary Link If Needed 25/06/2013 **PDF Answers File Link** 25/06/2013 **Diary Link If Needed** 25/06/2013	n Which Are Inaccurate	This is the date I was arrested for it. I was held in the police station. An appropriate adult was needed for interview as always. I have had no other option but to accept this until most recently. At the age of 16 years of age my mother acted for me! No doctors attended the police station to talk to me as on all other occasions before this date. The table below demonstrates the process I was abused by as I was wrongly accused of an incident I did not commit! Below are the case dates! **The Gazebo Case: --** **Arrest:** 25/06/**2013** **Arrest/Summons Ref 13**/0000/00/625125U. **Name Charged:** CODELL, SIMON PAUL. **Remand to Dates: --** **1+** **25/06/2013: "Police Station"** **2+** **26/06/2013: "Court & the World of Scrubs"** **3+** 27/06/2013: "World of Scrubs" **4+** 28/06/2013: "Judge & Chambers "Granted Bail" **5+** 10/07/2013: "Bail Conditions" **6+** 16/07/2013: "Bail Conditions" **7+** 16/08/2013: "Bail Conditions" **8+** 09/09/2013: "Bail Conditions" **9+** 19/11/2013: "Bail Conditions" **10+** 20/11/2013: "Bail Conditions" **11+** 23/12/2013: "Bail Conditions" **12+** On the **02 Mar 2014,** our client voluntarily underwent a Mental Health Assessment and received a diagnosis of being well, by **Dr Javis**. He went for the Assessment due to pressure being caused by the Police and CPS for reason for which we claim about within Our Pre–Action Conduct Letter. **13+** 08/04/2014: "Bail Conditions" "No more Bail Conditions" **14+** 01/07/2014: "I won the Case, No more Bail Conditions". • **Video of Interview:** "Yes;" Link • **Correspondents & Case Files;** "Yes" Link • **Bail Conditions: --** **1)** **On the Date of the 11/03/14**, Dr Jarvis assessed me from the Enfield triage team. At one stage through the bail conditions imposed as dated in this section. The case became such a burden to me due to the conditions imposed that it negatively affected my ability to run my company objectives., while tarnishing my life. This happened as I knew that I was innocent of the offence I was being prosecuted for, I could no longer handle the damage being caused to me and after a court hearing where the prosecuting team still would not dispose of the case proceedings even when the evidence submitted already proved my innocence., I started to worry even more of the reality of the damage being caused to me by this. Also, while at the court hearing as I mentioned above, I heard the

prosecuting teams spokesman make a desperate move to involve the doctors, so I decided to beat them to it. After the court had finished, I spoke with my doctor and asked them to assess me due to the cases ongoings as I knew I could prove my innocence and wanted a non-bios decision based upon the real facts. The doctor who assessed me agreed that I had no official mental health diagnoses and I won the case afterwards.

2) On the **04 Mar 2014** **Iain Williams** logged into the RIO Data Base and updated Notes, His Notes Suggest a Plan for a Triage assessment to take place about Mr. Simon Paul Cordell **this entry was added due to me meeting with Doctor Jarvis!**
3) The reason it has been added is because it proves that when **The Enfield Council Staff Started To Create An Officially Fabricated Record Concerning Me**, as exhibits prove before and on the date of the exhibited dated the **12/12/2017**, events were backdated across council, police and mental health records covering dates for which this case as active in its status, making their claims imposable, It also forms as a part of the polices long term abuse of process against me.

it is said that the Enfield Council staff avoided emails sent by my mother, which I had asked her to send on my behalf so that I could be protected from malicious rumor's that were being spread and which caused neighbours to severely victimise me.

The council told my mother that they would hold a meeting regarding what the neighbours were doing to me but at the same time, they contacted doctors enquiring whether I had any mental health history, to build a case against me unfairly, the answer given by NHS to the council was no mental health intervention or warning markers applied to my name, that have prior warranted any mental health intervention, but Members of the NHS staff still passed my personal details of any normal medical interventions that were raised and manipulated those case files to be other than the events to which they really are for wrongful use against me and then those fabricated claims were later relied upon to build me a mental health record that shows on council & police systems while being held on the Rio System for mental health. The Gazebo Case therefore demonstrates how my mental health history was later fabricated.

- The Gazebo Case Curfew - 26/06/2013: Court & the World of Scrubs until 28/06/2013.
- The Gazebo Case Curfew - 28/06/2013: Judge & Chambers granted bail on 08/04/2014, then the bail conditions were changed to "No More Bail Conditions" until the case was won on 01/07/2014.

The Gazebo Case Bail Dates Prove Innocence in Asbo Proceedings

The Gazebo Case also proves I did not commit the ASBO allegation because I have copies of the Facebook event being set up in the real names of the people involved, not mine. At the time, I was on curfew and would never have known that I was going to be released to organise such an event. I was wrongly accused and set up in relation to this case as well.

		28/02/2014 Records later reviewed on **12/12/2017** allegedly contained an entry stating: *"Subject with others was charged with attempted robbery."* However, these government records prove otherwise. **Why These Finding Matters:** I was never charged with others. I was never charged with attempted robbery. There would therefore be no legitimate reason for such wording to appear against my name. These findings are all important in these proceeding because they demonstrates that inaccurate information was used and latter relied on while also modified to be enhanced upon, so that the intel **"CD-Data"** can be executed for use within official systems at later dates by staff to obtain unwarranted Government involvement or decision making that will allow for Mental Health diagnoses. The issue is not the wording alone in the official records created internally but also the purpose to which they manipulated it to be used! Another part of the issue is that later decision makers have relied upon this information already in knowing that it was inaccurately recorded for wrong use! As more than just one serious entry got indicated as inaccurate, the reliability of the complete official records from all government systems required examination, as we have completed and exhibited throughout!
DOCX Answers File Link 25/06/2013 **Diary Link If Needed** 25/06/2013 **PDF Answers File Link** 25/06/2013 **Diary Link If Needed** 25/06/2013	**Finding 4:** The Gazebo Case Creates a Fixed Timeline That Cannot Be Rewritten	**The Gazebo Case Provides:** **1)** An arrest date. This date is independently verified. Unlike later records, opinions and allegations, these dates cannot be altered. The Gazebo Case therefore becomes a benchmark against which later allegations can be measured. The chronology relies upon the Gazebo Case because it provides fixed factual points capable of evaluating the reliability of later records. **EXHIBIT** • **2** States that on **12/12/2017** & **13/04/2018** an officer, named as **Adult Research Conducted - Deborah Batchelor Enfield PPD –** , searched for the records of our client and located a note referring to an entry dated **25/06/2013** within the RIO database. The note refers to a Metropolitan Police MERLIN reference containing information from a Risk Assessment (Cascade Information Report) linked to Police CRIS 3018184/13, which stated: a) *"Subject with others was charged with attempted robbery."* The information above is inaccurate. Our client was never arrested by others. Our client was never charged with attempted robbery.

		There would therefore be no legitimate reason for this wording to appear within records associated with his name. On **12/12/2017**, additional entries and dates were also identified that remain disputed. This record is said to originate from a police fax referral sent while our client was in police custody. Adult Research Conducted: Deborah Batchelor, Enfield PPD. **EXHIBIT** • **3** Proves that our client was genuinely arrested on 25/06/2013 and was present within a police station. No Mental Health Services were involved. The alleged offence was not: a) *"Subject with others was charged with attempted robbery."* Rather, the allegation concerned the belief that our client had taken a garden gazebo following an alleged squat party. **Why This Finding Matters** This finding is important because it establishes a fixed and independently verifiable event that can be assessed against about the information recorded later within official systems inaccurately! The arrest of **25/06/2013** can be evidenced through official records and therefore provides a reliable benchmark for examining subsequent entries. Where later records describe our client as having been charged with attempted robbery, yet the underlying police records do not support that claim, fundamental questions arise regarding the accuracy of the information being recorded and relied upon. The issue is not limited to a single inaccurate entry. The wider concern is that later decision makers have relied upon information that was already inaccurate when it entered official systems. If one significant entry can be shown to be incorrect, the reliability of related records created from the same information source requires careful examination. This finding therefore provides an important evidential reference point from which the accuracy, development and reliability of later records can be assessed. **Exhibit** <Dir> 02. Police Gazebo Case
DOXC Answers File Link 26/06/2013 **Till The** 01/02/2014	**Finding 5:** The Gazebo Case Curfew - 28/06/2013:	**The Gazebo Case** Judge & Chambers **"Granted** Bail on the **08/04/2014** then the **"Bail Conditions"** were changed to **"No More Bail Conditions,"** until case won on the **01/07/2014.**

Diary Link If Needed 26/06/2013 **Until** 2014 Intro **Till The** 01/02/2014 **PDF Answers File Link** 26/06/2013 till the 01/02/2014 **Diary Link If Needed** 26/06/2013 **Until 2014 Intro till The** 01/02/2014		
DOCX Answers File Link 28/02/2014 **Diary Link If Needed** 28/02/2014 **PDF Answers File Link** 28/02/2014	**Finding 6:** The Asbo	**The Asbo** These exhibits contain screenshots of the Facebook account used to create the **Hippy Fest** event relied upon within the ASBO proceedings. The screenshots were copied and preserved by my mother for use in my defense. The account shown within the exhibits was not my account. The exhibits identify the Facebook account used to create the event and preserve information relating to the individuals responsible for creating and administering it. At the time these proceedings were taking place, I engaged in the ongoing Gazebo Case and remained subject to the uncertainty, stress and restrictions associated with those proceedings. Although the material had been retained for my defense, I was genuinely concerned about my personal safety and did not wish to provide information to the police which could identify, implicate, or be used against other individuals connected to the event.

Diary Link If Needed 28/02/2014		My decision was therefore not based upon the evidence being unavailable. The evidence existed and had been preserved. My concern was the potential consequences of supplying such information to the authorities. **EXHIBIT** • **1** **Hippy Fest Account Exhibit** There is manual page controls located on the left-hand side of the image slider. The pages may be advanced manually or viewed automatically by moving the mouse cursor over the images. **Link 1**: Demo 2 **Mirror Link 2**: https://everyoneloginto.me/04.%20Extra-Police-And-Council-Cases/04.%20Asbo-Files10-09-2023%20-15-10-23/04.%20Asbo-Files10-09-2023%20-15-10-23/Fresh-Image-Slider-4-Asbo/Fresh-Image-Slider-4-Asbo/Fresh-Image-Slider-4-Asbo/Image-Slider-Demo/Image%20Slider%20Si%201.html The exhibit shows the Facebook account used to create the Hippy Fest event. The screenshots identify when the account was created and preserve information concerning the account responsible for creating the event. This evidence can be compared directly against the timeline relied upon during the ASBO proceedings. **1)** This Exhibit Identifies When the Hippy Fest Account Was Created. **2)** The Claimant Would Not Have Known That He Would Shortly Be Released from The Restrictions Imposed Upon Him as Part of The Gazebo Case. **3)** At The Time, The Claimant Remained Subject to Ongoing Proceedings and The Uncertainty Created by The Events Of **30/12/2013** And **31/12/2013.** **Why This Finding Matters** This finding is important because it concerns evidence that existed at the time of the ASBO proceedings and was capable of being examined against the allegations that were later relied upon. The significance of this exhibit is not simply that a Facebook account existed. The significance is that contemporaneous evidence existed identifying the account used to create the event when it was created, and information capable of being compared against the chronology of events relied upon during the proceedings. The claimant's position is that this material may have assisted in examining the accuracy and reliability of the allegations made against him. The evidence was preserved but not relied upon because of genuine concerns regarding personal safety and the consequences of providing identifying information to the police concerning other individuals. The ASBO was subsequently granted. The chronology therefore records the existence of this evidence so that it can now be considered alongside the remaining material and the timeline of events relied upon throughout these proceedings.

		Exhibit <Dir> 04. Asbo-Files10-09-2023 -15-10-23
DOCX Answers File Link 02/03/2014 **Diary Link If Needed** 02/03/2014 **PDF Answers File Link** 02/03/2014 **Diary Link If Needed** 02/03/2014	**Finding 7:** The Mental Health records are back dated and manipulated with frauded, RIO Notes	**RIO Notes** The Information Below Was Disclosed by Enfield Council Following a Freedom of Information Request Granted On **24/01/2017.** The records include information **recorded by Dawn Allan within Enfield Council's** case history relating to Mr Simon Cordell. At the time, my mother was repeatedly contacting the council seeking assistance and protection regarding ongoing problems with neighbours and the Victimisation I was experiencing. The purpose of her contact was to obtain support and intervention from the council in relation to those issues. The disclosed records show that information concerning me was being recorded, discussed, and shared before I met more than one of the individuals who later became involved in developing my case history. The records further demonstrate that, despite the concerns being raised relating to neighbor disputes and victimisation, information was recorded about my mental health which later became incorporated into official records. The records themselves acknowledge that I was not known to Mental Health Services. Despite this, dates later appeared within records and were attributed to significance beyond the events that occurred. The chronology contends that these dates were backdated, manipulated, and subsequently relied upon creating an inaccurate mental health history concerning me. The information was then relied upon by multiple agencies and later used to support further assessments, interventions, court applications, and detentions. **Source Identified** **Dawn Allan - Enfield Council Case History** **Dates Identified Within the Disclosure** On **24/01/2017**, Enfield Council disclosed records containing the following dates: **1)** 01/03/2012 **2)** **02/03/2014** **3)** 00/11/2014 These dates later became significant because they were relied upon as historical events despite concerns regarding their accuracy, context, and origin. On **02/03/2014**, I voluntarily attended a mental health assessment. My attendance was not the result of any established history of involvement with Mental Health Services. I attended because of the pressure, stress and hardship created by the Gazebo proceedings and the prolonged bail restrictions that I was subject to at the time.

		The assessment occurred during ongoing criminal proceedings which had a significant impact upon my life, wellbeing, and circumstances. The chronology therefore identifies an important context to this assessment which is often absent from later records. **Why This Finding Matters** These findings are important because the official records themselves acknowledge that I was not known to Mental Health Services. Despite that position, later records appear to have relied upon dates, entries and historical narratives that were subsequently treated as evidence of an established mental health history. The issue is not simply that information was recorded. The issue is this original information was recorded during a period of extreme stress, active criminal proceedings and restrictive bail conditions that when added together was fair for me to be worried about, considering that I am an innocent person and this all but becomes more concerning considering the case was dropped but latter reused by officers who had nothing to do with those case proceedings, years later. In the year of 2017 Government officials manipulated these case files for misuse, so, they could be relied upon as part of developing of a Fabricated mental health history, record for me. As the dates and entries relied upon are inaccurate, backdated and amended as removed from their original context, then the reliability of later records derived from those original entries must also be examined, as they may also contain Fraud in my name. Our findings therefore identify an early fraudulent stage in the development of an official history concerning Mr Simon Cordell and raises questions regarding the accuracy, source and reliability of information that was later relied upon by multiple agencies to section him under the Mental Health Act to deprive him of his life, wellbeing and property by intentional wrongful use of government services! Doctors assessment Notes dated the **03/02/2016,** themselves state that there was no prior date such as this in the RIO Notes attached to my name as Mental Health Records.
DOCX Answers File Link 04/03/2014 **Diary Link If Needed** 04/03/2014 **PDF**	**Finding 8:** RIO Notes	**RIO Notes** On **04/03/2014 at 09:07**, Iain Williams Validated Details for Dr Javis. **The record states**: ***"Plan: Triage Assessment."*** However, no follow-up ever occurred. My interaction with the service was limited to this assessment and there was no continuing involvement. Importantly, Iain Williams did not classify my interaction with Mental Health Services as a mental health history. Within the official record, he marked: **"No"**

Answers File Link 04/03/2014 **Diary Link If Needed** 04/03/2014		The record therefore demonstrates that, at the time it was created, my contact with the service was not being treated as evidence of an established mental health history. I subsequently continued dealing with the Gazebo proceedings and later won the case as and after the damage caused by those proceedings affected my life due to reckless line management overviews! **Why This Finding Matters** This finding is important because it is a contemporary record created at the time of the events themselves. The record shows that a triage assessment was considered, yet no follow-up occurred and no ongoing involvement with Mental Health Services resulted from that contact. More importantly, the officer recording the information marked **"No"** when recording whether there was a relevant mental health history. This is significant because it demonstrates that, in March 2014, the available information did not identify me as having an established mental health history. If professionals reviewing my circumstances at that time did not classify my contact with services as evidence of a mental health history, then later records suggesting otherwise require careful examination. This finding therefore provides another fixed point within the chronology against which the accuracy and development of later records can be assessed. **Exhibit** **Doctors Files:** **<Dir>** 10. New Doctors Fix 23-09-26 **<Dir>** 08. Simulation 1
DOCX Answers File Link 08/04/2014 **Diary Link If Needed** 08/04/2014 **PDF Answers File Link** 08/04/2014 **Diary Link If Needed**	**Finding 9:** The Gazebo Case Curfew - 28/06/2013:	**The Gazebo Case** Judge & Chambers **"Granted** Bail on the **08/04/2014** then the **"Bail Conditions**" were changed to **"No More Bail Conditions,"** until case won on the **01/07/2014.**

08/04/2014		
DOCX Answers File Link 20/04/2014 **Diary Link If Needed** 20/04/2014 **PDF Answers File Link** 20/04/2014 **Diary Link If Needed** 20/04/2014	**Finding 10:** The Gazebo Case The Asbo	**The Gazebo Case & The Asbo** **EXHIBIT** • **1** **The Gazebo Case Curfew - 28/06/2013:** Judge & Chambers **"Granted** Bail on the **08/04/2014** then the **"Bail Conditions**" were changed to **"No More Bail Conditions,"** until case won on the **01/07/2014.** **EXHIBIT** • **2** **The Asbo** **12.3.** Hired Out to 420 Hyde Park, Alan Browne **20/04/2014** this is the day I met Shannon. **Asbo Accused Dates** **12.2.** Sunday Going Out on Motor Bikes 07/04/2013. **12.3.** Hired Out to 420 Hyde Park, Alan Browne **20/04/2014** this is the day I met Shannon. **12.4.** Ponders End Police Station Christopher Jackson Ye 24/05/2014. **12.5.** White Hart Lane Steve Hoodless 25/05/2014 **12.6.** Progress Way 07/06/2014 **12.7.** 1 Falcon Park Pc Haworth 20/06/2014 **12.8.** Carpet right 19/07/2014. **12.9.** Alma Road 24/07/2014 **12.10.** Mill Marsh Lane 1. 27/07/2014 **12.11.** Mill Marsh Lane the Second Accusation: 10/08/2014.
DOCX Answers File Link 24/05/2014 **Diary Link If Needed** 24/05/2014 **PDF Answers File Link** 24/05/2014 **Diary Link If Needed**	**Finding 11:** The Asbo	**The Asbo** **EXHIBIT** • **2** **12.4.** Visiting Friends at the Ponders End Police Station Christopher Jackson Ye **24/05/2014.** Visiting Friends at the Ponders End Police Station Christopher Jackson Ye **24/05/2014.** The police officer who original made the report that was not latter amended stated themselves that I was in my car and pulled up as they watched. They themselves went to the doors of the old, closed police station while I stayed outside and never went in that they spoke to the squatters at the door who were squatting the building, no arrests were made.

24/05/2014		
DOCX Answers File Link 25/05/2014 **Diary Link If Needed** 25/05/2014 **PDF Answers File Link** 25/05/2014 **Diary Link If Needed** 25/05/2014	**Finding 12:** The Asbo	**The Asbo EXHIBIT** • **2** **Asbo Accused Dates** **12.5.** White Hart Lane Steve Hoodless **25/05/2014.** A Friend's Place - "I got asked to attend a friend's place of residence, to say hello and to drop off money for food:
DOCX Answers File Link 07/06/2014 **Diary Link If Needed** 07/06/2014 **PDF Answers File Link** 07/06/2014 **Diary Link If Needed** 07/06/2014	**Finding 13:** The Asbo	**The Asbo EXHIBIT** • **2** **Asbo Accused Dates** **12.6.** Progress Way **07/06/2014**. Visiting Friends at Progress Way when police officer on duty sets me up!
DOCX	**Finding 14:**	**The Asbo EXHIBIT**

Answers File Link 20/06/2014 **Diary Link If Needed** 20/06/2014 **PDF Answers File Link** 20/06/2014 **Diary Link If Needed** 20/06/2014	The Asbo	• **2** **Asbo Accused Dates** **12.7.** 1 Falcon Park Pc Haworth **20/06/2014.** Hiring out a sound system for a gentleman for his birthday party.
DOCX Answers File Link 01/07/2014 **Diary Link If Needed** 01/07/2014 **PDF Answers File Link** 01/07/2014 **Diary Link If Needed** 01/07/2014	**Finding 15:** The Gazebo Case	**The Gazebo Case** **EXHIBIT** • **1** Judge & Chambers **"Granted** Bail on the **08/04/2014** then the **"Bail Conditions**" were changed to **"No More Bail Conditions,"** until case won on the **01/07/2014.**
DOCX Answers File Link 19/07/2014	**Finding 16:** The Asbo	**The Asbo** **EXHIBIT** • **1** **Asbo Accused Dates** **12.8.** Carpet right **19/07/2014.**

Diary Link If Needed 19/07/2014 **PDF Answers File Link** 19/07/2014 **Diary Link If Needed** 19/07/2014		I saw a man who I know to be homeless, getting detained by police officers, so I stopped to make sure he was all right!
DOCX Answers File Link 24/07/2014 **Diary Link If Needed** 24/07/2014 **PDF Answers File Link** 24/07/2014 **Diary Link If Needed** 24/07/2014	**Finding 17:** The Asbo	**The Asbo** **EXHIBIT** • **1** **Asbo Accused Dates** **12.9.** Alma Road **24/07/2014.** Thursday at 16:30 driving down Alma Road in my car on the way home with no sound equipment after visiting my nan while she was ill!
DOCX Answers File Link 27/07/2014 **Diary Link If Needed** 27/07/2014	**Finding 18:** The Asbo	**The Asbo** **EXHIBIT** • **1** **Asbo Accused Dates** **12.10.** Mill Marsh Lane 1. **27/07/2014.**

PDF Answers File Link 27/07/2014 **Diary Link If Needed** 27/07/2014		
DOCX Answers File Link 10/08/2014 **Diary Link If Needed** 10/08/2014 **PDF Answers File Link** 10/08/2014 **Diary Link If Needed** 10/08/2014	**Finding 19:** The Asbo	**The Asbo EXHIBIT** • **1** **12.11.** Mill Marsh Lane the Second Accusation: **10/08/2014**. I did not get involved in organization of any rave, and I did not supply equipment. The police have alleged this event got run by Every Decibel Matters, I can confirm that I am not an employee of this organization, or a shareholder, or a director and have no controlling interest in this company.
DOCX Answers File Link 13/08/2014 **Diary Link If Needed** 13/08/2014 **PDF Answers File Link**	**Finding 20:** The Asbo	**The Asbo Exhibit:** Asbo Certificate Signed by Edmonton Police Borough Commander and Enfield Council <Dir> 08. Asbo-FlipBooks-10-09-23 **Asbo Flipbook Style, to the page:** https://everyonelogінto.me/03.%20R-2014-and-Onwards/03.%20New%2014%20Onwards%2017-09-26/03.%20Case-Flipbooks/08.%20Asbo-FlipBooks-10-09-23/1)%20Asbo/Files1/mobile/index.html#p=10

13/08/2014 **Diary Link If Needed** 13/08/2014		
DOCX Answers File Link 12/09/2014 **Diary Link If Needed** 12/09/2014 **PDF Answers File Link** 12/09/2014 **Diary Link If Needed** 12/09/2014	**Finding 21:** The Asbo	**The Asbo** PC Sophie Theodoulou Police Officer Who Lied and said that she Served me the First Asbo Folder! **Page Numbers:** 57,58 12/09/2014 **Asbo Condition Imposed until!** **Asbo was wrongly Granted** 04/08/2015. **End of Asbo Court Order - 04/08/2020** The Forged Asbo conditions placed upon me would not finish until **04/08/2020** meaning I could never go out ever again to a party in case I got set up again by the police and the Council!
DOCX Answers File Link 03/10/2014 **Diary Link If Needed** 03/10/2014 **PDF Answers File Link** 03/10/2014 **Diary Link If Needed**	**Finding 22:** Was a Private Life!	**Was a Private Life!** **EXHIBIT** • **2** On **03/10/2014**, I asked Shannon: "*Can you feel someone playing about with our lives around this time?"* • I asked Shannon whether she felt that somebody was interfering with, influencing, or manipulating events affecting our lives during that period. • What was meant by this statement was my belief that government officials were actively probing my name and manipulating information concerning me through official systems and media channels. • At the time, this activity contributed to the development of a false narrative concerning my character, reputation, and personal history. • I also believed that information relating to me was being circulated in a manner that presented me negatively while concealing the true facts surrounding the ASBO proceedings and much of the prior involvement government agencies had already had with me. • By this stage, large concerns had already been raised with the Police, CPS and Court House by both me and others who had become aware

<table>
<tr>
<td>03/10/2014</td>
<td></td>
<td>of serious inaccuracies within the records and allegations being relied upon against me.
• These concerns were raised through a variety of means, including verbal conversations, emails, and telephone calls.
• Those concerns included allegations of inaccurate records, manipulated information, procedural irregularities, and evidence which, in my view, demonstrated that I had been treated unfairly throughout the proceedings.

<u>Why This Finding Matters</u>
This finding is important because it records my concerns at the time the events were occurring, rather than years later.
The conversation demonstrates that, by October 2014, external influences were affecting the way information about me was being developed and presented.
It also demonstrates that concerns regarding inaccurate information, manipulated records and unfair treatment were already being raised during the relevant period and were not issues invented retrospectively.
The chronology therefore relies upon this conversation as evidence of my contemporaneous concerns regarding the accuracy of the information being relied upon against me and the way the Authorities were was being developing history in my name that gets held on their systems internally.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><u>DOCX Answers File Link</u>
06/11/2014
<u>Diary Link If Needed</u>
06/11/2014

<u>PDF Answers File Link</u>
06/11/2014
<u>Diary Link If Needed</u>
06/11/2014</td>
<td><u>Finding 23:</u>
The Asbo</td>
<td><u>EXHIBIT</u>
• <u>2</u>
Stage 1
<u>1x Recording.</u>
<u>1st POLICE CALL Recording!</u>
01m. 1st POLICE CALL Recording 06_11_2014
Page Number: Update Page Number 1,
<table>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td><u>06_11_2014</u></td>
<td>➢ <u>Simon Cordell’s MP3’S Indexed</u>
Stage 1
<u>1x Recording.</u>
<u>1st POLICE CALL Recording!</u>
01m. 1st POLICE CALL Recording 06_11_2014
<u>Page Number: Update Page Number</u> 1,
1) 05. 1st POLICE CALL Recording 06_11_2014.docx
2) 05. 1st POLICE CALL Recording 06_11_2014.mp3
3) 05. 1st POLICE CALL Recording 06_11_2014.pdf</td>
</tr>
</table>

<u>New Weblink dated 04/10/2026</u> http://192.168.0.49:90/09.%20MP3-Audio/1.%20Main%20transcripts%20mp3%20all%20together/index.aspx</td>
</tr>
</table>

		1) mp3 Index Solicitor Disputes 04_10_25.docx 2) mp3 Index Solicitor Disputes 04_10_25.pdf
DOCX Answers File Link 19/11/2014 **Diary Link If Needed** 19/11/2014 **PDF Answers File Link** 19/11/2014 **Diary Link If Needed** 19/11/2014	**Finding 24:** Rio	Rio Notes were obtained through a Subject Access Request in 2021 due to continued involvement from the Mental Health departments, which the claimant contends amounted to an abuse of process. The claimant asked his mother to obtain information from the NHS systems because, for a second time, attempts were being made to diagnose him with mental health issues whilst he maintained that public authorities were using medical services to dispute truthful statements he had made regarding events in his life. The chronology relies upon these records because they form part of the foundation from which the claimant's later mental health history was developed. **Exhibit 2** **The Doctor's Folder / Pub Book Issue 5** **Addressing Point 1** *"Telephone call received from Simon's mother to say that he is really unwell."* **Lucy Clitherow** This statement lacks clarification from the claimant's mother, who disputes making any telephone calls to the NHS regarding her son and maintains that it was NHS staff who contacted her rather than her contacting them. The chronology therefore identifies an immediate dispute regarding the origin and accuracy of information recorded within the medical records. **Addressing Point 2** "*He is extremely paranoid towards her."* *"He thinks the television is talking to him."* *"He is having quite a lot of trouble with the police."* These statements were recorded by Lucy Clitherow and attributed to the claimant's mother. The chronology identifies these entries because they later became relied upon as part of the claimant's developing mental health history. **Additional Notes** 1. **History**: No. 2. This is the first piece of evidence presently identified within the Rio Notes relating to **19/11/2014**. 3. The exhibit for **19/11/2014** was received following a Subject Access Request granted by NHS Services on **26/01/2019**. 4. The data contained within the Rio records supplied to the claimant does not appear to represent all information held by the NHS concerning this incident. The chronology contends that the records

disclosed were incomplete and therefore potentially misleading as to the true events that occurred on this date.

One later record state that:
*"We attended the flat around 17:30. There were police outside. They had been attempting to enter as they had received complaints from **Neighbors Due To Simon Screaming Out in Distress**."*
This entry demonstrates that additional records existed concerning the events of **19/11/2014** and that professionals had access to information which was not fully reflected within the material originally supplied.
It also demonstrates the records my mother obtained due to her SRA in my name from the Doctors, "RIO" were modified to give the narrative that my mother called the doctors on me when in fact it was Ozzy my Neighbor, as I also recollect due to her phoning me to warn me of them being outside my flats trying to getting by requesting the Code to the front communal door.

What This Demonstrates

1) Additional files exist which were available to professionals when forming opinions and making assessments but were not fully disclosed to the claimant.
2) The records relate directly to the events which occurred between the claimant and his mother on the same day and are consistent with recollections concerning neighbor complaints and the circumstances that existed at the time.
3) The records supplied to the claimant were only obtained years later, creating concerns regarding whether the disclosure represented the complete material held regarding the incident.
4) Had the claimant not later obtained the assessment records showing the events of that day, the material disclosed would have consisted of information placing responsibility upon his mother rather than presenting the complete circumstances.
5) The chronology contends that, from the beginning of Enfield Council's involvement and the later involvement of medical professionals, genuine events in the claimant's life became increasingly replaced by a developing mental health narrative. The claimant contends that information was repeatedly taken out of context, redeveloped, and relied upon in circumstances that resulted in him being portrayed in a manner inconsistent with the events he maintains were occurring.

The chronology specifically identifies the involvement of Dawn Allan and Debra Morgan because records associated with them form part of the early development of information that was subsequently relied upon in the creation of a mental health history concerning the claimant.
The chronology further contends that relevant records remain missing and that the disclosures supplied do not represent the complete records held concerning these events.
This is further exhibited within:
Dawn Allan & Debra Morgan

4-The-Particulars...Doctor-List-File-Upgrade 22-05-24
That file requires further revision because it fully explains the role played by those records in the development of the claimant's later history.
Update: 19/11/2014
The chronology identifies this date as a significant turning point.

1) The claimant had reached a point where he could no longer tolerate the sound-transmission problems within the flat.
2) The claimant could no longer cope with the ongoing neighbor issues, of which had already been reported by both him and his mother.
3) The claimant believed that what was being done to him was wrong and highly unlawful.
4) This was the period in which the claimant came to realise the true extent of the inadequate soundproofing within the Enfield Council property.
5) The claimant contends that a neighbours known as "**Ozzy",** whose real name is Hassan Ozman, repeatedly maintained that he could not hear the claimant despite both properties sharing adjoining walls.
6) The claimant's flat and Hassan Ozman's flat were directly connected through a shared wall structure, making sound transmission between the properties a significant issue.

The chronology therefore identifies neighbor disputes, noise transmission, repeated complaints, police attendance and housing issues as important parts of the background to the events of 19/11/2014.
The claimant contends that these genuine issues were never properly resolved despite repeated complaints made by both him and his mother.
The chronology further identifies the involvement of the Enfield Crisis Resolution and Home Treatment Team.
The claimant contends that records created during 2015 and 2016 relied upon information from this period and that information was subsequently redeveloped and deployed against him as part of a growing mental health history.

The records identify individuals including:

1) Sam Curtis - Approved Mental Health Professional.
2) Dr Kripalani - Consultant Psychiatrist.
3) Goodie Adama - Care Coordinator and Community Mental Health Nurse.

The chronology identifies these individuals because records associated with them form part of the chain through which information concerning the claimant was recorded, developed, shared, and later relied upon.

Why These Findings Matter
These findings are important because they demonstrate that the events of 19/11/2014 did not arise in isolation.
Prior to this incident, both the claimant and his mother had repeatedly contacted Enfield Council regarding neighbor disputes, noise nuisance,

anti-social behavior, and the severe sound-transmission problems within the council property.
The chronology contends that these issues were genuine, ongoing, and repeatedly reported, but were never adequately resolved.
The records themselves state **"History: No"**, demonstrating that no established mental health history existed at that stage.
At the same time, information later relied upon as evidence of mental health concerns was beginning to appear within official records.
The claimant's mother disputes the information attributed to her.
Additional records appear to exist beyond those originally disclosed.
Police attendance, neighbour complaints, housing problems, and ongoing disputes were all occurring at the same time.
The chronology therefore identifies a significant conflict between the documented history of neighbour and housing problems on the one hand, and the developing mental health narrative on the other.
The claimant's position is that genuine housing, neighbour, and environmental issues became increasingly overshadowed by records which reinterpreted those events through a mental health framework.
The significance of these findings therefore lies in:

1) The Repeated Complaints Made by Both the Claimant and His Mother.
2) The Failure to Resolve the Underlying Neighbour and Housing Issues.
3) The Recording Of **"History: No".**
4) The Disputed Information Attributed to The Claimant's Mother.
5) The Existence of Additional Records Not Originally Disclosed.
6) The Involvement of Multiple Agencies and Professionals.
7) The Later Development and Reliance Upon a Mental Health History Derived from This Period.

The chronology therefore identifies **19/11/2014** as one of the key stages in the development of the claimant's later official history because it marks the point at which genuine neighbour, housing and police-related issues became intertwined with information that was later relied upon by multiple public authorities when dealing with the claimant.

- **The following records we found.**
  1) Doctors attended my home to do a mental health assessment on me dated the **03/02/2016.** The Doctors Mental Health Assessment notes that they uploaded into Rio and contained a list of backdated notes about me.
     The19/11/2014 is one of those dates and it states that Mr Cordell's mother phoned the hub (triage team) and reported that I was unwell in such a way that it warranted for the doctors to attend my home and do a Mental HEALTH assessment on me, this is disputed as not being true.
     The quoted notes in dispute state: "*On 19/11/2014 Mr. Cordell's mother phoned the hub (triage team) and reported that he was*

paranoid towards her and towards the police. ***In response the home treatment visited the same day. When home treatment workers arrived the same day, the police were present*** *and* ***reported that Mr. Cordell had been screaming in distress****. The police said that they had found Mr. Cordell using a gas canister and thought that he was using nitrous oxide.* ***He was referred for a Mental Health Act assessment."***

- **Key Issues Disputed:**
  - **a)** My Mother Telephoned Them.
  - **b)** To Report Issues That Warranted a Mental Health Assessment on Me.
  - **c)** That He Was Paranoid Towards Her and Towards the Police
  - **d)** The Police Said That They Had Found Mr. Cordell Using a Gas Canister and Thought That He Was Using Nitrous Oxide.
- **Key Issues Not Disputed Are:**
  - **a)** In Response the Home Treatment Visited the Same Day.
  - **b)** When Home Treatment Workers Arrived the Same Day,
  - **c)** The Police Were Present
  - **d)** The Police Were Present Reported That Mr. Cordell Had Been Screaming in Distress.
  - **e)** The Police Said That They Had Found Mr. Cordell Using a Gas Canister and Thought That He Was Using Nitrous Oxide.
  - **f)** People Referred Simon for A Mental Health Act Assessment."

My Personal Rio Records held by Mental Health department we obtained from them by us with a subject Access Request in **late 2019** and received by us on the **08_02_2019.**

The records contain repeated assertions that Lorraine initiated contact with mental health services on 19 November 2014.
Two administrative entries & One Nursing entire.

- 12:31 Lucy Clitherow, administrative entries
- 14:29 Kyieka Downie, administrative entire
- 15:50 Lucy Clitherow, administrative entries

None of the above witnessed events at my flat or to do with myself.
Hearsay. if a boss or doctor is telling an administrative staff to note a record of what they are saying to the administrative staff then that becomes hearsay as it is a third person prospective and little weight is to be taken by it nor can it Soley be relied upon.
If a member of administrative staff takes a call from a person like my mother and needs to make a record, then this is still hearsay.
What is not hearsay Is?

Entry 1 - Lucy Clitherow 12:31

Direct evidence

Lucy can directly testify that:

1) She received a telephone call.
2) Lucy made the note at 12:31.
3) Lucy recorded certain information.
4) Lucy gave a number for the Hub.

Hearsay

These parts are hearsay because they are alleged statements made by Lorraine:

1) "*He is really unwell."*
2) *"He is extremely paranoid towards her."*
3) *"He thinks the television is talking to him."*
4) *"He is very paranoid towards the police."*
5) *"He is currently staying with his father."*

Lucy is not proving those things happened.
Lucy is recording what somebody allegedly told her.

Entry 2 - Kyieka Downie 14:29

Direct evidence

Kyieka can directly testify:

1) *"Spoke with the mother Lorraine."*
2) *"Mother left me with Simon's father's number."*
3) *"Spoke with Simon's father."*

Kyieka personally says these things were done.

Hearsay

1) *"Simon deems her as evil."*
2) *"Simon is not willing to communicate."*
3) *"Simon will not accept help."*

These are statements allegedly made by Lorraine.
Kyieka has no direct knowledge these things are true.

Entry 3 - Lucy Clitherow 15:50

Direct evidence

Lucy can directly testify:

1) *"Referral taken."*
2) *"Situation discussed with Scott Kerr and Helen Moorey."*
3) *"Decision made to assess Simon."*

These are actions Lucy says occurred.

Hearsay

1) *"Simon kicked his father out."*
2) *"Simon is extremely paranoid."*
3) *"He thinks his father is teaming up with his mother."*
4) *"He is not a threat to anyone but himself."*

Again, these are alleged statements from Lorraine.
Lucy has no first-hand knowledge whether they are true.

Entry 4 - Colin Clancy 19:12
This one is much more important.
It contains both direct evidence and hearsay.
Direct evidence
These are observations or actions Colin personally undertook:

1) *"We spoke initially with mother on phone."*
2) *"We attended the flat around 17.30."*
3) *"There were police outside."*
4) *"We spoke with the officers."*
5) *"We explained that we were from mental health services."*

These are first-hand observations.
These are not hearsay.

Mixed evidence
This part:

1) *"They had received complaints from neighbours."* is actually hearsay.
2) from police.

Colin did not receive the complaints himself.
He is reporting what police told him.

This part:
Colin states *"Police stated that they had not properly spoken with him."* Is also hearsay.

This part:
Colin states *"Police Observed Him Holding a Small Gas Canister."* If police observed it and told Colin, then hearsay.

Lorraine statements
These are also hearsay:

1) *"Lorraine Stated..."*
2) *"Lorraine Explained..."*
3) *"Lorraine Spoke Of..."*
4) *"Lorraine States..."*

They are records of alleged statements made by Lorraine.

The important legal points are.
A lot of people make the mistake of saying:
"The whole record is hearsay."
That is not correct.
A better argument is:
The records contain a mixture of direct observations, professional opinions, and hearsay accounts attributed to third parties. Many of the key allegations relied upon regarding Simon's mental state do not arise from direct observation but from information allegedly supplied by others, primarily Lorraine and police officers. The records therefore need to be analysed carefully to distinguish between what clinicians personally witnessed and what they were merely told.

The Biggest Weakness I See
Ironically, the strongest evidence in those notes is probably:
"We attended the flat around 17.30. There were police outside."
because Colin personally says he saw that.

The weakest parts are:
"Simon thinks the television is talking to him."
"Simon deems his mother evil."
"Simon kicked his father out."
because they come from alleged conversations and not from Colin's own observations.
the **hearsay portions inside the note**, particularly where serious conclusions about your mental state appear to come from alleged statements attributed to others rather than things the clinician personally witnessed on 19/11/2014.

- 19:12 Colin Clancy Nursing

The Original Informant Cannot Be Reliably Identified
- The records contain statements allegedly made by Lorraine.
- The records do not contain a signed statement from Lorraine.
- No audio recording of the alleged calls has been disclosed.
- No telephone recording has been disclosed.
- No independent proof of exactly what was said has been disclosed.

Repetition Does Not Equal Proof
- Multiple records repeat the same allegation.
- The repeated entries appear to derive from the same original source.
- Repeating information across records does not independently verify its accuracy.
- One allegation copied into several records can create the false appearance of corroboration.

The records contain a mixture of direct observations, professional opinions, and hearsay accounts attributed to third parties. Many of the key allegations relied upon regarding Simon's mental state do not arise from direct observation but from information allegedly supplied by others, primarily Lorraine and police officers. The records therefore need to be analysed carefully to distinguish between what clinicians personally witnessed and what they were merely told.

However, these records appear to rely heavily on one another and may not constitute independent proof that she made the referral.
Lorraine consistently maintained that she did not initiate contact and that services contacted her after police involvement,
then it becomes necessary to examine contemporaneous call records, referral logs, switchboard records, and other documentary evidence to establish who actually initiated the first contact.

Without those records, the NHS notes demonstrate what staff believed happened, but do not necessarily prove who made the initial referral. Lorraine found herself blamed for events she repeatedly said she did not initiate. The records portray her as the driving force behind a mental health referral, yet her own account was that professionals contacted her after events were already underway. If her account is correct, she suffered a double injustice.

First, she witnessed her son become the subject of escalating intervention by police and mental health services.

Second, she was later portrayed as the person who triggered those interventions. The tragedy is that a mother who believed she was trying to protect her son became cast as the source of concerns that neither she nor her family believed accurately reflected what was taking place.

My mother

"My mother disputed making this call while alive."

I have identified several weaknesses in the chain of evidence and can argue that the records do not reliably establish that Lorraine was the person who initiated the mental health referral on 19/11/2014.

Following the police attendance I became distressed and refused to open the door.

What I Am Saying Is the Following:

a) On 19/11/2014 I was at my flat when police attended without me knowing.

b) The Home Treatment Team subsequently attended without me knowing.

c) Police were already present before the Home Treatment Team arrived.

d) I spoke with my mother on that day.

e) My mother also phoned me and explained that the police had just contacted her as the doctors are outside trying to get the code to gain entry to get to my front door as they want to access me.

f) mother told me what happened and why the police telephoned her with the doctors.

a) She told me she believed the police had become involved because the doctors telephoned them as they could not get into the flats as they was missing the access code. She also explained that the police never knew it since 2006 as to when I first moved in and need to ask my mother for it.

b) She told me that she was put into a three-way telephone conversation, what she believed to be with met ccc and the doctors outside my home. She told me at some stage in the conversation it seemed as if the police had believed they put the phone down and continued relaying information with the doctors that contained the reason for the doctor's attendance.

c) She told me she heard a discussion about Ozzy next door neighbour phoning them and reporting screaming.

d) She was sure Ozzie was involved and she even stated they said his door number as well.

e) This was years before any Rio records were disclosed.
f) The Rio SAR was not obtained until late **2019**.
g) When I eventually read the SAR Notes it was the year of **2020**.
h) Colin Clancy's note and the other staffs logged on the day in question.
i) I found that Colin Clancy's note states: *"They had received complaints from neighbours due to Simon screaming out in distress."*
j) From my perspective, the significance is: My Mother Lorraine's account existed years before the records were disclosed and as my personal Diary also proves as for when the records were finally obtained for the RIO Data Base, what she had described was found inside the contemporaneous nursing note. This is an undoubtable credibility point. Lorraine's account of events did not arise after reading the Rio notes. She described the involvement of neighbours and the police years before the records were disclosed. When the Rio records were eventually obtained, Colin Clancy's contemporaneous note referred to police receiving complaints from neighbours. This demonstrates that her version of events were consistent with information later found within the clinical records.
k) Even more bluntly: My mother's account to me did not come from the Rio records. My mother told me on the day that police and doctors were outside, that they were discussing a report that I had allegedly been screaming, and that a neighbour was involved. We did not obtain the Rio records until years later. When the records were eventually disclosed, I found notes from Colin Clancy recording that police had received complaints from neighbours due to Simon screaming in distress. This was information my mother had been describing for years before she ever saw the records. **My Mum was telling the same story years before the records existed in our possession.** That is why you see it as supporting her credibility rather than creating it.
l) Another issue of concern, I have been able to identify is a Computer System chronology order irregular filling command. To my understanding is: g.

m) A question that naturally follows is: If the neighbour complaint was already known to police Staff on **19/11/2014**, why do later records increasingly focus on Lorraine as the source of concern if.

n) **Colin's note** the records themselves show that police were already attending the address following complaints from neighbours. Therefore, another referral pathway already existed. No original call recording, telephone log, audio recording, signed statement from Lorraine, or independent evidence has been produced proving that Lorraine initiated the referral. The later **2016** assessment merely repeats the earlier account and cannot be treated as independent confirmation. *"We attended the flat around 17.30. There were police outside. They had been attempting to enter as they had received*

complaints from neighbours due to Simon screaming out in distress."

o) If police genuinely thought Simon was screaming in mental distress and possibly using nitrous oxide, why were they standing outside waiting?

p) Why did they all leave, and it take for doctors to obtain a warrant for the **25/11/2014**?

q) If Lorraine had already supposedly made all these serious reports hours earlier, why are police telling CRHT they are there because of **neighbour complaints**?

r) Colin's entry is the first note made by someone that actually involved a person who was in attendance.

s) **Colin's Clinical Opinion Inserted Without Explanation is:** *"We spoke initially with mother on phone. She reiterated that Simon has suffered years of harassment by the police for past offences.* ***Not all true.****"* **"Not all true,"** appears to be **Colin Clancy's opinion**, inserted into the clinical note and it demonstrates a bios option biased on no fair investigation. **The note does not say:** *"Police records show this was incorrect."* Or *"We verified this information and found it inaccurate."* It says: **"NOT ALL TRUE." The Author Is Judging Lorraine's Credibility**, by writing: **"NOT ALL TRUE,"** the author is effectively telling future readers: *"I do not fully believe what Lorraine is saying."* Yet the same note then goes on to rely heavily on information allegedly supplied by Lorraine. That creates a contradiction. If Lorraine was not considered reliable, why are later conclusions based on information attributed to Lorraine? A conclusion appears to have been reached without the supporting reasoning being recorded. The note contains an unsupported value judgement regarding information provided by Lorraine. The author dismisses part of her account as "not all true" but records no internal investigation, based upon evidence, or reasoning supporting that conclusion. Colin Clancy's introduced his personal opinion into the clinical record without providing an evidential basis for future readers to evaluate the comment. Then later records rely upon allegations such as:

1) Simon believes his mother is conspiring against him.

2) Simon thinks the TV is talking to him.

3) Simon is paranoid.

4) Simon sees his mother as evil.

So, a fair question becomes: Why was Lorraine considered unreliable when speaking about police harassment, but reliable when making statements that supported a mental health narrative? Colin Clancy dismissed Lorraine's account when it criticised police conduct, but accepted Lorraine's alleged statements when they supported concerns about Simon's mental health. He explains neither decision. The note records judgement, but not the evidence used to reach that judgement Causing Colin's note to read more like the construction of a narrative from conversations with third parties than a record of an assessment conducted on Simon himself. He

		openly dismisses information favourable to Simon, yet records and relies upon allegations that are damaging to Simon. The note shows what Colin believed and what others allegedly told him. Staff recorded information as if it came from Lorraine when it: **1)** Came From Another Source, **2)** Was Partly Inferred, **3)** Was Misunderstood, **4)** Or Was Incorrectly Attributed. **Mental Health Assessment Referral Form** **On 19 November 2014** somebody in the Mental Health Home Treatment Team created a referral concerning Simon Cordell. The form records my mother as being connected to that referral. However, the section that should clearly explain the reason for the referral is largely unreadable. Because that section cannot be properly read, the form by itself does not clearly show who started the process, why the referral was made, or whether the information recorded was accurate. The referral form contains substantial redactions or obscured text in the section that would explain the reason for referral. This prevents independent examination of the information relied upon when the decision was made to attend my address. The copy supplied under the Subject Access Request does not appear to be a straightforward photocopy of the original document. Part of the "Reason for Referral" section appears to have been physically covered before scanning, preventing examination of information that was originally present on the form. **1)** A piece of paper appears to have been placed over part of the "Reason for referral" section before scanning. **2)** The covered area obscures handwriting that may have originally appeared beneath. **3)** Text visible on the overlaid piece appears to include "MHA AX referred 21/11/14" (or remarkably similar wording), although the scan quality makes it difficult to read with certainty. If the records are to be believed, Lorraine had contacted mental health services and reported that Simon was unwell, paranoid, having difficulties with police, believing the television was talking to him, and refusing help. Simon was not a known patient to the Home Treatment Team and had not been assessed. Consequently, before attending an unknown person at a residential address, staff would ordinarily need to consider safety and risk issues. This would naturally involve checking whether police held any relevant information, whether there were concerns about violence, whether previous incidents existed, and whether police awareness or support was required before attendance. Therefore, if Lorraine's alleged reports were genuinely the basis for the referral, it would be reasonable to expect police awareness and information sharing to occur as part of the staff safety and risk assessment process before attending Simon's address.

		If Lorraine supposedly reported all these serious mental health concerns before CRHT attended, what safeguarding, risk assessment, police checks, and referral process took place before the team arrived? Because if that process really happened as mandated, there should be records of it somewhere and this would prove that the police and doctors had been in Contact and would have both been acting on the same information as the police had provided to colin with that being that Ozzy my Neighbour initiated the referral between them and not my mother! **Evidential Points Are** • The original "Reason for Referral" section cannot be independently read. • A later dated overlay appears to cover earlier referral information. • Police were already present before CRHT attendance. • Police reportedly attributed their attendance to neighbour complaints. • Colin's note does not clearly identify who initiated the referral pathway. • Multiple later records repeat the allegation that Lorraine initiated contact. • Repetition of an allegation is not proof of the allegation. • Lorraine allegedly disputed being the originator of the referral. • The chronology contains references to 19/11, 20/11, 21/11 and 25/11 activity. • The records evolved over several days rather than being one completed contemporaneous account. **Colin's Note Shows** that when CRHT and the police were together at the scene, Lorraine's position was simple and consistent: *"Do not attempt to see him following this as it will antagonise the situation."* In other words, Lorraine is recorded as telling mental health staff to stop pursuing Simon and leave the situation alone. This is important because it is the opposite of somebody seeking further mental health intervention. **The Note Then Moves to A Later Telephone Conversation At 19:30**. It starts naturally enough, with Lorraine explaining that a friend is now with Simon and that he is calmer. However, from this point onwards the note suddenly expands into a much broader mental health narrative. **Colin records** allegations concerning paranoia, persecution, television references, family psychiatric history, historical abuse, refusal of treatment and the possibility of antipsychotic medication. **The difficulty with Colin's account** is that it does not sit naturally alongside Lorraine's earlier recorded position. Minutes beforehand she is recorded as telling CRHT not to continue attending Simon because it will only make matters worse. Yet shortly afterwards she is presented as supplying extensive information which supports further psychiatric assessment and intervention. What makes this more difficult to accept is that many of these matters do not appear in the earlier administrative notes created that same day. If these were genuinely the central concerns being reported by Lorraine, it

would be reasonable to expect them to appear consistently throughout the earlier referral records. They do not.
The inconsistency becomes greater when Colin records:

1) *“Simon has suffered sexual abuse.”*
2) *"She reiterates that he will most likely refuse all medicine interventions."*
3) *"He has been prescribed medicine for Crohn's disease. He does not take."*
4) *"We have mutually agreed to plan: CRHT to call mother tomorrow am to negotiate another visit to assess."*


These entries read as though Lorraine is now participating in plans for continued mental health intervention. However, only moments earlier Colin recorded Lorraine asking CRHT not to continue attending Simon because doing so would antagonise the situation.
The question therefore is not whether Colin spoke to Lorraine. The question is how Lorraine's recorded position changes so dramatically within the same note.
At one stage Lorraine is recorded as saying:
Leave Simon alone.
Yet by the end of the entry, she is presented as discussing antipsychotic medication, Simon's refusal of treatment, family mental health history and agreeing to further assessment arrangements.
Those two positions are fundamentally difficult to reconcile and are not reflected consistently within the earlier records created that day.
The note therefore gives the appearance that information, interpretation, and conclusions have become merged together. The further the note progresses, the further it moves away from the practical events of the day and the closer it moves towards a developed psychiatric narrative that had not been consistently recorded in the earlier entries especially when two different prior staffs obtain reason for the assessment earlier failed to document such occurrences.

To win I need to explain what happened on the day to me!

Original "Reason for Referral" cannot be examined.

- The most important section of the referral form is obscured.
- Original handwritten information cannot be read.
- The disclosed copy prevents independent examination of what was actually written on 19/11/2014.

The referral sheet has been amended as redacted to hide the correct reason for lucy referring me to be assessed by the doctors as an administrative person or who gave her these orders.



2. A Separate piece of paper appears to have been placed over the original document to redact the original authors intel.

- This does not appear to be a non-redacted photocopy.
- A physical overlay appears to have been placed over the original handwriting before scanning.
- The main Information beneath the paper is concealed.

3. The Overlay Separate piece of paper is Wrote in with a pen with a later dated and information

- The overlay Paper used to redact intel contains wording similar to:
  - **a)** "MHA AX Referred 21/11/14"
  - **b)** which is **two days later**.
  - **c)** That is not a redaction made on 19/11/2014.
  - **d)** It is information from a later date physically covering information from an earlier date.
- This raises questions regarding when information was latter redacted from the file and as to why?

Yet the original reason-for-referral section is not available for examination.

4. The Original referral reasons are no longer verifiable

- Because the original text is hidden, it is impossible to compare:
  - what was originally recorded,
  - Why it was obscured so other doctors could not understand the forms' purpose of existence fulfilled.
  - The file cannot be checked for Contingency against what was later entered into Rio, as must be mandated: **Civil Contingencies Act 2004**
  - I.e. against what was later repeated in assessments.

5. No obvious clinical reason to conceal original referral information in 2014

- Clinicians require access to original referral information.

- Internal clinical records normally preserve information rather than obscure it.
- Concealing the original reason reduce stability in the needed clinical reliability for usefulness in Emergency Situations.

Issues with the Chronology

Events span multiple dates.

Documents appear to have been worked on across several dates:

- 19/11/2014 (incident)
- 20/11/2014 (further observations)
- 21/11/2014 (possible MHA referral reference)
- 25/11/2014 (later assessment records)

Different wording used throughout records

Examples include:

- "Telephone call received from Simon's mother."
- "Referral taken from Simon's mother."
- "Spoke with mother"
- "We spoke initially with mother on phone."

These do not all mean exactly the same thing.

Issues with the 2016 Assessment

2016 assessment was written long after events.

The assessment was not created on 19/11/2014.

2016 assessment relies on earlier records.

The assessor was not recording first-hand observations from 2014.

Later assessment repeats earlier allegations as fact

The statement:

"Mother phoned the Hub."

appears to have been carried forward from earlier records.

Repetition is not independent verification.

Multiple documents repeating the same statement does not prove the statement is true.

DOCX Answers File Link 20/11/2014 **Diary Link If Needed** 20/11/2014 **PDF Answers File Link** 20/11/2014 **Diary Link If Needed** 20/11/2014	**Finding 25:**	Doctors went for another assessment against all the odds! Arranged for the **25-11-2014** The Official Notes are in the diary
DOCX Answers File Link 25/11/2014 **Diary Link If Needed** 25/11/2014 **PDF Answers File Link** 25/11/2014 **Diary Link If Needed** 25/11/2014	**Finding 26:**	**EXHIBIT** • **1** • **Doctors were unable to!" We WERE UNBALE TO AXE SIMON."** ➢ The RIO Note explain that after the assessment on the 19/11/2014 were I was found to be un detainable due to showing no signs of a mental health illness. ➢ This day was recorded, and the Rio notes were fabricated from the events that took place in the assessment from this day and onwards. ➢ **On the 20/11/2014** the determination to manipulate official records in our clients name against him went even further than prior occurrences as their the doctors who were working with the Enfield Council and Metropolitan Police force had requested at court for another section 136 under the Mental Health Act to gain access his house to do yet again another assessment to undermine the true facts for wrongful purposes, but the judge refused. I never knew about this until **26/01/2019** when the Mental Health Records were requested & overviewed. **EXHIBIT** • **2** 1. **Margaret Garrod Validated by Details:** 25 Nov **2014** 16:57 Margaret Garrod is the head AMP Worker
DOCX Answers File Link	**Finding 27:**	**EXHIBIT** • **1** • **Christmas Period!**

20/12/2014 **Diary Link If Needed** 20/12/2014 **PDF Answers File Link** 20/12/2014 **Diary Link If Needed** 20/12/2014		**1)** Through the Christmas Period the Torture that our client was put through stopped with correspondence from the official persons involved but the conditions imposed continued as did the torture committed by members of his **neighbors** due to dawn Allen and co and fear of reprisals were present **2)** Facebook Simon Benjamin account check for the last time I spoke on the wall.
DOCX Answers File Link 26/01/2015 **Diary Link If Needed** 26/01/2015 **PDF Answers File Link** 26/01/2015 **Diary Link If Needed** 26/01/2015	**Finding 28:**	**EXHIBIT** • **1** **My Birthday** I had to turn off all the people able to put posts on my walls in my social network accounts because Ozzie and stain and Debra were banging on the walls at me so my whole estate could hear what they were doing to me around the time of a clock, and I knew the damage that it could cause me. When I checked the accounts, I had loads of happy birthday posted so I said thank you to everyone and locked the account. I was not allowed out to rave due to the conditions imposed by the Asbo, while they were attacking me. But I still had my driving license and visited my family.
DOCX Answers File Link 01/03/2015 **Diary Link If Needed**	**Finding 29:**	**Asbo Condition Imposed!** The ASBO conditions continued until **00/00/2021.** But we will not be following the timeline so closely from Herin after this section of the timeline unless relevant, so not to confuse the purpose of this document, what is to prove **+++++**

01/03/2015 **PDF Answers File Link** 01/03/2015 **Diary Link If Needed** 01/03/2015		
DOCX Answers File Link 02/03/2015 **Diary Link If Needed** 02/03/2015 **PDF Answers File Link** 02/03/2015 **Diary Link If Needed** 02/03/2015	**Finding 30: Disrepair** Case Files	• Mum Sent email complaint regarding repairs to my flat to feedback@enfieldhomes.org **This Is to Do with My Disrepair Case Files** **New Weblink 1:** **<Dir>** 04. Disrepair **Mirror Weblink:** https://everyoneloginto.me/03.%20R-2014-and-Onwards/04.%20Disrepair/ **New Weblink 2:** **<Dir>** 05. Housing Transfer and Decorating Files **Mirror Weblink:** https://everyoneloginto.me/03.%20R-2014-and-Onwards/05.%20HousingTransfer%20and%20DecoratingFiles/ ➢ *"My flat has been unlivable due to the damp and the issues just being covered up and not repaired in the way in which they should."*
DOCX Answers File Link 04/03/2015 **Diary Link If Needed** 04/03/2015 **PDF**	**Finding 31: Disrepair** Case Files	• Email from Jo O'Brien On the 04/03/2015 mother sent an email back to Jo O'Brien about the complaint regarding repairs to my flat to change the date for the appointment due to already having appointments on 10.03.2015, about the: 03/03/2014. • Email from Jo O'Brien regarding repairs from Enfield Council. appointment has been booked for a Wates operative to attend on Tuesday 10th March between 8.00am-10.30am. **Order Number** 1509056/1. **On the 4th mum** sent email back to change the date for the appointment due to already having appointments on the **10/03/2015**

Answers File Link 04/03/2015 **Diary Link If Needed** 04/03/2015		*"This is causing my flat to suffer, and this is causing my health to suffer. My flat has been unlivable due to the damp and the issues just being covered up and not repaired in the way in which they should."*
DOCX Answers File Link 05/03/2015 **Diary Link If Needed** 05/03/2015 **PDF Answers File Link** 05/03/2015 **Diary Link If Needed** 05/03/2015	**Finding 32:**	• Jo O'Brien replied to mums' email to say date had been changed to the **13/03/2015.**
DOCX Answers File Link 06/03/2015 **Diary Link If Needed** 06/03/2015 **PDF Answers File Link** 06/03/2015	**Finding 33:**	**EXHIBIT** • **1** Mother and I were **contacting the Enfield Council about** the ongoing **ASBO case** that I was dealing with since the **12/09/2014**, the met police along with Enfield Council had submitted to the court, I had been subjected to an interim order on the **05/11/2014** by the court, which breached my Human Rights and was unlawful. Enfield Council state they were not involved in the ASBO case but if they were not involved why is Enfield Council name on the ASBO files which were in front of the court why are there statements from Enfield Council in the ASBO files which can be proven. **There are reasons I was never helped by Enfield Council with the issues with the neighbours, the above is one of them.** **15** FW RE FOI 06/03/2015 13:42 1008 **16** FW RE FOI 06/03/2015 15:36 1008

Diary Link If Needed 06/03/2015					
	17	FW RE FOI	06/03/2015	17:16	1008

EXHIBIT

- **2**

Sarah Fletcher

stated that Enfield Council has nothing to do with the Asbo.

"He was very derogatory about the police and previous housing staff who had signed a request for an Asbo application against him. I told him that I could not comment about previous action taken."

EXHIBIT

- **3**

Kaunchita Maudhub

stated that Enfield Council has nothing to do with the Asbo.

*"We are aware of Simon Cordell as **STEVE/PAT** obtained an ASBO against him for illegal raves E.g."*

EXHIBIT

- **4**

Geoffrey Mann

Implied that Enfield Council has nothing to do with the Asbo.

"1. Anti-Social Behaviour Order

We are aware that the police applied for an Anti-Social Behaviour Order (ASBO) which was granted on 4th August 2015 against your son in relation to activities that cations away from Burncroft Avenue. We are aware that your son is appealing against the ASBO, and we are therefore unable to comment further."

EXHIBIT

- **5**

Daniel Ellis

Daniel Ellis' correspondence does not state that Enfield Council applied for the ASBO and instead treats the ASBO as a separate matter from the complaint being investigated.

EXHIBIT

- **6**

Lemmy Nwabuisi

stated that Enfield Council has nothing to do with the Asbo.

29/11/2016

Letter sent to Lemmy Nwabuisi.

Your mother wrote:

"There have been complaints put into Enfield Council since 2014 about Mr Simon Cordell's neighbours... Yet as soon as Enfield Council gets reports against Mr Simon Cordell you are willing to address these complaints."

She then linked this directly to:

reports the police had put into Enfield Council about Mr Simon Cordell and meetings between the police and Enfield Council.

		Lemmy added it into the 1st Injunction Order for the Enfield Council: -- Page 256 or 254 **EXHIBIT** • **7** **24/11/2016** Formal complaint sent by Lorraine Cordell to: **1)** Rob Leak **2)** Ray James **3)** Sally McTernan **4)** Sarah Fletcher **5)** Jackie Gubby **6)** Joan Ryan MP In that complaint your mother specifically wrote that: The issues started because of what the police wrote in the newspapers about the ASBO, that the truth was not printed, that an appeal was pending, and that the police case was wrong. *"The judge did grant the ASBO order but not on the grounds the police case was for" and "this case is still waiting for an appeal hearing at the crown court".*
DOCX Answers File Link 19/03/2015 **Diary Link If Needed** 19/03/2015 **PDF Answers File Link** 19/03/2015 **Diary Link If Needed** 19/03/2015	**Finding 34:**	**The First Recorded Complaint to Dawn Allen Concerning the Neighbours** On **19/03/2015**, the claimant's mother emailed Dawn Allen regarding ongoing neighbour problems and the effect those problems were having upon the claimant's health. This email is significant because it establishes that concerns regarding the neighbours were being formally reported before the later allegations, records and interventions relied upon by public authorities. **Email Subject:** **RE: Can You Please Help** Dear Dawn Allen, My son has had an issue with his neighbours who live above him. This has been going on for a while, and it is making my son's health go downhill because he is not sleeping due to what is going on. We would like to put a report on the issue and therefore would it please be possible for you to make a date when you could come to my son's home to do this. If you can let me know via this email with dates this can get done so we can get this issue addressed as soon as possible, I would be grateful. No response was received to this email. **The Enfield Councils History FOI Indexed 2NEW** 01. The Enfield Councils History FOI Indexed 2NEW.pdf **A Flipbook Style, to the page:**

		The Enfield Councils Colterol History Held About Mr. Simon Cordell SAR Requested! **To the page** The Enfield Councils Colterol History Held About Mr. Simon Cordell SAR Requested! **24/11/2016 = p238** First thing in my council history was from me and mother! Then the same follows until Lemmy & Co add fake intel to ruin my life and backdate it before my mother's complaints for official use. **Re: Formal Complaint due to letter dated 29/11/2016 this Formal Complaint is to be added to the Formal Complaint dated 24/08/2016.** **05/12/2016** **08/12/2016** **The Email Flipbooks** **The Original Files** **Notes** The claimant's position is that the disturbance being reported at this time primarily involved: **1)** Debbie Andrews (responsible) **2)** Stain Curtis (responsible) **3)** Mathiyalagan (responsible) The claimant contends that the banging and associated disturbance had already become established by this stage and was occurring throughout the day and night whenever it was known that he was inside the property. **Time:** All day and all night whenever they knew that I was indoors. The chronology further records that these events were not being documented from memory. The claimant was recording events, concerns, and incidents because he had been instructed to do so and was attempting to maintain a documented history of what was occurring within his life and home environment. **Why These Findings Matter** These findings are important because they established a fixed date by which Enfield Council had already been informed that: **1)** Ongoing neighbour issues were being reported. **2)** The claimant's sleep was being affected. **3)** The claimant's health was being affected. **4)** Assistance and intervention had been requested.

		5) A home visit has been requested. The significance of this correspondence extends beyond a single complaint. By this stage, the claimant and his mother had already been dealing with Enfield Council regarding housing and **disrepair** issues dating back to the period following the claimant's move into the property in **2006**. The claimant's position is that long-standing **disrepair** issues have caused damage to personal belongings and created ongoing problems within the property. As a result, the council departments and staff involved were not dealing with a new issue or an unknown resident. They were already familiar with the claimant, his family, and the history of the property. This finding is therefore important because it demonstrates that the claimant and his mother were actively reporting neighbour problems, housing concerns, sleep deprivation, and the impact upon the claimant's health before the later records, allegations and interventions were developed. The chronology relies upon this email because it proves that the flow of information began with the claimant and his mother reporting themselves as victims of ongoing issues and seeking assistance from the council. The finding further demonstrates that the concerns being raised were not retrospective. They were being reported to council staff while the events were allegedly occurring. The chronology therefore identifies **19/03/2015** as an important benchmark date because it provides documentary evidence that neighbour complaints, housing concerns and the deterioration of the claimant's wellbeing had been brought to the attention of Dawn Allen and Enfield Council at an early stage, yet the underlying issues remained unresolved. **Notes:** **The banging Started!** ➢ Debbie Andrews (responsible) ➢ Stain Curtis (responsible) ➢ Mathiyalagan (Responsible) **Time:** All-Day and All-Night whenever they knew that I was indoors!
DOCX Answers File Link 20/03/2015 **Diary Link If Needed** 20/03/2015 **PDF**	**Finding 35:**	**Enfield Council Were Aware of the Ongoing ASBO Proceedings Whilst Complaints Were Being Made About Housing and Neighbour Issues** **Email References** When complaints were being made at the same time regarding neighbour issues, housing conditions and the claimant's wellbeing, both the claimant and his mother were also communicating with Enfield Council regarding the ongoing ASBO proceedings.

15	FW RE FOI	06/03/2015	13:42	1008
16	FW RE FOI	06/03/2015	15:36	1008
17	FW RE FOI	06/03/2015	17:16	1008

Answers File Link 20/03/2015 **Diary Link If Needed** 20/03/2015		The chronology records that the claimant had been dealing with the ASBO proceedings since **12/09/2014**. The claimant had also been subjected to an interim order imposed by the court on **05/11/2014**, which he contends was unlawful and interfered with his rights. The correspondence identified above demonstrates that Enfield Council were aware that ASBO proceedings existed and that matters relating to those proceedings were actively being discussed during the same period that housing complaints, neighbour complaints and requests for assistance were being raised. The chronology therefore identifies an overlap between: **1)** The ongoing ASBO proceedings. **2)** Complaints concerning neighbours. **3)** Complaints concerning housing conditions. **4)** Requests for intervention and assistance from Enfield Council. **Notes** It is the claimant's position that Enfield Council have repeatedly suggested that they were not involved in the ASBO proceedings. However, the claimant contends that this position is difficult to reconcile with the documentary evidence. The claimant's position is that: **1)** Enfield Council's name appears within the ASBO material placed before the court. **2)** Statements from Enfield Council employees appear within the ASBO files. **3)** Enfield Council officers were aware of the ASBO proceedings while communicating with the claimant and his mother. **4)** Information arising from the ASBO proceedings was subsequently relied upon by council departments and staff. The chronology therefore records these matters because they raise questions concerning the extent of Enfield Council's involvement, knowledge and reliance upon information connected to the ASBO proceedings. **Why These Findings Matter** These findings are important because they demonstrate that while the claimant and his mother were repeatedly seeking help regarding neighbour issues, housing problems and the deterioration of the claimant's wellbeing, Enfield Council were already aware that ASBO proceedings were taking place. The chronology identifies a significant overlap between the timing of: **1)** The ASBO proceedings. **2)** Complaints made by the claimant and his mother. **3)** Requests for assistance from Enfield Council. **4)** The creation of later records concerning the claimant. The claimant's position is that the ongoing ASBO proceedings provide one explanation as to why complaints regarding neighbour behavior and housing issues were not dealt with appropriately.

		The chronology does not rely solely upon the existence of the ASBO. Rather, it relies upon the fact that council staff were aware of the proceedings at the same time as complaints were being submitted concerning neighbour disputes, health concerns, and requests for intervention. The significance of this finding therefore lies in the timing. It demonstrates that the claimant and his mother were actively seeking assistance whilst the claimant was simultaneously involved in ongoing court proceedings. The chronology relies upon these records because they establish that Enfield Council were aware of both matters at the same time and were receiving information concerning both matters from the claimant and his mother. The claimant's position is that this overlap is relevant when considering why repeated requests for assistance were unsuccessful and why the issues reported during this period remained unresolved.
DOCX Answers File Link 31/03/2015 **Diary Link If Needed** 31/03/2015 **PDF Answers File Link** 31/03/2015 **Diary Link If Needed** 31/03/2015	**Finding 36: Dawn Allen**	**The 2nd email mum sent** to Dawn Allen about flat repairs and neighbours no reply to this email (RE: Issue I am having) Email name. **Subject: RE:** Issue I am having Dear Dawn Allen, ➢ My mother and I have made phone calls about the neighbours above my flat, yet nothing is being done. ➢ **Please Can You Get Back to Me As Soon As Possible in Order to Setup A Meeting at My Home** so we can address the issues with the neighbours as soon as possible as I cannot live the way I am any longer. There are also still issues with repairs that have not been addressed. **Why These Findings Matter** This was not the first email sent to Dawn Allen. It was a follow-up email sent because the earlier email dated **19/03/2015** had not been answered. **Finding 1:** By **31/03/2015**, both the claimant and his mother had already reported neighbour issues directly to Dawn Allen. The email proves that Enfield Council had been informed that neighbour problems were ongoing and affecting the claimant's daily life. **Finding 2:** The email proves that the claimant was reporting sleep deprivation. The claimant specifically states that the neighbours were preventing him from sleeping and that the situation was affecting his health. **Finding 3:** The email proves that a request for intervention has already been made. The claimant had previously asked for somebody from Enfield Council to attend the property and discuss the problems directly. **Finding 4:** The email proves that multiple attempts have been made to obtain help. The claimant and his mother had already made several telephone calls in addition to the emails being sent. **Finding 5:** The email proves that the issues were not limited to neighbour complaints. Outstanding repair and **disrepair** issues were still being reported at the same time.

		Finding 6: The email demonstrates that the claimant was identifying himself as the person suffering from the issues and seeking help from Enfield Council rather than being the subject of complaints made by others. **Finding 7:** The chronology establishes that neighbour complaints, health concerns and **disrepair** complaints were already being raised before the later records, allegations and interventions relied upon by public authorities. **Finding 8:** The email demonstrates that the claimant believed the situation had become intolerable. The request for urgent intervention and the statement that he could no longer continue living in those conditions provide evidence of the seriousness of the matters being reported. **My Personal Damages & Losses** **The Banging Had Started** The claimant's position is that the disturbances being reported at this stage involved: **1)** Debbie Andrews (Responsible) **2)** Stain Curtis (Responsible) **3)** Mathiyalagan (Responsible) The claimant contends that the disturbance occurred throughout the day and night whenever it was known that he was inside the property. **Disrepair** The chronology records that **disrepair** issues remained unresolved despite repeated attempts to bring them to the attention of Enfield Council. The claimant's position is that these issues existed for years and had already caused damage to personal belongings and affected his ability to enjoy and safely occupy the property. **Time Spent Building** Despite the ongoing problems, the claimant continued building projects, developing business interests, and attempting to maintain normal daily activities from within the property. **Working at Home Doing Court Case Defense Work** The claimant was also spending time preparing and working on legal matters and court proceedings affecting his life. **Conclusion** This email establishes that by **31/03/2015**: **1)** Neighbour Complaints Had Been Reported. **2)** Sleep Deprivation Had Been Reported. **3)** Health Concerns Had Been Reported. **4)** **Disrepair** Issues Had Been Reported. **5)** Multiple Requests for Assistance Had Been Made. **6)** A Home Visit Had Been Requested. **7)** No Meaningful Response Had Been Received.

		The chronology therefore relies upon this email as evidence that Enfield Council had been informed of the issues and that further attempts were being made to obtain assistance when no response was received to the earlier complaint.
DOCX Answers File Link 11/04/2015 **Diary Link If Needed** 11/04/2015 **PDF Answers File Link** 11/04/2015 **Diary Link If Needed** 11/04/2015	**Finding 37:**	**Ongoing Victimisation, ASBO Concerns and a Further Request for Police Intervention** On **11/04/2015**, the claimant's position is that he was continuing to suffer ongoing victimisation from individuals previously identified throughout this chronology. The claimant contends that the conduct being complained of was not isolated or occasional but had become a persistent pattern of behavior affecting his daily life, health, wellbeing, and ability to peacefully occupy his home. **EXHIBIT** • **1** The claimant records that the disturbances and noise nuisances were continuing and had become an established part of daily life. The claimant's position is that the following individuals were primarily responsible for the conduct being complained about: **1)** Debbie Andrews (Responsible) **2)** Stain Curtis (Responsible) **3)** Mathiyalagan (Responsible) The claimant contends that the disturbances occurred repeatedly throughout the day and night and were carried out whenever it was known that he was inside the property. The claimant further contends that repeated banging on walls, ceilings, floors, and building fixtures had become a sustained course of conduct. The claimant states that, despite repeatedly making it clear that he was aware of what was occurring and had not been intimidated into silence, the conduct continued. The claimant's position is that the disturbances were deliberate rather than accidental and were having a significant impact upon his ability to sleep, work, study and enjoy the property. At the same time, the claimant continued reviewing the ASBO case material that was being relied upon against him. The chronology records that this review led the claimant to believe that serious problems existed within the ASBO case itself and that further clarification was required from senior police officers. As a result, the claimant sought additional guidance and assistance from the Metropolitan Police. **EXHIBIT** • **2** **Police Call Made and Transcribed** The claimant telephoned the Metropolitan Police to raise concerns regarding the ASBO proceedings and information he believed required investigation.

		The claimant identified himself and asked for information to be forwarded to **Chief Superintendent Jane Johnson.** During the conversation, the claimant explained that: **1)** He Believed There Were Serious Concerns Regarding the ASBO Application. **2)** He Believed Information Relied Upon Within the ASBO Proceedings Had Been Manipulated or Manufactured. **3)** He Wanted a Senior Officer to Review the Material for Herself. **4)** He Requested That the Relevant Records, CAD References and Associated Information Be Examined. **5)** He Requested Contact from Chief Superintendent Jane Johnson Regarding the Issues He Had Raised. **6)** He Offered to Attend a Police Station and Provide the Material That He Believed Supported His Concerns. The claimant also stated that he had already submitted complaints and documents concerning the matter and wished the issues to be reviewed by a senior officer. **Findings Proven by This Entry** **Finding 1:** By **11/04/2015**, the claimant was continuing to report ongoing neighbour-related problems which he believed were affecting his daily life and wellbeing. **Finding 2:** The claimant considered the situation sufficiently serious, that he continued documenting incidents and preserving records of what was occurring. **Finding 3:** The claimant was actively seeking assistance from public authorities rather than remaining silent about the matters being complained about. **Finding 4:** The claimant had concerns regarding the conduct of the ASBO proceedings and was raising those concerns directly with senior Metropolitan Police officers. **Finding 5:** The claimant was prepared to provide evidence and supporting material to senior officers and requested that the matters be formally reviewed. **Finding 6:** The claimant maintained that problems existed both inside the ASBO case and within the ongoing circumstances affecting him at home. **My Personal Damages & Losses** **The Banging Had Continued** The claimant's position is that the disturbance pattern remained ongoing and continued to affect: **1)** Sleep. **2)** Health. **3)** Concentration. **4)** Day-To-Day Living. **5)** Ability To Work from Home. **Working at Home Doing Court Case Defense Work**

		At the same time these events were occurring, the claimant was spending time reviewing and preparing material connected to the ASBO proceedings and matters arising from them. **Why These Findings Matter** These findings are important because they demonstrate that the claimant was not passively accepting either the neighbour issues or the ASBO proceedings. The chronology shows that the claimant was: **1)** Continuing To Document Events. **2)** Continuing To Seek Assistance. **3)** Continuing To Report Concerns. **4)** Continuing To Raise Issues with Senior Officers. **5)** Continuing To Challenge Information He Believed to Be Inaccurate. The significance of this entry is that it demonstrates an active effort to obtain intervention, oversight, and review from public authorities whilst the claimant believed he was being subjected to ongoing neighbour-related problems and ongoing consequences arising from the ASBO proceedings. The chronology therefore relies upon this entry because it provides further evidence that the claimant was repeatedly attempting to obtain assistance, investigation and review whilst the events complained of were allegedly occurring.
DOCX Answers File Link 17/04/2015 **Diary Link If Needed** 17/04/2015 **PDF Answers File Link** 17/04/2015 **Diary Link If Needed** 17/04/2015	**Finding 38:**	<table><tr><td>**22**</td><td>FW Issue I am having</td><td>17/04/2015</td><td>17:57</td><td>1051</td></tr></table> • **The 3rd email mum** sent to Dawn Allen about flat repairs and neighbours no reply to this email (FW: Issue I am having) Email name. **EXHIBIT** • **1** **Repeated Requests for Assistance Were Ignored** **Exhibit 1** On **17/04/2015**, Lorraine Cordell sent a further email to Dawn Allen after receiving no response to the emails previously sent on **19/03/2015** and **31/03/2015**. The email stated that: *"My son is really suffering due to what the neighbours are doing."* and *"A report needs to be made as this is making my son's health go downhill."* The email further confirmed that: **1)** The Claimant Was Being Deprived of Sleep. **2)** His Health Was Deteriorating. **3)** Numerous Telephone Calls Had Already Been Made. **4)** A Meeting at The Property Had Been Requested. **5)** Repair Issues Remained Unresolved. No response was received.

		My Personal Damages & Losses **The Banging Had Continued** **1)** Debbie Andrews (Responsible) **2)** Stain Curtis (Responsible) **3)** Mathiyalagan (Responsible) **Time:** All Day and All Night. The claimant continued reporting: **1)** Sleep Deprivation. **2)** Ongoing Neighbour Nuisance. **3)** Outstanding **Disrepair**. **4)** Deterioration In Health. **At The Same Time, The Claimant Continued:** **1)** Building His Business Projects. **2)** Studying And Developing Company Policies. **3)** Working On His Court Defense. **Why These Findings Matter** **Finding 1:** Enfield Council had been informed on at least three occasions that neighbour issues were affecting the claimant's health. **Finding 2:** Enfield Council had been informed that the claimant was being deprived of sleep. **Finding 3:** Enfield Council had been informed that multiple requests for assistance had already been made. **Finding 4:** Enfield Council has been asked to investigate and attend to the property. **Finding 5:** Outstanding **disrepair** issues were reported at the same time. **Finding 6:** The complaints originated from the claimant and his mother seeking help from Enfield Council. **Finding 7:** Despite repeated warnings concerning health, welfare and living conditions, no meaningful intervention followed.
DOCX Answers File Link 04/05/2015 **Diary Link If Needed** 04/05/2015 **PDF Answers File Link** 04/05/2015	**Finding 39:**	**The Fourth Request for Assistance Was Ignored Whilst the Problems Continued** **Exhibit 1** **The Enfield Gov / Email's Issue** **550. x2 Lorraine Cordell *Re* Issue I am Having with Neighbours** **Page Number: 2031** **04/05/2015 - 13:22** This was the **fourth email** sent by Lorraine Cordell to Dawn Allen regarding the ongoing neighbour issues, housing problems, and the effect they were having on Simon Cordell. The email confirms that repeated requests for assistance have already been made and that no meaningful response has been received. The email states: *"I have been sending you so many emails, yet I am getting no reply, nothing is being done."* It further states that:

<table>
<tr>
<td>Diary Link If Needed
04/05/2015</td>
<td></td>
<td>"My son is having so many issues with the neighbours he has asked for help, yet nothing is being done."
The email also confirms that:
"My son went up to the neighbours and asked if they would please stop banging all the time."
and that:
"People who also have been in my son's flat have also heard what is going on."

The Email Additionally Raises Concerns Regarding:
1) Noise Nuisance.
2) Water Pipe Banging.
3) Wooden Flooring Within Neighboring Properties.
4) Ongoing Disturbance from Occupiers of Flat 113.
5) The Effect Upon the Claimant's Health.
No response was received.

Findings Proven by This Email
Finding 1: By 04/05/2015, Enfield Council had already received multiple emails regarding neighbour nuisance and disturbance.
Finding 2: Enfield Council had been informed that the claimant's health was suffering because of the ongoing situation.
Finding 3: Enfield Council had been informed that attempts had already been made to resolve the issues directly with the neighbours.
Finding 4: Independent visitors to the property had witnessed and heard the disturbance being complained about.
Finding 5: Complaints concerning noise, wooden flooring, pipe banging, and nuisance were all reported to Enfield Council.
Finding 6: The claimant and his mother were actively seeking intervention and assistance from Enfield Council.
Finding 7: By this date, repeated requests for assistance had still not produced any effective intervention.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOCX Answers File Link
28/05/2015
Diary Link If Needed
28/05/2015

PDF Answers File Link
28/05/2015</td>
<td>Finding 40:</td>
<td>
<table>
<tr><td>25</td><td>FW Issue I am having with neighbours</td><td>28/05/2015</td><td>15:16</td><td>1092</td></tr>
</table>
The 5th email mum sent to Dawn Allen about flat repairs and neighbours no reply to this email (FW: Issue I am having with neighbours) Email name.

The Fifth Request for Assistance Was Ignored Whilst the Reported Harm Continued
Exhibit 1
The Enfield Gov / Email's Issue: 02
FW Issue I am Having with Neighbours
</td>
</tr>
</table>

Diary Link If Needed 28/05/2015		**Page Number: 2045** **Date:** 28/05/2015 - 15:16 This was the **fifth email** sent to Dawn Allen regarding neighbour issues, housing **disrepair,** and the impact the situation was having upon Simon Cordell. The email demonstrates that repeated requests for assistance have already been made and that no meaningful response has been received. The email stated: *"Could you please reply to all my emails as to what can be done with the issues that are going on. You have not replied to one email, and this is not fair."* It further stated: "I don't know what is going on and why my son is being treated like this by Enfield Council. Is it due to what the police did to him?" **Findings Proven by This Email** **Finding 1:** By **28/05/2015**, at least five written requests for assistance had been sent regarding the same ongoing issues. **Finding 2:** The email proves that no response had been received from Dawn Allen despite multiple previous attempts to obtain help. **Finding 3:** The issues being reported concerned both neighbour nuisance and housing **disrepair**. **Finding 4:** The claimant and his mother were continuing to seek assistance from Enfield Council rather than remaining silent about the issues. **Finding 5:** The complaints were ongoing and unresolved despite repeated reports. **Finding 6:** The claimant's mother was questioning why assistance was not being provided and whether this was connected to the ASBO proceedings already affecting her son.
DOCX Answers File Link 31/05/2015 **Diary Link If Needed** 31/05/2015 **PDF Answers File Link** 31/05/2015 **Diary Link If Needed**	**Finding 41:**	**Formal Complaint Raised Against Dawn Allen After Repeated Requests for Assistance Went Unanswered** **Exhibit 1** **The Enfield Gov / Email's Issue: 02** **561. Lorraine Cordell *Fwd*. Issue I am Having with Neighbours (2)** **Page Numbers: 2048-2049** **01/06/2015 - 14:38** **From:** Lorraine Cordell **To:** Dawn Allen **Subject:** FW: Issue I am Having with Neighbours By this stage, repeated emails had already been sent regarding neighbour issues and housing concerns. Instead of being a request for help, this email had become a formal complaint regarding the lack of response from Dawn Allen. The complaint stated: *"I have sent a number of emails regarding the issues my son is having with his neighbours, which you have failed to reply to and have not addressed the issues which have been ongoing."* It further stated:

31/05/2015		*"I have given you enough time to reply and address the issues, yet you have failed to do anything."* The complaint then requested that the following matters be investigated: **1)** Why Emails Were Not Being Replied To. **2)** Why Nothing Had Been Done Regarding the Ongoing Issues. **3)** Why A Person Had Been Allowed to Suffer Without Assistance Being Provided. The email concluded with a request that the complaint be dealt with or passed to somebody capable of dealing with it. **Findings Proven by This Email** **Finding 1:** By **01/06/2015**, multiple previous reports concerning neighbour and housing issues had already been submitted to Dawn Allen. **Finding 2:** The matter had progressed from a request for assistance into a formal complaint regarding the failure to respond. **Finding 3:** The complaint proves that concerns were raised about the handling of the reports themselves rather than merely the neighbour issues. **Finding 4:** Enfield Council had been informed that the claimant's circumstances were continuing and remained unresolved. **Finding 5:** A specific complaint was made that a person was allowed to suffer without action being taken. **Disrepair** The claimant records that damp and housing-conditioning issues remain unresolved during this period. The claimant states that damage to clothing and personal belongings was continuing and that photographs were taken to document the condition of affected items. The claimant identifies the ongoing damp issues as having a direct impact upon normal daily living and enjoyment of the property. **Time Spent Building** Despite the ongoing circumstances, the claimant continued developing a new **Event Fire Precautions and Equipment Checklist and Policy**. **Time Start:** 07:00 AM **Time End:** 03:30 PM The claimant's mother also continued working on the company website. **Time Start:** 09:00 AM **Time End:** 02:00 PM **Working at Home Doing Court Case Defense Work** The claimant continued spending time and resources preparing material connected to the allegations and proceedings affecting him. **Time Start:** 12:00 AM **Time End:** 06:00 AM **Why These Findings Matter**

		Finding 1: This email proves that repeated requests for assistance had already been made before June 2015. **Finding 2:** This email proves that concerns had escalated into a formal complaint regarding the lack of response from the officer responsible. **Finding 3:** This email demonstrates that concerns regarding welfare, housing conditions and unresolved issues were continuing to be reported directly to Enfield Council. **Finding 4:** The complaint establishes that the issue was no longer simply the original reports, but the failure to respond to those reports. **Finding 5:** This finding demonstrates that opportunities to investigate and intervene had already been raised on multiple occasions before later events within the chronology occurred. **Finding 6:** The chronology relies upon this complaint because it establishes a documented record that concerns were being escalated after repeated attempts to obtain help had been unsuccessful.
DOCX Answers File Link 10/06/2015 **Diary Link If Needed** 10/06/2015 **PDF Answers File Link** 10/06/2015 **Diary Link If Needed** 10/06/2015	**Finding 42:**	**Escalated Complaint to Dawn Allen Regarding Neighbour Issues, Health Deterioration and Council Inaction** **Exhibit 1** **The Enfield Gov / Email's Issue: 02** **RE: Please Can You Help; This Cannot Carry On!** **Page Number: 2063** **10/06/2015 - 21:13** This email is significant because it demonstrates that repeated attempts have already been made by both the claimant and his mother to obtain assistance from Dawn Allen and Enfield Council. The email records that: **1)** Numerous Emails Had Already Been Sent. **2)** Numerous Telephone Calls Had Already Been Made. **3)** No Meaningful Response Had Been Received. **4)** The Claimant's Health Was Continuing to Deteriorate. **5)** Attempts Had Been Made to Resolve Matters Directly with Neighbours. **6)** The Claimant and His Mother Were Requesting Intervention from Enfield Council. The email further records that Debbie Andrews had been approached directly regarding the issues, but the situation remained unresolved. **Findings Proven by This Email** **Finding 1:** By **10/06/2015**, Enfield Council had already received repeated emails and telephone calls regarding neighbour issues affecting the claimant. **Finding 2:** The claimant's deteriorating health had been reported directly to Enfield Council. **Finding 3:** Attempts have been made to resolve the issues informally before seeking further council intervention. **Finding 4:** The claimant's mother was explicitly requesting assistance because previous requests had not been made upon.

		Finding 5: A request was made for Enfield Council to intervene or assist with a move if the issues are not resolved. **Finding 6:** By this date, the complaint was no longer simply about neighbour nuisance. It had become a complaint about the failure of Enfield Council to respond to repeated reports. **Finding 7:** The email establishes that concerns regarding welfare, health, housing, and neighbour-related problems were all being raised together.
DOCX Answers File Link 20/06/2015 **Diary Link If Needed** 20/06/2015 **PDF Answers File Link** 20/06/2015 **Diary Link If Needed** 20/06/2015	**Finding 43:**	<table><tr><td>**29**</td><td>FW Issue I am having with neighbours</td><td>20/06/2015</td><td>19:12</td><td>1115</td></tr></table> • **The 6th email** mum sent to Dawn Allen about flat repairs and neighbours no reply to this email (FW: Issue I am having with neighbours) Email name. • **Escalation of the Complaint Following Continued Non-Response from Dawn Allen** **Exhibit 1** **The Enfield Gov / Email's Issue: 02** **FW: Issue I am Having with Neighbours** **Page Numbers: 2067-2068** **20/06/2015 - 19:12** This was the **sixth email** sent regarding the ongoing neighbour issues, housing **disrepair,** and the effect the situation was having upon Simon Cordell. The email demonstrates that previous complaints had still not been addressed and that the claimant's mother had reached the point of formally escalating the matter. The email states: "*Seeing as you are not addressing the emails that are being sent, I have no option but to take this higher."* **Findings Proven by This Email** **Finding 1:** By **20/06/2015**, at least six separate emails had been sent regarding the same unresolved issues. **Finding 2:** The claimant's mother records that previous correspondence had not been addressed. **Finding 3:** The matter progressed beyond requests for assistance and had become a complaint regarding the failure to respond. **Finding 4:** The claimant's mother considered the situation serious enough to escalate the complaint beyond Dawn Allen. **Finding 5:** The issues concerning neighbour nuisance, wellbeing and housing conditions remained unresolved despite repeated reports. **Finding 6:** This email establishes a documented pattern of unanswered correspondence. **Disrepair**

		The claimant records that damp, heating, and housing conditions remained unresolved despite repeated reports to both Enfield Council and Enfield Homes. The claimant states that the condition of the property continued to affect his wellbeing and daily living circumstances. **Summary** During this period, the claimant records that: **1)** The Neighbour Complaints Remained Unresolved. **2)** Housing And **Disrepair** Problems Remained Unresolved. **3)** Repeated Requests for Assistance Remained Unanswered. **4)** The Claimant's Mother Was Forced to Escalate the Complaint Because No Meaningful Action Had Been Taken. The chronology identifies this date as the point where lack of response itself had become a separate complaint. **Time Spent Building** Despite the ongoing circumstances, the claimant continued working on a new **Event Campsite Policy** and associated site plans. **Time Start:** 07:00 AM **Time End:** 03:30 PM The claimant's mother also continued working on the company website. **Time Start:** 09:00 AM **Time End:** 02:00 PM **Working at Home Doing Court Case Defense Work** The claimant continued spending time and resources preparing his defense against the allegations being made against him. **Time Start:** 12:00 AM **Time End:** 06:00 AM **Why These Findings Matter** **Finding 1:** This email proves that repeated attempts to obtain assistance had already failed by June 2015. **Finding 2:** This email establishes that the lack of response had itself become a matter of complaint. **Finding 3:** The email demonstrates that the claimant and his mother were continuing to seek help through official channels rather than remaining silent. **Finding 4:** The escalation of the complaint demonstrates that earlier reports had not resolved the issues being raised. **Finding 5:** The chronology relies upon this email because it provides documentary evidence that concerns previously reported remain unanswered and unresolved. **Finding 6:** By 20/06/2015, Enfield Council had been given repeated opportunities to address the reported issues before the complaint was formally escalated.

DOCX Answers File Link 01/07/2015 **Diary Link If Needed** 01/07/2015 **PDF Answers File Link** 01/07/2015 **Diary Link If Needed** 01/07/2015	**Finding 44:**	**Formal Complaint Against Dawn Allen Following Months of Unanswered Reports** **Exhibit 2 & EXHIBIT 3** **01/07/2015 - 14:38** **To:** Dawn Allen **Subject:** FW: Issue I am Having with Neighbours By **01/07/2015**, the matter had progressed beyond requests for assistance and had become a formal complaint regarding the failure of Dawn Allen to respond to repeated reports concerning neighbour issues, health concerns, and housing conditions. The complaint stated: *"I have sent several emails regarding the issues my son is having with his neighbours, which you have failed to reply to and have not addressed the issues which have been ongoing."* It further stated: *"I have given you enough time to reply and address the issues, yet you have failed to do anything."* The complaint then specifically requested that the following matters be investigated: **1)** Why were emails not being replied to? **2)** Why nothing had been done regarding the issues that had been ongoing for some time. **3)** Why has a person been allowed to suffer without intervention or support? The complaint concluded with a request that, if Dawn Allen could not deal with the matter, it should immediately be passed to somebody who could. **A Flipbook Style, to the page:** The Enfield Councils Colterol History Held About Mr. Simon Cordell SAR Requested! **Findings Proven by This Complaint** **Finding 1:** By **01/07/2015**, numerous emails had already been sent to Dawn Allen regarding neighbour issues and housing concerns. **Finding 2:** A formal complaint has become necessary because previous requests for assistance have not received meaningful responses. **Finding 3:** Enfield Council had been informed that the issues remained ongoing and unresolved. **Finding 4:** The complaint specifically challenged the failure to respond to reports already submitted. **Finding 5:** The complaint specifically challenged the failure to investigate issues that had already been reported. **Finding 6:** The complaint records that the claimant was suffering and that no effective action had been taken. **Finding 7:** The chronology establishes that repeated opportunities existed for intervention before later events developed. **The Funfair and Wider Context** **Exhibit 1**

		July 2015 coincided with the annual funfair being presented within the local park adjoining the housing estate. By this stage, the claimant had already spent approximately: **1)** One Year Dealing with The Gazebo Case. **2)** A Further Period Subject to ASBO Interim Order Restrictions. The chronology records that the claimant remained focused upon avoiding confrontation and maintaining his own safety despite the ongoing circumstances affecting him. The claimant also records taking steps to improve the security of his property by reinstating the use of a security gate. **Disrepair** The claimant records that unresolved damp, heating, and housing-condition issues remained present within the property. The chronology identifies these issues because they had already been reported repeatedly and were continuing alongside the neighbour complaints. The claimant records that he remained the person having to live with the consequences of those unresolved conditions. **Time Spent Building** Despite the circumstances, the claimant continued working on: **Event Car Parking Space Options** and other business-related planning and studies. **Time Start:** 07:00 AM **Time End:** 03:30 PM The claimant's mother also continued working on the company website. **Time Start:** 09:00 AM **Time End:** 02:00 PM **Working at Home Doing Court Case Defense Work** The claimant continued spending time, effort and personal resources preparing material connected to the allegations being made against him. **Time Start:** 12:00 AM **Time End:** 06:00 AM **Why These Findings Matter** **Finding 1:** This complaint proves that repeated requests for assistance had already been made before July 2015. **Finding 2:** This complaint proves that concerns regarding neighbour issues, wellbeing and housing conditions were being actively reported to Enfield Council. **Finding 3:** This complaint proves that the issue had become not just the underlying reports, but the continuing failure to respond to those reports. **Finding 4:** The complaint establishes that concerns regarding suffering, welfare and unresolved problems were raised directly with the officer responsible. **Finding 5:** The complaint demonstrates that the claimant and his mother were continuing to pursue official channels to obtain help.

		Finding 6: The chronology relies upon this complaint because it demonstrates that opportunities existed for investigation, intervention and resolution before later events developed. **Finding 7:** By **01/07/2015**, the issues had been reported repeatedly, the lack of response had become a formal complaint, and the underlying matters remained unresolved.
DOCX Answers File Link 10/07/2015 **Diary Link If Needed** 10/07/2015 **PDF Answers File Link** 10/07/2015 **Diary Link If Needed** 10/07/2015	**Finding 45:**	**Formal Complaint Escalated Following Continued Failure to Respond** **Exhibit 1** **The Enfield Gov / Email's Issue: 02** **RE: Please Can You Help This Cannot Carry On!** **Page Number: 2069** **10/07/2015 - 21:13** **This was the eighth email** sent to Dawn Allen regarding the ongoing neighbour issues, housing **disrepair,** and the effect the situation was having upon Simon Cordell. At this stage, repeated emails, complaints, and telephone calls had already been made. The email records that: **1)** Numerous Emails Had Already Been Sent Without Reply. **2)** Numerous Telephone Calls Had Already Been Made. **3)** The Claimant's Health Was Continuing to Suffer. **4)** The Claimant and His Mother Had Attempted to Speak Directly to Neighbours. **5)** Assistance Had Been Repeatedly Requested from Enfield Council. **6)** A Move from The Property Was Being Requested If the Issues Could Not Be Resolved. The email further records that concerns regarding neighbour behavior, sleep deprivation, welfare, and housing conditions remain unresolved. No meaningful response was received. **Findings Proven by This Email** **Finding 1:** By **10/07/2015**, repeated emails and telephone calls had already been made to Dawn Allen and Enfield Council. **Finding 2:** The claimant's health had been reported as suffering because of the ongoing circumstances. **Finding 3:** The claimant and his mother had attempted to resolve matters directly before seeking further intervention. **Finding 4:** The request for council assistance remained outstanding. **Finding 5:** The claimant's mother was actively requesting intervention from Enfield Council regarding both neighbour conduct and housing issues. **Finding 6:** A transfer from the property was requested if the council could not resolve the issues. **Finding 7:** By this date, the matters being reported remained unresolved despite repeated complaints. **Disrepair** The claimant records that damp, heating, and housing-conditioning issues remain unresolved.

		The claimant states that these conditions continued to affect his wellbeing, health, and enjoyment of the property. The chronology identifies these issues because they were repeatedly reported alongside the neighbour complaints. **Time Spent Building** Despite the circumstances, the claimant continued working on creating an updated **Fairground Rides & Amusements Policy**. **Time Start:** 07:00 AM **Time End:** 03:30 PM The claimant's mother also continued working on the company website. **Time Start:** 09:00 AM **Time End:** 02:00 PM **Working at Home Doing Court Case Defense Work** The claimant continued spending time and personal resources preparing his defense against the allegations being made against him. **Time Start:** 12:00 AM **Time End:** 06:00 AM **Why These Findings Matter** **Finding 1:** This email demonstrates a continuing pattern of unanswered complaints and requests for assistance. **Finding 2:** This email proves that concerns regarding health, welfare, housing conditions, and neighbour issues were being reported directly to Enfield Council. **Finding 3:** The email demonstrates that the claimant and his mother were actively seeking assistance rather than remaining silent about the issues. **Finding 4:** By this stage, the claimant and his mother considered the situation serious enough to request rehousing if the issues could not be resolved. **Finding 5:** The chronology establishes that opportunities existed for Enfield Council to investigate, intervene and address the reported issues before later events developed. **Finding 6:** The complaint demonstrates that repeated warnings regarding the claimant's wellbeing and living conditions have already been communicated to Enfield Council. **Finding 7:** The chronology relies upon this email because it provides documentary evidence that the reported issues remained unresolved despite repeated complaints, requests for intervention and requests for assistance.
DOCX Answers File Link 03/08/2015	**Finding 46:**	**ASBO Trial Hearing and Guilty Verdict** **03/08/2015 - 04/08/2015** **ASBO Trial Date** This was the final hearing of the Anti-Social Behaviour Order proceedings held at Highbury Corner Magistrates Court. On **03/08/2015** and **04/08/2015**, the ASBO trial was heard, and a guilty verdict was recorded against Mr Simon Cordell.

Diary Link If Needed 03/08/2015 **PDF Answers File Link** 03/08/2015 **Diary Link If Needed** 03/08/2015		The claimant maintains that the verdict was made in error and did not accurately reflect the evidence or the grounds relied upon by the prosecution. Following the hearing, the claimant returned home and reviewed the case material in greater detail because he knew that he had not committed the offences alleged against him. During that review, the claimant identified what he considered to be significant inconsistencies, errors, and irregularities within the ASBO documentation and supporting evidence. The claimant's position is that it was during this period that concerns regarding the accuracy of timestamps, records and supporting material became increasingly apparent. **ASBO Hearing Information** **Date:** 03/08/2015 & 04/08/2015 **Defendant:** Mr Simon Cordell **Court:** Highbury Corner Magistrates Court **Case Number:** 1402490741 **Judge:** Judge Pigot **Prosecution Representative:** Robert Talalay **Defense Barrister:** Mr Andrew Locke **Case Handler:** Miss Sally Gilchrist, Legal Executive, Metropolitan Police (present) **Hearing Type:** Full Hearing **Exhibit 2** **The Enfield Gov / Email's Issue: 02** **From Andy Barrister** **Page Number: 2079** **From:** Josephine Ward **To:** Lorraine Cordell **Date:** 03 August 2015 - 20:50 **Subject:** From Andy *"See attached."* **Findings Proven by This Hearing** **Finding 1:** The ASBO trial was heard on 03/08/2015 and 04/08/2015. **Finding 2:** A guilty verdict was recorded against the claimant. **Finding 3:** Miss Sally Gilchrist attended as the Metropolitan Police case handler. **Finding 4:** The claimant immediately began reviewing the case material following the hearing. **Finding 5:** The claimant identified what he considered to be significant errors and inconsistencies within the ASBO evidence. **Finding 6:** The claimant did not accept the correctness of the verdict and continued examining the evidence after the hearing. **Background Circumstances** At the time of the trial:

		1) Housing **Disrepair** Issues Remained Unresolved. 2) The Claimant Continued Reporting Neighbour Issues. 3) The Claimant Remained Engaged in Ongoing Court Proceedings and Defense Preparation. **Time Spent Building** Despite the circumstances, the claimant continued developing an updated **Event Lighting Policy**. **Time Start:** 07:00 AM **Time End:** 03:30 PM The claimant's mother continued working on the company website. **Time Start:** 09:00 AM **Time End:** 02:00 PM **Working at Home Doing Court Case Defense Work** The claimant continued spending time and resources preparing material connected to the allegations and proceedings against him. **Time Start:** 12:00 AM **Time End:** 06:00 AM **Why These Findings Matter** **Finding 1:** This hearing produced the guilty verdict that became relied upon in later records. **Finding 2:** This date marks the point at which the claimant began closely examining the ASBO evidence in response to the verdict. **Finding 3:** The hearing provides a fixed and independently verifiable point within the chronology. **Finding 4:** The claimant's review of the ASBO material following the hearing forms the foundation of many of the later findings contained within this chronology. **Finding 5:** The chronology relies upon this date because it marks the transition from defending the ASBO proceedings to investigating how the evidence and records relied upon within those proceedings were developed. **Finding 6:** This hearing became a key turning point from which many subsequent complaints, disclosures, investigations, and findings later originated.
DOCX Answers File Link 04/08/2015 **Diary Link If Needed** 04/08/2015	**Finding 47:**	**The ASBO Was Granted and Later Became the Foundation for Further Proceedings** **Date:** 04/08/2015 **ASBO Granted:** 04/08/2015 **End of ASBO Order:** 04/08/2020 On **04/08/2015**, the Anti-Social Behaviour Order was granted against Mr Simon Cordell following the proceedings heard at Highbury Corner Magistrates' Court on 03/08/2015 and 04/08/2015. The claimant maintains that the order was granted in error and that the evidence provided upon it did not support the findings made by the court.

PDF Answers File Link 04/08/2015 **Diary Link If Needed** 04/08/2015		This date is important because it became the starting point for many later actions, allegations, records, council investigations, injunction proceedings, and associated documents relied upon by public authorities. **ASBO Court Information** **Case Number:** 011402490741 **Defendant:** Mr Simon Cordell **Date of Birth:** 26 January 1981 **Court:** Highbury Corner Magistrates' Court **Judge:** Judge Pigot **Prosecution:** Robert Talalay **Defense Barrister:** Mr Andrew Locke **Metropolitan Police Representative:** Miss Sally Gilchrist, Legal Executive **Exhibit 1** The claimant's barrister's correspondence was circulated following the hearing. **From:** Josephine Ward **To:** Lorraine Cordell **Date:** 03 August 2015 **Subject:** From Andy *"See attached."* **Exhibit 2** **The Second ASBO Folder** The claimant identifies page 18 of the second ASBO folder as important because it contains wording and conditions imposed following the granting of the order. The chronology relies upon this exhibit because the consequences of the ASBO continued long after the hearing itself. **Exhibit 3** **The ASBO Order and Conditions** The ASBO restrictions remained in force until **04/08/2020**. The chronology identifies these conditions because they had a continuing impact upon the claimant's ability to live normally, travel, socialise and defend himself against allegations being made against him. **Exhibit 4** **Lemmy Nwabuisi's First Injunction Order** The chronology identifies this exhibit because the order later relied upon many dates stretching from: **04/08/2015 onwards** The claimant notes that many of those dates later appeared within: **1)** Injunction Applications. **2)** Witness Statements. **3)** Council Records. **4)** Anti-Social Behaviour Investigations. **5)** Housing Enforcement Actions.

		The chronology therefore identifies the ASBO date as the foundation from which many later proceedings developed. **Exhibit 5 & 6** **Lemmy's Indexed Injunction Material** Received on **25/06/2018**. The material consisted of: **1)** Claim Forms. **2)** Injunction Applications. **3)** Statements. **4)** Indexed Evidence. The chronology identifies these exhibits because they demonstrate the continued reliance upon material arising after the ASBO was granted. **Disrepair** Housing **disrepair** issues remained unresolved during this period. The claimant records that housing complaints, damp issues and maintenance concerns continued whilst the ASBO restrictions were in force. **Time Spent Building** Despite the circumstances, the claimant continued developing business material, event documentation and studying. **Working at Home Doing Court Case Defense Work** The claimant continued spending substantial time preparing material connected to the allegations and proceedings affecting him. **Why These Findings Matter** **Finding 1:** 04/08/2015 is a fixed and independently verified date on which the ASBO was granted. **Finding 2:** The ASBO remained in force until 04/08/2020. **Finding 3:** The ASBO became a foundation upon which many later actions, allegations, records, and proceedings were built. **Finding 4:** Materials later relied upon by Lemmy Nwabuisi and Enfield Council repeatedly reference events occurring after the ASBO had been granted. **Finding 5:** The chronology identifies this date as a major turning point because many later records, injunctions, housing actions, and investigations originate from events occurring after the order came into force. **Finding 6:** This date provides one of the chronology's most important benchmark dates because it allows later records to be measured against a fixed and verifiable court outcome. **Finding 7:** The claimant's position is that many later allegations would not have arisen, or would have been interpreted differently, had the ASBO not been granted on 04/08/2015. **Also**

		Finding 1: Enfield Council Possessed and Relied Upon the ASBO File In Lemmy Nwabuisi's witness statement dated **07 August 2017**, he states: "*The Defendant was previously known to the Claimant, and an anti-social behavior order was made on 4 August 2015**..." and "...**a copy of the Order is at page 27 of the exhibit bundle."* This proves that: **1)** Lemmy Nwabuisi Possessed the ASBO Order. **2)** Enfield Council Possessed the ASBO Order. **3)** The ASBO Was Being Relied Upon by The Council During the Injunction Proceedings. **4)** The ASBO Had Become Part of The Evidence Bundle Used Against the Claimant. **5)** The ASBO Was Still Being Actively Relied Upon Nearly Two Years After It Had Been Granted. **Finding 2: Geoffrey Mann's Statement Contradicts the Council's Position** On **22/12/2016**, Geoffrey Mann wrote: *"We are aware that the police applied for an Anti-Social Behaviour Order (ASBO) which was granted on 4th August 2015..."* The chronology identifies this statement because it demonstrates that Enfield Council had knowledge of the ASBO and were discussing it as part of official correspondence. However, by **07 August 2017**, Lemmy Nwabuisi was not merely aware of the ASBO. He possessed it. He exhibited it. He relied upon it. He used it in a later court application. The chronology therefore identifies a difference between: **1)** Being Aware of the ASBO. **2)** Possessing The ASBO. **3)** Relying Upon The ASBO. **4)** Deploying The ASBO Within Later Court Proceedings. The records demonstrate that Enfield Council progressed beyond mere awareness and were actively relying upon the order during later litigation. **Finding 3: The Altered ASBO Order Was Deliberately Preserved and Reused** The ASBO Order contains handwritten alterations within conditions **d** and **e**. Those alterations create the wording: **1)** **"Dis Us Ed"** **2)** **"Re Man"** The chronology identifies that: **1)** The Amendments Do Not Appear Within the Original Printed Wording. **2)** The Amendments Appear to Have Been Added Using the Same Pen Used to Complete the Order.

		3) The Alterations Appear Within the Body of The Order Itself. 4) The Document Was Preserved. 5) The Document Was Copied. 6) The Document Was Later Reproduced Inside Lemmy Nwabuisi Injunction Material. The claimant and his mother identified the altered wording shortly after receiving the order. The claimant's position is that the wording was capable of being interpreted as a warning directed towards anybody attempting to challenge the order or act on the claimant's behalf. The chronology further identifies that there appears to be no legitimate administrative reason for manually altering the wording of an official court order in this manner. If the alterations were irrelevant: 1) The Altered Copy Could Have Been Discarded. 2) The Altered Copy Could Have Been Replaced. 3) A Clean Copy Could Have Been Exhibited. Instead, the altered version remained within material later relied upon by Enfield Council and Lemmy Nwabuisi. **Why These Findings Matter** These findings demonstrate that the ASBO did not remain a historical court document. The chronology establishes that: 1) The ASBO Granted On **04/08/2015** Was Retained by Enfield Council. 2) Lemmy Nwabuisi Later Relied Upon It Inside His Injunction Proceedings. 3) The Order Formed Part of The Evidence Used Against the Claimant Years Later. 4) The Version Retained Contains Handwritten Alterations Not Present Within the Printed Wording. 5) The Same Altered Version Was Preserved Rather Than Replaced. 6) The Council Therefore Continued Relying Upon the Altered Document During Later Litigation. 7) The ASBO Became a Foundation Document Connecting the Original Proceedings to Later Injunction Proceedings. The claimant's position is that this demonstrates a clear documentary link between the original ASBO proceedings and the later injunction proceedings brought by Enfield Council, with the altered ASBO Order remaining part of the material relied upon throughout.
DOCX Answers File Link 14/08/2015	**Finding 48:**	**The ASBO Verdict Was Publicised Whilst the Appeal Process Was Ongoing** **Date:** 14/08/2015 Following the ASBO being granted on **04/08/2015**, information relating to the case was publicised through newspaper articles and material originating from the Metropolitan Police. The claimant was simultaneously pursuing an appeal against the decision and continued examining the case

Diary Link If Needed 14/08/2015 **PDF Answers File Link** 14/08/2015 **Diary Link If Needed** 14/08/2015		material because he maintained that the allegations relied upon by the prosecution had not been properly proved. **Exhibit 1** **Publicity Following the ASBO** The chronology identifies that newspaper articles were published stating that the claimant had been given an ASBO for organising illegal raves. The claimant maintains that these reports did not accurately reflect the true outcome of the proceedings and portrayed him as guilty of matters that he states were not properly proved before the court. The claimant further records that the publication of those reports coincided with increasing problems within his daily life and home environment. **Exhibit 2** **The Enfield Gov / Email's Issue: 02** **572. GL-HCORNERMCENQ_RE_ Simon Cordell (4)** **Page Number: 2085** This correspondence demonstrates that enquiries were already being made concerning the court proceedings and appeal process shortly after the ASBO was granted. **Findings Proven by This Entry** **Finding 1:** The ASBO was granted on **04/08/2015** and immediately became a matter of public record. **Finding 2:** The claimant was already challenging the correctness of the verdict and pursuing appeal-related enquiries. **Finding 3:** Information concerning the ASBO was publicly circulated whilst the claimant continued disputing the outcome. **Finding 4:** The claimant was actively reviewing the case papers because he maintained that the allegations relied upon against him had not been properly established. **Finding 5:** The publicity surrounding the ASBO had consequences beyond the courtroom because it affected how the claimant was viewed by others who became aware of the reports. **Impact Upon the Claimant** The claimant records that publication of the ASBO material significantly damaged his reputation. The claimant states that his name was publicly associated with allegations relating to illegal raves and serious anti-social behavior despite his continued challenge to the decision and ongoing appeal efforts. The claimant further records that the publicity intensified difficulties he was already experiencing in relation to his housing situation and everyday life. **Disrepair** Housing **disrepair** issues remained unresolved during this period.

		The claimant records that problems relating to damp, heating and the condition of the property continued despite repeated reports being made to the relevant housing authorities. **Time Spent Building** Despite the circumstances, the claimant continued studying and developing business documentation. The claimant continued working on policies, planning material and event-related documentation. The claimant's mother also continued working on building the company website. **Working at Home Doing Court Case Defense Work** The claimant continued spending considerable time preparing and reviewing material connected to the allegations and proceedings affecting him. The claimant's focus during this period was directed towards understanding the case, preserving evidence, and progressing the appeal process. **Why These Findings Matter** **Finding 1:** This entry demonstrates that the ASBO was being publicly reported whilst the claimant continued disputing the verdict. **Finding 2:** The chronology establishes that the claimant did not accept the correctness of the decision and immediately began examining the case material and pursuing appeal-related action. **Finding 3:** The publication of the ASBO allegations had reputational consequences that extended beyond the courtroom. **Finding 4:** The claimant's position is that the publicity damaged his reputation and contributed to difficulties that followed. **Finding 5:** The chronology relies upon this entry because it marks the point at which the court decision moved beyond a courtroom matter and became publicly circulated information. **Finding 6:** This date forms an important link between the ASBO proceedings, the appeal process and later events relied upon throughout the chronology.
DOCX Answers File Link 16/08/2015 **Diary Link If Needed** 16/08/2015 **PDF**	**Finding 49:**	**Publication of the ASBO and the Escalation of Existing Problems** **Date:** 16/08/2015 Following publication of the ASBO material and newspaper coverage, the claimant records that the difficulties already being experienced within the property became significantly worse. **Exhibit 1** **Newspaper Articles** The chronology identifies that newspaper articles were published following the ASBO decision. The claimant records that the articles stated that he had been given an ASBO for organising illegal raves and further described him as:

Answers File Link 16/08/2015 **Diary Link If Needed** 16/08/2015		*"well-known for organizing illegal raves in Enfield and across London."* The claimant maintains that these descriptions were inaccurate and damaged his reputation. The claimant further records that the publication of those reports occurred whilst he was actively pursuing his appeal against the ASBO. **Findings Proven by This Entry** **Finding 1:** Following the granting of the ASBO, information concerning the claimant was publicly circulated through newspaper reports. **Finding 2:** The claimant was already pursuing an appeal whilst the reports were being published. **Finding 3:** The publicity caused concern regarding damage to the claimant's reputation and standing within the community. **Finding 4:** The claimant records that the situation within the housing estate deteriorated after publication of the ASBO material. **Finding 5:** The claimant identifies this period as a turning point where existing tensions became significantly worse. **Exhibit 2** **Neighbour Context** The claimant records that following publication of the ASBO material: **1)** Debbie Andrews **2)** Stain Curtis **3)** The Mathiyalagan Family changed their behavior towards him for the worse. The chronology identifies this because the claimant links the worsening of neighbour problems directly to the publicity generated following the ASBO proceedings. **Additional Findings** **Finding 6:** The claimant records that other neighbours who had not previously been involved began participating in the conduct being complained of. **Finding 7:** The claimant records that the publicity placed him at increased risk of hostility from members of the public who had seen or heard the reports. **Finding 8:** The chronology establishes that concerns regarding neighbour problems continued while the claimant's name and address were being circulated publicly. **Disrepair** Housing **disrepair** issues remained unresolved. The claimant records that damp, heating, and housing bad condition problems were continuing despite repeated complaints and requests for assistance. **Summary** The claimant records that: **1)** Publicity Surrounding the ASBO Increased Pressure Upon Him.

		2) Existing Neighbour Difficulties Became Worse. 3) Housing Issues Remained Unresolved. 4) Appeal Proceedings Were Underway. 5) No Effective Intervention Had Taken Place in Relation to The Issues Being Reported. **Time Spent Building** Despite the circumstances, the claimant continued developing an updated **Event Traffic Management Policy** and **On-Site Road Traffic Plan**. The claimant's mother also continued working on the company website. **Working at Home Doing Court Case Defense Work** The claimant continued spending time preparing material connected to the ASBO appeal and related proceedings. **Why These Findings Matter** **Finding 1:** This entry establishes that publication of the ASBO occurred whilst the claimant was challenging the decision. **Finding 2:** This entry links the publication of the ASBO material with a worsening of the claimant's circumstances within the housing estate. **Finding 3:** The chronology records that the claimant's reputation was affected by information publicly circulated following the ASBO. **Finding 4:** The claimant identifies this period as the point at which existing problems escalated significantly. **Finding 5:** The chronology relies upon this entry because it demonstrates that the consequences of the ASBO extended beyond the courtroom and into the claimant's daily life, housing circumstances, and relationships with neighbours. **Finding 6:** This date provides an important link between the ASBO proceedings, the public dissemination of information concerning the claimant and the worsening of events that followed.
DOCX Answers File Link 17/08/2015 **Diary Link If Needed** 17/08/2015 **PDF Answers File Link** 17/08/2015	**Finding 50:**	**Finding 49: What The Diary Records Was Happening** This diary entry was created as part of the incident-recording process requested by Enfield Council's Community Safety Unit and forms part of the contemporaneous records kept by the claimant. **Finding 1: Repeated Disturbance Was Being Recorded** The diary records that the claimant was documenting repeated disturbances occurring throughout the day and night involving occupiers of Flats 111, 113 and 117 Burncroft Avenue. The disturbances recorded included: 1) Repeated Impacts and Banging Noises. 2) Repeated Use of Water Fixtures and Plumbing. 3) Noise Made Through Floors, Walls, and Building Fixtures. 4) Incidents Occurring During the Claimant's Normal Use of The Property.

Diary Link If Needed 17/08/2015		**Finding 2: The Problems Were Affecting Health** The diary records that the claimant considered the disturbances to be affecting: **1)** Sleep. **2)** Eating. **3)** Physical Wellbeing. **4)** Ability To Use the Property Normally. **5)** Ability To Work and Study from Home. The claimant specifically records ongoing concerns regarding deterioration in health. **Finding 3: The Problems Were Being Recorded Whilst They Were Occurring** This is important. The diary does not describe events years later. The diary records what the claimant states was happening at the time the events were occurring. The records were being created because the council requested incident recording. **Finding 4: Housing Conditions Remained Unresolved** The diary records that damp, heating, and sound-transmission issues remained unresolved. The claimant records that: **1)** Bedrooms Remained Cold. **2)** Heating Issues Remained Unresolved. **3)** Damp Remained Unresolved. **4)** Sound Transmission Issues Remained Unresolved. **Finding 5: Complaints Had Already Been Made** The diary records that the claimant believed: **1)** Complaints Had Already Been Submitted. **2)** Problems Had Already Been Reported. **3)** Housing Issues Had Already Been Reported. **4)** No Effective Resolution Had Been Achieved. **Finding 6: The Claimant Continued Working Despite the Problems** The diary records that the claimant continued: **1)** Building Business Documentation. **2)** Studying. **3)** Creating Policies and Event-Management Documentation. **4)** Preparing Court Defense Material. This demonstrates that normal daily activity continued despite the circumstances being recorded. **The Main Point This Entry Proves** If I had to reduce the entire diary entry into one sentence, it would be: On 17/08/2015, the claimant was recording ongoing noise, housing and wellbeing concerns in an official incident diary requested by Enfield

		Council, whilst simultaneously dealing with the consequences of the recently granted ASBO and continuing to prepare his defense and appeal-related work. **The Main Failures Recorded Against Enfield Council** Your diary is really recording these failures: **Failure 1** • Failure to address the reported neighbour issues. **Failure 2** • Failure to address the reported heating problems. **Failure 3** • Failure to address the reported damp problems. **Failure 4** • Failure to address the reported sound-transmission problems. **Failure 5** • Failure to act after complaints had already been made. **Failure 6** • Failure to provide a resolution despite continuing reports. Those are the points that stand out most strongly when reading the entry as evidence rather than as a personal account.
DOCX Answers File Link 18/08/2015 **Diary Link If Needed** 18/08/2015 **PDF Answers File Link** 18/08/2015 **Diary Link If Needed** 18/08/2015	**Finding 51:**	<table><tr><td>**30**</td><td>Mother FW Please can you help this cannot carry on</td><td>18/08/2015</td><td>11:19</td><td>1174</td></tr></table> • **The 9th email mum** sent to Dawn Allen about flat repairs and neighbours no reply to this email (FW: Please can you help this cannot carry on) email name. **Formal Complaint Escalated Beyond Dawn Allen Due to Continued Failure to Respond** **Exhibit 1** **The Enfield Gov / Email's Issue: 02** **Mother FW Please Can You Help This Cannot Carry On** **Page Numbers: 2086-2087** **18/08/2015 - 11:19** This was the **ninth email** sent concerning the ongoing neighbour issues, housing **disrepair,** and lack of intervention. Unlike the earlier emails, this correspondence demonstrates that the claimant's mother had reached the point where she no longer expected a response from Dawn Allen and was attempting to identify another officer capable of dealing with the issues. The email states: *"Can you please give me a person's name and email address that can address this issue, as you seem to not want to reply..."* It further states: *"I am sending these emails to the correct email address which I am DAWN.ALLEN@Enfield.gov.uk."* **Findings Proven by This Email** **Finding 1:** By **18/08/2015**, at least nine emails had been sent concerning the same unresolved issues. **Finding 2:** The claimant's mother had concluded that Dawn Allen was not responding to the correspondence.

		Finding 3: The claimant's mother specifically requested details of another officer who could deal with the matter. **Finding 4:** The email confirms that the correct council email address had been used, removing any suggestion that the earlier correspondence had been sent to the wrong recipient. **Finding 5:** By this date, the complaint had moved beyond neighbour issues and had become a complaint about the continued failure to respond or take the correct actions. **Finding 6:** The chronology demonstrates that repeated opportunities had been provided to address the issues before escalation was sought. **Disrepair** The claimant records that housing **disrepair** issues remained unresolved. The chronology identifies that complaints concerning: **1)** Damp. **2)** Heating. **3)** Sound Transmission. **4)** General Housing Conditions. continued alongside the neighbour complaints and remained unresolved. **Time Spent Building** Despite the circumstances, the claimant continued developing business documentation, policies, and event-management material. The claimant's mother also continued working on the company website. **Working at Home Doing Court Case Defense Work** The claimant continued spending time and personal resources preparing material connected to the allegations and proceedings affecting him. **Why These Findings Matter** **Finding 1:** This email demonstrates that repeated complaints had already been submitted before August 2015. **Finding 2:** This email demonstrates that the claimant's mother was no longer asking only for assistance but was actively seeking escalation because previous complaints had produced no meaningful response. **Finding 3:** The email proves that the correspondence was being sent to the correct officer and correct council email address. **Finding 4:** The chronology establishes that concerns regarding neighbour issues, welfare and housing conditions had not been resolved despite repeated reports. **Finding 5:** This email is important because it demonstrates that the lack of response has itself become a matter of complaint. **Finding 6:** By **18/08/2015**, the claimant and his mother were attempting to bypass the officer originally responsible because earlier requests for intervention had not resulted in action. **Finding 7:** The chronology relies upon this email because it provides documentary evidence that repeated requests for assistance had reached the point where escalation was being sought due to the continuing absence of any meaningful response.

DOCX Answers File Link 20/08/2015 **Diary Link If Needed** 20/08/2015 **PDF Answers File Link** 20/08/2015 **Diary Link If Needed** 20/08/2015	**Finding 52:**	**Geoffrey Mann Confirmed That the Claimant Was Making Noise Complaints On 20/08/2015.** **Date:** 20/08/2015 **Exhibit 1** **Geoffrey Mann - Complaint Response Dated 22/12/2016** Within the response to the complaint, Geoffrey Mann wrote: "*We have checked our records since 4th August 2015 and found two records of telephone complaints received from your son. One on 20th August 2015 and again on 26th January 2016 which related to noise and the issues he was having with a neighbour. These concerns were dealt with at the time by relevant officers."* **Findings Proven** **Finding 1** Enfield Council confirmed that Simon Cordell made a telephone complaint on **20/08/2015** regarding noise and neighbour issues. **Finding 2** This proves that the claimant was reporting problems to Enfield Council shortly after the ASBO was granted on **04/08/2015**. **Finding 3** The complaint concerned: **1)** Noise Nuisance. **2)** Problems Involving Neighbours. **3)** Issues Occurring at The Claimant's Home. **Finding 4** This contradicts any suggestion that the claimant remained silent or failed to seek assistance following the ASBO proceedings. The council's own records confirm that complaints were being made. **Finding 5** The complaint was recorded by the council and acknowledged by Geoffrey Mann in a later official response. **Finding 6** The council stated: *"These concerns were dealt with at the time by relevant officers."* This confirms that officers have knowledge of the complaints and that the issues entered council systems. **What This Proves About the Wider History** The chronology already shows: **1)** Numerous Emails Sent by Lorraine Cordell to Dawn Allen. **2)** Requests For Intervention Regarding Neighbour Issues. **3)** Requests For Help Regarding Housing Conditions. **4)** Requests For Assistance Regarding Health Concerns. This finding adds an important additional fact: **The claimant was not only emailing and writing to the council. He was also telephoning the council to report the issues.** **Disrepair**

		Housing issues remained unresolved during this period. The claimant records that: **1)** Damp Problems Continued. **2)** Heating Issues Continued. **3)** Sound-Transmission Issues Continued. The chronology identifies these issues because they exist at the same time as the claimant was reporting neighbour-related concerns. **Time Spent Building** The claimant continued studying and developing business documentation during this period. The claimant's mother also continued working on the company website. **Working At Home Doing Court Case Defense Work** The claimant continued preparing material connected to: **1)** The ASBO Proceedings. **2)** Appeal-Related Work. **3)** Defense Preparation. **Why These Findings Matter** **Finding 1** The council's own records confirm that the claimant was making complaints about neighbour issues on **20/08/2015**. **Finding 2** The complaint was made only sixteen days after the ASBO was granted. **Finding 3** The complaint demonstrates that the claimant was actively seeking assistance and reporting problems rather than remaining silent. **Finding 4** The council acknowledged that the complaint existed and was recorded within its systems. **Finding 5** This finding supports the chronology because it independently confirms that complaints regarding neighbours and noise were being made to the council during 2015. **Finding 6** The chronology therefore relies upon this entry because it proves that the claimant was reporting neighbour-related issues directly to Enfield Council, and that those reports were known to council officers.
DOCX Answers File Link 28/08/2015 **Diary Link If Needed**	**Finding 53:**	**Police Complaint Submitted by the Claimant Was Cancelled and Then Reopened** **Date:** 28/08/2015 **Exhibit 1** **A Police Complaint Was Submitted and Then Cancelled** The claimant records that a police complaint previously submitted was cancelled. The claimant further records that he later received correspondence dated **30/08/2015** stating that the complaint was again being addressed, however no further meaningful follow-up was received.

28/08/2015 **PDF Answers File Link** 28/08/2015 **Diary Link If Needed** 28/08/2015		**Findings Proven** **Finding 1** A complaint was submitted to the police by the claimant. **Finding 2** The complaint was cancelled despite having already been submitted and recorded. **Finding 3** The claimant later received correspondence indicating that the complaint was once again being processed. **Finding 4** The chronology records no meaningful **conclusion** or resolution following the reopening of the complaint. **Finding 5** This demonstrates inconsistency in the handling of complaints raised by the claimant. **Neighbour Issues** The claimant continued recording ongoing neighbour-related disturbance involving occupiers of Flats 111, 113 and 117 Burncroft Avenue. The claimant records that the disturbances remained ongoing and continued to affect daily life, wellbeing, and use of the property. **Disrepair** The claimant records that damp, freezing conditions, and unresolved housing defects remained present. The claimant states that the property conditions were continuing to affect his health and wellbeing and that reported repair issues remained unresolved. **Time Spent Building** Despite the circumstances, the claimant continued working on an updated **Event Food Safety Policy** and continued studying and developing business documentation. The claimant's mother also continued working on the company website. **Working at Home Doing Court Case Defense Work** The claimant continued spending time and resources preparing material connected to allegations being made against him and ongoing court matters. **Why These Findings Matter** **Finding 1** This entry demonstrates that the claimant was actively using official complaint procedures rather than remaining silent. **Finding 2** The chronology records that a complaint was both cancelled and later reopened, raising questions regarding how the complaint was managed. **Finding 3**

		The entry demonstrates that the claimant continued to seek assistance from public authorities during the same period that he was dealing with the consequences of the ASBO proceedings. **Finding 4** The chronology identifies this event because it demonstrates that concerns raised by the claimant did not progress through a straightforward complaint process. **Finding 5** This entry forms part of a wider pattern in which complaints, reports and requests for assistance were repeatedly submitted but not resolved in a manner that brought the underlying issues to an end.
DOCX Answers File Link 29/08/2015 **Diary Link If Needed** 29/08/2015 **PDF Answers File Link** 29/08/2015 **Diary Link If Needed** 29/08/2015	**Finding 54:**	**Police Attended the Claimant's Address After Reports That His Safety Was at Risk** **Date:** 29/08/2015 **Exhibit 1** **Police Attendance at 109 Burncroft Avenue** The claimant records that police attended his home after he had previously contacted them reporting concerns that his safety was at risk. The claimant further records that: **1)** A 999 call had been made. **2)** Concerns have been reported regarding information published by the police. **3)** The matter was serious enough for police attendance at the property. **4)** The attendance was recorded and preserved on video. The claimant identifies the relevant recording as: **"1st ASBO Police MP4 - Attending mine 6 days later for a gun No Protection! 22_08_2015 + 29_08_2015.mp4"** **Findings Proven** **Finding 1** The claimant contacted the police and reported concerns relating to his personal safety. **Finding 2** Police officers attended the claimant's address following those reports. **Finding 3** The attendance was recorded and preserved on video evidence. **Finding 4** The claimant continued to report concerns and seek assistance through official channels following the ASBO proceedings. **Finding 5** The claimant records that concern arose following publication of information regarding the ASBO. **Finding 6** The chronology demonstrates that the claimant was actively reporting risks and requesting assistance rather than remaining silent. **Neighbour Issues**

		The claimant continued recording ongoing neighbour-related problems involving occupiers of Flats 111, 113 and 117 Burncroft Avenue. The claimant records that the issues remained ongoing and continued to affect daily life and wellbeing. **Disrepair** Housing conditions remained unresolved. The claimant records that: **1)** Damp Remained Present. **2)** Heating Problems Remained Present. **3)** Living Conditions Continued to Deteriorate. **4)** Reported Repair Issues Remained Unresolved. The claimant identifies these issues as having a continuing impact upon his health and day-to-day life. **Time Spent Building** Despite the circumstances, the claimant continued working on an updated **Event Food Safety Policy** and continued studying and developing business documentation. The claimant's mother also continued working on the company website. **Working at Home Doing Court Case Defense Work** The claimant continued spending time and resources preparing material connected to: **1)** The ASBO Proceedings. **2)** Appeal-Related Work. **3)** Defense Preparation. **Why These Findings Matter** **Finding 1** This entry demonstrates that the claimant considered the situation serious enough to contact the police and request assistance. **Finding 2** The police attendance confirms that concerns raised by the claimant were formally reported. **Finding 3** The event was preserved on video and forms part of the claimant's supporting evidence. **Finding 4** The chronology demonstrates that the claimant continued using official reporting procedures after the ASBO was granted. **Finding 5** The claimant's position is that concerns regarding his safety were being raised whilst he was simultaneously dealing with ongoing housing problems, neighbour disputes, and the consequences of the ASBO proceedings. **Finding 6** The chronology relies upon this entry because it demonstrates that requests for assistance, reports of risk and concerns regarding personal

		safety were continuing to be raised with public authorities during this period.
DOCX Answers File Link 30/08/2015 **Diary Link If Needed** 30/08/2015 **PDF Answers File Link** 30/08/2015 **Diary Link If Needed** 30/08/2015	**Finding 55:**	**Police Confirmed the Complaint Would Be Investigated** **Exhibit 1** **Police Correspondence** The claimant received a letter from the police regarding a complaint that had been submitted on **28/08/2015**. The correspondence confirmed that the complaint had been received and that the matter would be investigated. **Findings Proven** **Finding 1:** A formal complaint had been made to the police by the claimant. **Finding 2:** The police formally acknowledged the complaint. **Finding 3:** The police confirmed that the complaint required investigation. **Finding 4:** The claimant retained documentary evidence proving that the complaint existed. **Finding 5:** This demonstrates that the claimant was actively reporting concerns through official channels rather than remaining silent. **Why These Findings Matter** **Finding 1:** The existence of the letter independently proves that a police complaint has been submitted. **Finding 2:** The police accepted that the complaint required investigation. **Finding 3:** This contradicts any suggestion that the claimant had raised no concerns. **Finding 4:** The chronology relies upon this letter because it provides documentary evidence that concerns reported by the claimant entered the police complaints process.
DOCX Answers File Link 18/09/2015 **Diary Link If Needed** 18/09/2015 **PDF Answers File Link** 18/09/2015	**Finding 56:**	**Finding 56: The Real Beginning of the Debra Andrews Case 18/09/2015** One of the important questions raised throughout this chronology is: **When did Enfield Council first become involved with Debra Andrews?** The evidence suggests the answer is not **23/09/2015**. The evidence shows that by **18/09/2015**, Enfield Council's Anti-Social Behaviour Team was already actively dealing with complaints involving Debra Andrews of 113 Burncroft Avenue. [01. 1 Orig...13-01-2022 | PDF] The records show an email dated **18/09/2015 at 17:23** sent by PC Mark Tilley to Dolly Ogunseye, an Anti-Social Behaviour Officer working on behalf of Enfield Council. According to the email: **1)** Police Had Already Attended Debra Andrews' Address Previously. **2)** Police Had Spoken to Her Before. **3)** Police Had Been Given a Letter by Her. **4)** Police Considered the Contents of the Letter to Make No Sense. **5)** Police Believed She Was Suffering from Mental-Health Issues. **6)** Police Had Attended Again on Another Occasion.

Diary Link If Needed 18/09/2015		7) Police Reported That She Spoke to Them Through Her Letterbox Rather Than Answering the Door. 8) Police Stated That They Had Received No Further Calls from Her Afterwards. This is extremely important. Because by the time the chronology begins describing complaints from Debra Andrews, there is already documented evidence showing: 1) Council Involvement. 2) Police Involvement. 3) Concerns Regarding Her Presentation. 4) Concerns Regarding the Reliability of Information Being Supplied. 5) Discussions Taking Place Between Police and Council Officers. **Why This Finding Matters** The significance of this date is not simply that an email exists. The significance is that this email appears to demonstrate that Enfield Council and its Anti-Social Behaviour Team already know more than later records suggest. At the same time: 1) Simon Cordell And His Late Mother Had Already Been Making Repeated Complaints Regarding Neighbours. 2) Requests For Help Had Already Been Made. 3) Housing Concerns Had Already Been Raised. 4) Multiple Reports Had Already Been Submitted. Yet those complaints were not met with the same urgency. The chronology therefore identifies a significant difference in treatment. When complaints were made by Simon Cordell and his family, intervention was limited and requests for assistance often went unanswered. When complaints were made by Debra Andrews, council officers attended, police officers became involved, communications were exchanged and immediate safeguarding concerns were discussed. **The Question Raised by The Evidence** The email of **18/09/2015** also creates another important question. Later SAR records, document history surrounding Debra Andrews to begin around **23/09/2015**. However, the evidence shows council and police officers discussing her case on **18/09/2015**, five days earlier. The chronology therefore asks: If council and police officers were already discussing the matter on 18/09/2015, why does the later documented history appear to begin on 23/09/2015? And: Why are earlier police concerns regarding Debra Andrews, including concerns recorded by attending officers, not reflected in the same way within later records? **What This Finding Proves** This finding demonstrates that:

1) Enfield Council Were Aware of Debra Andrews Before 23/09/2015.
2) Police And Council Officers Were Already Discussing Her Circumstances On 18/09/2015.
3) Concerns Regarding Her Presentation Had Already Been Recorded.
4) Simon Cordell Was Discussed Between Agencies Before Any Fair Investigation of His Own Complaints Had Taken Place.
5) The Chronology Raises Questions Regarding Why Later Records Appear to Begin on A Later Date Despite Evidence Showing the Matter Was Already Active.

That, in my view, is the core of Finding 56. It is not really about Debra Andrews herself. It proves that **the council already knew about the situation, were already exchanging information with police, and that the official chronology appears to start later than the evidence suggests it should.**

Sent: 18 September **2015** 17:23
To: Dolly Ogunseye
Subject: 113 Burncroft Avenue, Enfield, Middlesex, EN3 7JQ
Miss Debra Andrew [SEC=PROTECT]
Hi Dolly,
Nick and I attended 113a while ago and spoke to the lady a while ago when she originally called Police. At the time she did not want us to speak to her neighbour as things had got better. The lady handed us a letter about what had happened but none of it made any sense.
We believe she was suffering from mental health issues. On another occasion we popped round to see her, and she would not come and speak to us so instead she spoke through her letterbox to us. The male at 109 - Simon Cordell who is causing the problems is very well known to Police and is also very anti Police. I know some Officers went around and spoke to him, and things seemed to get better. After that we have had no further calls from the lady at 118.
We will try and get around to see her when were back on duty on Monday.

Ozzy Date
On **19.11.14** Mr. Cordell's mother phoned the hub (triage team) and reported that he was paranoid towards her and towards the police. In response the home treatment visited the same day. When home treatment workers arrived the same day, the police were present and reported that Mr. Cordell had been screaming in distress. The police said that they had found Mr. Cordell using a gas canister and thought that he was using nitrous oxide. A Neighbour referred for a Mental Health Act assessment.

DOCX Answers File Link 21/09/2015 **Diary Link If Needed** 21/09/2015 **PDF Answers File Link** 21/09/2015 **Diary Link If Needed** 21/09/2015	**Finding 57:**	**Finding 57: The Authorities Immediately Accepted Debra Andrews' Allegations Whilst Ignoring Months of Complaints Made by Simon Cordell and Lorraine Cordell** **21/09/2015** **This was the first recorded reply from Dawn Allen to my mother's regarding the neighbor complaints,** **They knew they had avoided protecting me and allowed a client of theirs to victimise me. As me and mother had written to them to make them aware.** By **21/09/2015**, the position is clear. This was not the beginning of the dispute. By this date, Simon Cordell and Lorraine Cordell had already spent months contacting council departments regarding: **1)** Neighbour Harassment, **2)** Anti-Social Behaviour, **3)** Housing Issues, **4)** Disrepair, **5)** Sleep Deprivation, **6)** Wellbeing Concerns, **7)** And Ongoing Victimisation Inside 109 Burncroft Avenue. The records show several emails references and complaints stretching back many months before September 2015. Despite this, no officer had visited Simon Cordell's home to thoroughly investigate about what he was complaining. No full report had been made. No meaningful intervention had occurred. Yet only days after the involvement of Debra Andrews, the situation changed dramatically. **Who Was Already Involved?** By this point the matter already involved: **1)** Dawn Allen, Enfield Council Housing Officer. **2)** Dolly Ogunseye, Anti-Social Behaviour Officer. **3)** Pc Mark Tilley, Metropolitan Police. **4)** The Anti-Social Behaviour Team. **5)** Housing Staff. **6)** Police Officers. This is important because these were not junior members of the public passing gossip between neighbours. These were public officials acting in professional capacities. **What Did They Already Know?** Only days earlier, on **18/09/2015**, communications between police and the Anti-Social Behaviour Team show that concerns already existed regarding Debra Andrews. Police recorded that: **1)** They Had Previously Attended Her Address.

2) They Had Been Given Letters by Her.
3) Those Letters **"Made No Sense".**
4) They Believed She Was Suffering from Mental-Health Issues.
5) She Sometimes Refused to Answer the Door and Spoke Through the Letterbox Instead.
6) Police Stated They Had Received No Further Calls from Her Afterwards.

This is extremely important.
Because it proves concerns regarding Debra Andrews were already known before the later council history began developing.

What Happened When Simon Asked for Help?
What did Simon ask for?
Nothing unreasonable.
The emails simply ask:

1) Please Visit the Property.
2) Please Witness What Is Happening.
3) Please See the Neighbour Behaviour for Yourself.
4) Please Investigate What Is Being Reported.
5) Please Help.

Simon specifically tells Dawn Allen:
"You would have to come to my flat at some point to here for yourself what is going on as you can clearly hear it and see what the neighbour is doing."
That statement is important.
Because Simon is not avoiding investigation.
He is requesting investigation.
He is inviting officials to attend.
He is asking them to witness the situation for themselves.

What Response Was Given?
Rather than attend the property, Dawn Allen repeatedly attempted to move the discussion away from the home and into council offices.
At the same time:

1) Neighbour Complaints Were Being Passed into The Anti-Social Behaviour Team,
2) Discussions Were Taking Place About Debra Andrews,
3) And Agencies Were Already Beginning to Focus Attention Upon Simon Cordell.

This creates an obvious imbalance.
While Simon and Lorraine were requesting help and investigation, official resources were increasingly being directed towards allegations being made against Simon instead.

Why This Finding Matters
This finding does not simply prove that complaints were made.
It proves that by **21/09/2015**:

1) Enfield Council Were Fully Aware That Simon Cordell Was Alleging Neighbour Harassment.

		2) Enfield Council Knew Repeated Complaints Had Already Been Made. 3) Enfield Council Knew Housing Problems Remained Unresolved. 4) Enfield Council Knew Wellbeing Concerns Were Being Reported. 5) Police And Anti-Social Behaviour Officers Were Already Involved. 6) Concerns Regarding Debra Andrews Had Already Been Raised Internally. 7) Yet No Equivalent Scrutiny Appears to Have Been Applied to the Allegations Being Made Against Simon Cordell. This is one of the earliest points in the chronology where the reader can see two vastly different standards developing. One standard for complaints made by Simon Cordell. Another standard for complaints made about Simon Cordell. And that difference becomes increasingly important throughout everything that follows. By the time of these emails, your records show: 1) 15 Previous Email References. 2) 16 Previous Email References. 3) 17 Previous Email References. 4) Numerous Phone Calls. 5) Complaints Stretching Back Months. ➢ By the **21/09/2015** my mother had contacted the Enfield Council more than 30 times regarding what my neighbours were doing to me by attacking me in my home illegally, as shown below up to 30.
DOCX Answers File Link 23/09/2015 **Diary Link If Needed** 23/09/2015 **PDF Answers File Link** 23/09/2015 **Diary Link If Needed** 23/09/2015	**Finding 58:**	**Finding 58: Debra Andrews Was Immediately Treated as a Victim Whilst Simon Cordell Was Immediately Labelled the Perpetrator 23/09/2015** The Council's own records show that on **23/09/2015** an Anti-Social Behaviour case was formally created and circulated by Dolly Ogunseye. The case identified Debra Andrews as the victim and immediately identified Simon Cordell as the perpetrator. Dawn Allen attended the property together with Bola Quadri and the allegations made by Debra Andrews were accepted and recorded as the basis of the case history. [Attachment 5_105. | PDF] The significance of this date is not simply that a complaint was received. The significance is that by the very first formal entry: 1) Debra Andrews is already treated as the victim. 2) Simon Cordell is already treated as the perpetrator. 3) Safeguarding measures are already being discussed. 4) Mental Health Services are already involved. 5) Enquiries regarding Simon Cordell are already being proposed. 6) Warning letters and intervention against Simon Cordell are already being considered. The history therefore begins with a position where guilt has effectively already been assumed. **What The History Does Not Tell the Reader**

		The Council history starts on **23/09/2015**. However, the evidence proves the matter was already active before this date. On **18/09/2015**, police officers were already communicating with Council officers regarding Debra Andrews. Police stated: *"The lady handed us a letter about what had happened but none of it made any sense."* Police further stated: "We believe she was suffering from mental health issues." Police also recorded that on another occasion she would not answer the front door and instead spoke to them through her letterbox. Those facts existed before the Council history began. Yet none of those concerns appear at the start of the official chronology relied upon against Simon Cordell. Instead, the chronology begins with Simon Cordell already identified as the perpetrator. **What Dawn Allen Already Knew** This is where the chronology becomes important. By **23/09/2015**, Dawn Allen was not dealing with a stranger. By this point: **1)** Lorraine Cordell Had Already Spent Months Reporting Neighbour Issues. **2)** Numerous Emails Had Already Been Sent. **3)** Numerous Telephone Calls Had Already Been Made. **4)** Complaints Regarding Neighbour Harassment Had Already Been Raised. **5)** Complaints Regarding Disrepair Had Already Been Raised. **6)** Complaints Regarding Simon Cordell's Wellbeing Had Already Been Raised. **7)** Repeated Requests for Assistance Had Already Been Made to Enfield Council. Yet none of that history appears within Debra Andrews' Council history. The complaints made by Simon Cordell and Lorraine Cordell disappear. The allegations made against Simon Cordell remain. **What This Finding Proves** This finding proves that the Council history was not created from a neutral starting point. The first formal entry already assumes: **1)** Debra Andrews Is the Victim. **2)** Simon Cordell Is the Perpetrator. **3)** Action Should Be Taken Against Simon Cordell. **4)** Mental Health Services Should Be Contacted Regarding Simon Cordell. **5)** Safeguarding Action Should Be Taken in Favour of Debra Andrews. **At the same time:**

		1) Police Concerns Regarding Debra Andrews Are Pushed into The Background. 2) Earlier Complaints Made by Simon Cordell and Lorraine Cordell Are Missing. 3) Earlier Requests for Help Are Missing. 4) Earlier Context Is Missing. The result is that the official history begins from a position which supports action against Simon Cordell while excluding the information that places those allegations into their proper context. 1) Dawn Allen Checked NHS Records None in existence. **23/09/2015** 2) Sarah Flexure Checked Internal Council Computers & Neighbours records due to George & Co for History about me but none! **11/11/2016** 3) Geoffrey Oman Checked Internal Council Computers & Neighbors records for History about me but none! **22/12/2016** 4) Lemmy Council. **24/12/2016**
DOCX Answers File Link 24/09/2015 **Diary Link If Needed** 24/09/2015 **PDF Answers File Link** 24/09/2015 **Diary Link If Needed** 24/09/2015	**Finding 59:**	**Dawn Allen and Dolly Ogunseye Ignored What They Already Knew About Debra Andrews and Started Building a History Against Simon Cordell Instead** ➢ Dolly Ogunseye ➢ Anti-Social Behaviour Officer Housing Anti-Social Behaviour Team Tenancy Management Enfield Council ➢ Hi Dolly, ➢ I am well thanks, ➢ I see your department is busy as ever… ➢ **Re: SC, he is not open to MH services and does not have a MH worker.** **EXHIBIT • 1!** **24/09/2015: Email Sent RE SOVA Alert - D.A - 1009639** By **24/09/2015**, Dawn Allen, Dolly Ogunseye and the Anti-Social Behaviour Team already knew that concerns had been raised regarding Debra Andrews by police officers only days earlier. They already knew: 1) Police Had Previously Attended Debra Andrews. 2) Police Had Been Given a Letter by Debra Andrews Which They Stated Made No Sense. 3) Police Believed Debra Andrews Was Suffering from Mental-Health Issues. 4) Police Attended Her Address on More Than One Occasion. 5) Debra Andrews Would Sometimes Refuse to Answer Her Door and Instead Spoke Through the Letterbox. 6) Simon Cordell And Lorraine Cordell Had Already Spent Months Making Complaints to Enfield Council. Despite all this information already existing, no investigation was carried out into the complaints made by Simon Cordell and Lorraine Cordell before action started being developed against Simon Cordell.

Instead, the Council immediately moved Debra Andrews into the Anti-Social Behaviour process and began arranging for her case to be transferred into the Community Safety Unit.

What Happened Instead?

The records show that on **24/09/2015** Dolly Ogunseye stated:
"Ms. Andrews case has been identified as one of many cases involved in this process."
At this stage:

1) Simon Cordell Had Never Been Interviewed Fairly.
2) Lorraine Cordell's Complaints Had Not Been Properly Investigated.
3) Dawn Allen Had Not Attended 109 Burncroft Avenue to Witness What Simon Cordell Was Reporting.
4) Council Officers Had Not Properly Investigated the Neighbour Allegations Made Against Simon Cordell.
5) The Anti-Social Behaviour Case Was Already Progressing Forwards.

Why This Is Important

This date proves that the Council did not approach the matter from a neutral position.
By **24/09/2015**:

1) Debra Andrews Was Already Being Treated as A Vulnerable Victim.
2) Safeguarding Procedures Were Already Being Discussed.
3) Community Safety Unit Involvement Was Already Being Arranged.
4) Action Against Simon Cordell Was Already Being Considered.

Yet at the same time:

1) Simon Cordell's complaints remained unresolved.
2) Lorraine Cordell's complaints remained unresolved.
3) Previous reports concerning Debbie Andrews, Stain Curtis and the Mathiyalagan family remained unresolved.
4) No equivalent safeguarding process was put in place for Simon Cordell despite the volume of complaints that had already been submitted.

What This Finding Proves

Finding 1: By **24/09/2015**, the Council had already chosen which side of the dispute they intended to support.
Finding 2: Dawn Allen and Dolly Ogunseye already possessed information that raised concerns regarding Debra Andrews, yet that information was not treated with the same importance as allegations made against Simon Cordell.
Finding 3: The Community Safety Unit process was already being prepared before Simon Cordell received a fair investigation into his own complaints.
Finding 4: Lorraine Cordell had already spent months reporting problems, yet Debra Andrews' allegations received immediate attention and escalation.
Finding 5: This date demonstrates the continuing pattern throughout the chronology whereby complaints made by Simon Cordell and his family

		were ignored, while allegations made against Simon Cordell were rapidly investigated, recorded, and developed.
DOCX Answers File Link 28/09/2015 **Diary Link If Needed** 28/09/2015 **PDF Answers File Link** 28/09/2015 **Diary Link If Needed** 28/09/2015	**Finding 60:**	**Debra Andrews' Case Was Escalated into the Community Safety Unit Whilst Simon Cordell's Complaints Continued to Be Ignored** On **28/09/2015**, Debra Andrews' case was formally identified as a high-level Anti-Social Behaviour case and transferred into the Community Safety Unit. This date is important because by this stage the Council already knew: **1)** Police Had Previously Attended Debra Andrews. **2)** Police Had Already Spoken with Debra Andrews on More Than One Occasion. **3)** Police Had Already Stated That Information Supplied by Debra Andrews "Made No Sense". **4)** Police Had Already Expressed Concerns Regarding Debra Andrews' Mental Health. **5)** Police Had Already Recorded That Debra Andrews Would Sometimes Speak Through Her Letterbox Rather Than Open Her Front Door. **6)** Lorraine Cordell Had Already Spent Months Making Complaints Regarding Neighbour Harassment, Intimidation, Disrepair, Sleep Deprivation and The Effects These Issues Were Having Upon Simon Cordell. **7)** Simon Cordell Had Already Spent Months Attempting to Obtain Assistance Through Official Channels. Despite all of this, no fair investigation had been carried out into the complaints being made by Simon Cordell and Lorraine Cordell before Debra Andrews' case was escalated. Instead, the Council chose to move Debra Andrews into a higher-level Anti-Social Behaviour process and prepare her case for onward management by the Community Safety Unit. **What This Finding Proves** **Finding 1:** By **28/09/2015**, Enfield Council had already chosen to escalate Debra Andrews' allegations. **Finding 2:** This decision was made despite police already recording concerns regarding Debra Andrews' behavior and mental-health presentation. **Finding 3:** The complaints made by Simon Cordell and Lorraine Cordell were still unresolved when Debra Andrews' case received immediate escalation. **Finding 4:** The Council already possessed information which required scrutiny of Debra Andrews' allegations before accepting them at face value. **Finding 5:** The Community Safety Unit became involved before Simon Cordell received a fair investigation into the issues he and his mother had repeatedly been reporting.

		Finding 6: This date marks the point where the dispute stopped being treated as a neighbour disagreement and began developing into a formal enforcement case against Simon Cordell.
DOCX Answers File Link 30/09/2015 **Diary Link If Needed** 30/09/2015 **PDF Answers File Link** 30/09/2015 **Diary Link If Needed** 30/09/2015	**Finding 61:**	**Debra Andrews Was Already Being Treated as the Victim Whilst Complaints Made by Simon Cordell Continued to Be Ignored** **Dear Jackie Gubby, 30/09/2015** **Finding 61:** Thank you for taking the time to talk to me on the phone today and **explaining why you could not come to the meeting on the 28/09/2014 at 14:30!** As said on the phone the surveyors took all the details of repairs and said they will deal with them. I am happy, you will get keep updated as too, what is going on with the repairs and keep me updated. **Also** The 2nd email mum sent to Dawn Allen about flat repairs and neighbours no reply to this email (RE: Issue I am having) Email name. **31/03/2015** **Finding 36:** **Subject: RE:** Issue I am having Dear Dawn Allen, ➢ I and my mother have made many phone calls about the neighbours above my flat, yet nothing is being done. ➢ **Please Can You Get Back to Me As Soon As Possible in Order to Setup A Meeting at My Home** so we can address the issues with the neighbours as soon as possible as I cannot live the way I am any longer. There are also still issues with repairs that have not been addressed. On **30/09/2015**, Lorraine Cordell contacted Jackie Gubby following a telephone conversation concerning the ongoing neighbour issues affecting Simon Cordell. The significance of this date is that it provides another real-time example of Simon Cordell and Lorraine Cordell reporting incidents to Enfield Council at the exact same time that Debra Andrews' case was already being developed by Dawn Allen, Dolly Ogunseye, and the Anti-Social Behaviour Team. According to the report provided to Jackie Gubby: **1)** Simon Cordell Heard Repeated Banging on The Communal Entrance Door. **2)** Simon Cordell Went Outside to See Who Was Causing the Disturbance. **3)** Whilst Returning Towards the Building, Debra Andrews Struck Him with Her Shopping Bags. **4)** Another Female Witness Observed What Happened. **5)** The Witness Intervened and Told Debra Andrews to Stop. **6)** Debra Andrews Became Agitated and Repeatedly Attempted to Prevent the Witness from Speaking with Simon Cordell. **7)** The Witness Nevertheless Spoke with Simon Cordell and Listened to What He Had to Say Before Leaving.

		This is important because the incident directly contradicts the impression later created that only Debra Andrews was reporting concerns and only Debra Andrews required protection. The records show Simon Cordell and Lorraine Cordell continuing to report incidents through official channels whilst the Council was already progressing Debra Andrews through the Anti-Social Behaviour process. **The Banging Continued** The claimant records that the following neighbours continued participating in the conduct he was reporting: **1)** Debbie Andrews. **2)** Stain Curtis. **3)** Mathiyalagan. **Time:** All-Day and All-Night whenever they knew that he was indoors. The claimant's position is that the disturbances continued to affect: **1)** Sleep. **2)** Health. **3)** Concentration. **4)** Daily Living. **5)** Ability To Work and Study from Home. At the same time, disrepair issues remained unresolved and complaints concerning housing conditions continued. **What This Finding Proves** **Finding 1:** By **30/09/2015**, Simon Cordell and Lorraine Cordell were still reporting incidents involving Debra Andrews directly to Enfield Council. **Finding 2:** The incident involved an independent witness who allegedly intervened and witnessed the interaction. **Finding 3:** The Council was receiving reports from both sides of the dispute but was already developing a case history that primarily focused on allegations against Simon Cordell. **Finding 4:** The chronology shows that incidents reported by Simon Cordell continued to be recorded and escalated by his family despite little meaningful intervention taking place. **Finding 5:** This date demonstrates that alternative accounts of events existed at the same time Debra Andrews was being presented within the Council history as the victim. **Finding 6:** The complaints made by Simon Cordell and Lorraine Cordell continued to exist alongside the allegations being developed against Simon Cordell, yet they did not receive the same level of attention, investigation, or safeguarding response. **Finding 7:** This finding provides further evidence that the Council received competing versions of events but were increasingly building a history in one direction only.
DOCX Answers File Link	**Finding 62:**	**01/10/2015**

01/10/2015 **Diary Link If Needed** 01/10/2015 **PDF Answers File Link** 01/10/2015 **Diary Link If Needed** 01/10/2015		**Finding 62: Dawn Allen and Dolly Ogunseye Ignored the Existing Evidence and Continued Building a False History Against Simon Cordell** By **01/10/2015**, Dawn Allen, Dolly Ogunseye and the Anti-Social Behaviour Team already possessed information which should have caused them to treat any new allegations from Debra Andrews with caution. Only days earlier: **1)** Police Had Already Attended Debra Andrews. **2)** Police Had Already Spoken Directly with Debra Andrews. **3)** Police Had Already Been Handed Written Material by Debra Andrews. **4)** Police Recorded That the Material "Made No Sense". **5)** Police Believed Debra Andrews Was Suffering from Mental-Health Issues. **6)** Police Recorded That Debra Andrews Would Sometimes Refuse to Open Her Front Door and Instead Communicate Through Her Letterbox. **7)** Police Had Already Communicated These Concerns to The Council and Anti-Social Behaviour Team. Despite all of this, the Council did not stop and review what they were being told. Instead, a new allegation immediately appeared. The Council history records: *"Just received some disturbing news about an incident that took place today."* The very next allegation escalates dramatically. It is now being alleged that Simon Cordell attempted to strangle Debra Andrews. The significance of this cannot be understated. If somebody genuinely believed Simon Cordell had attempted to strangle a vulnerable woman, the matter would be expected to generate: **1)** Immediate Police Intervention. **2)** Criminal Investigation. **3)** Witness Evidence. **4)** Arrest Records. **5)** Disclosure Records. **6)** Supporting Evidence. Yet neither Simon Cordell nor Lorraine Cordell were informed that such an allegation had allegedly been made. The allegation appears within the growing Council history, but there appears to be no corresponding evidence showing that the allegation was ever properly tested before becoming part of the official narrative. **What Dawn Allen Had Still Not Done** **1)** By **01/10/2015**: **2)** Dawn Allen Still had Not Properly Investigated the Months of Complaints Being Made by Lorraine Cordell. **3)** Dawn Allen Had Still Not Attended and Witnessed the Neighbour Issues Repeatedly Being Reported From 109 Burncroft Avenue.

4) Dawn Allen Had Still Not Properly Investigated the Conduct Being Complained About Concerning Debra Andrews.
5) Dawn Allen Had Still Not Properly Investigated the Complaints Concerning Debbie Andrews, Stain Curtis, and The Mathiyalagan Family.
6) Dawn Allen Had Still Not Provided a Balanced Investigation Despite Complaints Stretching Back Months.
7) Dawn Allen Had Still Not Addressed the Repeated Reports Concerning Sleep Deprivation, Deteriorating Health, Harassment and Disrepair.

What Happened Instead

Instead of investigating the complaints already in her possession:

1) Debra Andrews' allegations continued being developed.
2) Simon Cordell continued to be presented as the perpetrator.
3) Mental-health enquiries concerning Simon Cordell continued.
4) Safeguarding measures continued to be developed around Debra Andrews.
5) Additional allegations continued to be added into the Council history.

The result was that the Council history was becoming larger and more serious whilst the complaints being made by Simon Cordell and Lorraine Cordell remained unresolved.

What This Finding Proves

Finding 1: By **01/10/2015**, Dawn Allen and Dolly Ogunseye already possessed information that raised concerns regarding the reliability of information being supplied by Debra Andrews.
Finding 2: Despite those concerns, they continued developing allegations against Simon Cordell.
Finding 3: The allegation that Simon Cordell attempted to strangle Debra Andrews appeared after police had already raised concerns regarding Debra Andrews' behavior and mental-health presentation.
Finding 4: The chronology shows allegations becoming progressively more serious whilst the complaints being made by Simon Cordell and Lorraine Cordell continued to be ignored.
Finding 5: Dawn Allen and the Anti-Social Behaviour Team were actively building a history case against Simon Cordell whilst failing to thoroughly investigate the complaints already being made by him and his family.
Finding 6: The Council history increasingly recorded allegations against Simon Cordell whilst excluding or minimising the context that existed before those allegations were made.
Finding 7: This date represents another stage in the development of a one-sided Council history which accepted allegations against Simon Cordell whilst failing to apply the same standard of scrutiny to the information being supplied by Debra Andrews.

DOCX Answers File Link 06/10/2015 **Diary Link If Needed** 06/10/2015 **PDF Answers File Link** 06/10/2015 **Diary Link If Needed** 06/10/2015	**Finding 63:**	**Finding 63: Debra Andrews Was Moved into Accommodation by the Council Whilst Simon Cordell Continued to Be Left in the Same Circumstances, He Had Been Reporting for Months** By **06/10/2015**, the position had changed dramatically. Only weeks earlier, Debra Andrews had entered the Anti-Social Behaviour process and had been presented by Council officers as a vulnerable person requiring protection and support. The records show that safeguarding concerns had already been raised, Community Safety Unit involvement had already been arranged, and multiple agencies were already involved in her case. [Attachment 5_105. | PDF] The significance of this date is that Debra Andrews was subsequently moved into hotel accommodation by the Council. This demonstrates that when the Council accepted that somebody was vulnerable and required assistance, the Council had the power, resources, and ability to take immediate action. Yet at the same time: **1)** Simon Cordell Had Already Spent Months Reporting Neighbour Harassment. **2)** Lorraine Cordell Had Already Sent Repeated Complaints and Requests for Help. **3)** Housing Disrepair Had Already Been Reported. **4)** Sleep Deprivation Had Already Been Reported. **5)** Health Concerns Had Already Been Reported. **6)** Requests For Intervention Had Already Been Made. **7)** Requests For Home Visits Had Already Been Made. **8)** Requests For Assistance Regarding Neighbour Issues Had Already Been Made. Despite all those complaints, Simon Cordell remained on the same property and the same circumstances continued. **What Was Still Happening to Simon Cordell?** Whilst protection and accommodation were being arranged for Debra Andrews: **1)** **The Banging Continued**. **2)** The Neighbour Issues Continued. **3)** The Disrepair Issues Continued. **4)** The Sleep Deprivation Continued. **5)** The Damage to Health and Wellbeing Continued. **6)** The Claimant Remained Subject to the Consequences of the ASBO Proceedings. The chronology therefore shows two hugely different responses to two vastly different people living within the same block. **What This Finding Proves** **Finding 1:** By **06/10/2015**, Enfield Council had demonstrated that it was willing and able to take significant action when it believed somebody required protection. **Finding 2:** Debra Andrews received intervention, support, and alternative accommodation.

		Finding 3: Simon Cordell and Lorraine Cordell had been asking for help for months before this date. **Finding 4:** The complaints made by Simon Cordell concerning neighbours, health, wellbeing, and housing conditions had still not resulted in equivalent intervention. **Finding 5:** The chronology demonstrates that different standards were being applied to complaints made by Simon Cordell and complaints made against Simon Cordell. **Finding 6:** This date provides further evidence that allegations against Simon Cordell generated action, whilst complaints made by Simon Cordell generated little meaningful assistance. **Finding 7:** The contrast between the treatment of Debra Andrews and the treatment of Simon Cordell became increasingly difficult to ignore as the chronology developed. **Disrepair** The flat remained in poor condition. **1)** Damp issues remained unresolved. **2)** Heating concerns remained unresolved. **3)** Sound-transmission problems remained unresolved. **4)** Complaints regarding living conditions remained unresolved. **Why These Findings Matter** **Finding 1:** This date demonstrates that the Council had the ability to act when it chose to do so. **Finding 2:** The Council's treatment of Debra Andrews shows that intervention, support, and accommodation options were available. **Finding 3:** The chronology shows that similar concerns raised by Simon Cordell and Lorraine Cordell over many months did not receive the same response. **Finding 4:** This finding highlights the growing imbalance in how complaints were being handled. **Finding 5:** The chronology relies upon this date because it demonstrates the difference between how the Council responded to allegations made against Simon Cordell and how it responded to complaints made by Simon Cordell.
DOCX Answers File Link 13/10/2015 **Diary Link If Needed** 13/10/2015 **PDF**	**Finding 64:**	**Finding 64: Debra Andrews Was Being Fast-Tracked into Protection Whilst False and Unverified Allegations Were Being Built Against Simon Cordell** By **13/10/2015**, the position had moved far beyond a neighbour dispute. The records show that Dolly Ogunseye was actively communicating with Louise Brown regarding Debra Andrews and the steps being taken by Enfield Council to remove her from the property. At this stage, the Council were already attempting to locate alternative accommodation for Debra Andrews whilst her case remained under investigation. [Attachment 5_105. | PDF] This is important because it demonstrates that the Council had already decided that Debra Andrews required protection, support and rehousing

Answers File Link 13/10/2015 **Diary Link If Needed** 13/10/2015		before any balanced investigation into the wider circumstances had taken place. At the same time: **1)** The complaints made by Simon Cordell and Lorraine Cordell remained unresolved. **2)** Months of reports concerning neighbour harassment, intimidation, disrepair, sleep deprivation, and damage to wellbeing remained unresolved. **3)** Dawn Allen had still not properly addressed the complaints repeatedly being sent by Lorraine Cordell. **4)** Simon Cordell had still not received the same level of support, protection, or investigation. **5)** The Council were already treating Debra Andrews as a vulnerable victim requiring intervention. **What Dolly Ogunseye Was Saying to Other Council Officers** On **13/10/2015**, Dolly Ogunseye informed Louise Brown that: **1)** Debra Andrews suffered from a history of mental-health problems. **2)** Debra Andrews is currently supported by mental health services. **3)** Debra Andrews had made allegations against Simon Cordell. **4)** Simon Cordell was described as aggressive, violent, and anti-police. **5)** Simon Cordell was accused of threatening to kill Debra Andrews. **6)** A decision had already been made to move Debra Andrews from the property immediately. [Attachment 5_105. | PDF] The significance of this date is that these descriptions were already being circulated between Council departments. The narrative was no longer contained within a complaint file. At this stage, descriptions of Simon Cordell were being actively shared between officers as established facts. **What Makes This Finding Important** Only weeks earlier: **1)** Police Had Informed the Council That Debra Andrews Had Supplied Information Which "Made No Sense". **2)** Police Believed Debra Andrews Was Suffering from Mental-Health Issues. **3)** Police Recorded Behaviour They Themselves Considered Concerning. **4)** Police Had Already Discussed Those Concerns with Council Staff. [Attachment 5_105. | PDF] Yet by **13/10/2015**, those earlier concerns were no longer the focus. Instead, the focus had shifted entirely towards developing allegations against Simon Cordell. The chronology shows that concern for Debra Andrews' welfare continued to grow whilst the complaints made by Simon Cordell and Lorraine Cordell continued to receive little meaningful attention. **What This Finding Proves**

		Finding 1: By **13/10/2015**, Enfield Council had already decided that Debra Andrews required rehousing and protection. **Finding 2:** Allegations against Simon Cordell were already being circulated between Council departments as established facts. **Finding 3:** The Council had already begun describing Simon Cordell as aggressive, violent, and anti-police before any fair investigation of his own complaints had been completed. **Finding 4:** Earlier police concerns regarding Debra Andrews had ceased to be the focus of the case. **Finding 5:** The complaints submitted by Simon Cordell and Lorraine Cordell remained unresolved despite months of reporting. **Finding 6:** The Council were actively arranging protection and accommodation for Debra Andrews whilst failing to provide equivalent protection, assistance, or investigation to Simon Cordell. **Finding 7:** This date demonstrates that the Council was no longer investigating a dispute between neighbours. They were building a history in which Debra Andrews was treated as the victim and Simon Cordell was treated as the perpetrator.
DOCX Answers File Link 15/10/2015 **Diary Link If Needed** 15/10/2015 **PDF Answers File Link** 15/10/2015 **Diary Link If Needed** 15/10/2015	**Finding 65:**	**Finding 65: Debra Andrews Was Removed Whilst Simon Cordell Was Left Behind** By **15/10/2015**, the difference in how the two sides of the dispute were being treated had become impossible to ignore. The records show that Debra Andrews was being provided with protection, support, and alternative accommodation by Enfield Council. At this stage, Council officers were actively working to remove her from the situation and place her into hotel accommodation whilst her case continued to be progressed through the Anti-Social Behaviour process. [Attachment 5_105. | PDF] At the same time, Simon Cordell remained at **109 Burncroft Avenue**. No alternative accommodation had been offered to him. No emergency housing solution had been offered to him. No meaningful protection had been provided to him despite months of complaints, reports, telephone calls, and emails from both himself and Lorraine Cordell concerning what was allegedly happening within the block. [02. New Fi...& Onwards | PDF], [Attachment 4_104. | PDF] **Louise Brown Attended 109 Burncroft Avenue** This date is also important because it relates to the involvement of **Louise Brown**. A formal complaint was later raised regarding Louise Brown's actions following her attendance at the property with two police officers. The significance is not simply that officers attended. The significance is that whilst Council staff, Community Safety Unit officers and police officers were attending matters connected to allegations against Simon Cordell, the repeated complaints that Simon Cordell and Lorraine Cordell had been making for months remained unresolved.

		The chronology therefore demonstrates that significant resources were being deployed in response to allegations made against Simon Cordell whilst comparatively little action was taken in response to allegations made by Simon Cordell. [Attachment 5_105. | PDF], [Attachment 4_104. | PDF], [02. New Fi...& Onwards | PDF] **What Was Happening Inside the Property?** The claimant records that: **1)** Debbie Andrews was no longer present because the Council had moved her. **2)** Stain Curtis remained living within the block. **3)** The Mathiyalagan family remained living within the block. **4)** The banging and disturbance continued. **5)** The reported nuisance did not end when Debra Andrews left. This is important because it directly challenges the idea that one individual alone was responsible for all the problems being reported by Simon Cordell. The chronology records that the issues being complained about continued despite Debra Andrews no longer being present within the block in the same way as before. **Disrepair** The disrepair issues remained unresolved. The claimant continued reporting: **1)** Damp. **2)** Poor living conditions. **3)** Outstanding repairs. **4)** Housing issues affect health and wellbeing. Despite years of complaints, photographs and correspondence, the claimant records that meaningful resolution had still not been achieved. [02. New Fi...& Onwards | PDF] **What This Finding Proves** **Finding 1:** By **15/10/2015**, Enfield Council had demonstrated that it could move and protect a resident when it chose to do so. **Finding 2:** Debra Andrews had received a level of intervention, protection and support that Simon Cordell had never received despite months of complaints. **Finding 3:** Simon Cordell remained in the same environment he had been repeatedly complaining about. **Finding 4:** The complaints made by Simon Cordell and Lorraine Cordell remained unresolved. **Finding 5:** The nuisance and disturbance being reported did not simply disappear after Debra Andrews was moved. **Finding 6:** The chronology demonstrates that Enfield Council's response to allegations against Simon Cordell was significantly stronger than its response to complaints made by Simon Cordell. **Finding 7:** This date highlights the growing imbalance within the chronology, where protection, support and resources were directed

		towards people making allegations against Simon Cordell, whilst Simon Cordell himself continued reporting ongoing problems without receiving equivalent assistance. **Why These Findings Matter** This finding is important because it demonstrates that by October 2015 the Council had already shown that it possessed both the authority and the ability to intervene when it believed intervention was necessary. The chronology shows that such intervention was provided to Debra Andrews. The chronology also shows that Simon Cordell and Lorraine Cordell spent months requesting intervention, assistance, investigation, and support. The difference between those two responses forms an important part of the wider chronology and helps explain why the claimant believed that his complaints were not being treated equally or fairly.
DOCX Answers File Link 16/10/2015 **Diary Link If Needed** 16/10/2015 **PDF Answers File Link** 16/10/2015 **Diary Link If Needed** 16/10/2015	**Finding 66:**	**16/10/2015** **Finding 66: Louise Brown Ignored Months of Complaints, Circumvented the Agreed Meeting Process and Attended Simon Cordell's Home Without His Appropriate Adult Present** This finding cannot be viewed isolated. To understand what happened on **15/10/2015** and why a formal complaint was submitted on **16/10/2015**, it must be read together with the earlier correspondence between Lorraine Cordell and Enfield Council. On **31/03/2015**, Lorraine Cordell wrote to Dawn Allen on Simon Cordell's behalf requesting help regarding the ongoing neighbour issues and repairs. In that email, she specifically requested that a meeting be arranged **at Simon's home** so the problems could be witnessed and properly addressed. She explained that both she and Simon had already made numerous telephone calls and that nothing was being done. [Email Book...binder INDEX | PDF] The significance of that email is that it proves Simon Cordell was not refusing contact with the Council. The position was the complete opposite. Lorraine Cordell was actively requesting: **1)** A Meeting. **2)** A Home Visit. **3)** Investigation Of the Neighbours. **4)** Investigation Of the Repairs. **5)** Intervention By the Council. Despite those requests, meaningful intervention did not follow. Months passed. Complaints continued. Emails continued. Telephone calls continued. Requests for assistance continued. The issues remained unresolved.

		By **30/09/2015**, Lorraine Cordell was still discussing meetings with Council officers and was still trying to obtain assistance regarding the ongoing problems at 109 Burncroft Avenue. The records show that meetings had already been discussed and that Lorraine Cordell expected to be involved in any discussions affecting Simon Cordell. This is important because Lorraine Cordell was acting on Simon Cordell's behalf and was the person dealing directly with the Council. Simon Cordell was not aware of much of this correspondence at the time. Many of these emails only became known years later after he obtained copies of his mother's emails, Council records, Housing files, Subject Access Request disclosures and the possession material that was later served upon him. **What Happened Instead** According to Lorraine Cordell's complaint, Louise Brown attended Simon Cordell's property on **15/10/2015** accompanied by **two police officers**. Lorraine Cordell states that she was meant to be involved and expected the matter to be handled through an arranged meeting. Instead, officers attended Simon Cordell's home when she was not present. The complaint makes clear that Lorraine Cordell believed she should have been there. She had already been corresponding with the Council. She had already been making the complaints. She had already been trying to arrange meetings. She had already been asking the Council to investigate what was happening. The complaint therefore challenges why Louise Brown chose to attend Simon Cordell's property with police officers rather than follow the process that had previously been discussed. **What Louise Brown Did Not Do** According to Lorraine Cordell: **1)** Louise Brown Already Possessed the Case File. **2)** Louise Brown Asked Simon Cordell Questions. **3)** Louise Brown Did Not Take a Proper Report. **4)** Louise Brown Did Not Take Meaningful Notes. **5)** Louise Brown Did Not Review the Videos Simon Cordell Had Gathered. **6)** Louise Brown Did Not Review the Letters Debbie Andrews Had Allegedly Posted Through the Door. **7)** Louise Brown Did Not Review the Evidence Available. **8)** Louise Brown Did Not Properly Investigate the Attack That Had Allegedly Taken Place Against Simon Cordell. **9)** Louise Brown Did Not Properly Investigate the Complaints That Had Been Submitted for Months.

		The complaint therefore records that, after months of waiting for assistance, the first substantial visit still failed to properly examine the evidence Simon Cordell and Lorraine Cordell had been trying to provide. **Debbie Andrews Had Already Received Support** One of the most significant parts of the complaint is that Lorraine Cordell records being told that Debbie Andrews had not been at her address and had been staying in hotel accommodation. By this stage: **1)** Debbie Andrews had already received support. **2)** Debbie Andrews had already received intervention. **3)** Debbie Andrews had already received accommodation. **4)** Debbie Andrews was treated as vulnerable and in need of assistance. **At The Very Same Time:** **1)** Simon Cordell remained at 109 Burncroft Avenue. **2)** Simon Cordell's complaints remained unresolved. **3)** Simon Cordell had not received equivalent support. **4)** Simon Cordell had not received equivalent intervention. **5)** Simon Cordell continued reporting neighbour problems, disturbance, and deteriorating wellbeing. **What Lorraine Cordell Was Actually Complaining About** The complaint is not simply about a visit. The complaint is about how the entire matter was being handled. Lorraine Cordell repeatedly makes the point that: **1)** Simon Cordell Had Been Reporting Problems First. **2)** The Family Had Been Asking for Help First. **3)** The Family Had Been Providing Evidence First. **4)** Debbie Andrews Was Receiving Support. **5)** Simon Cordell Was Not Receiving Support. **6)** The Council Appeared to Have Already Decided Who the Victim Was. **7)** The Council Appeared to Have Already Decided Who the Problem Was. Lorraine Cordell specifically challenges why Simon Cordell was asked to give his word that he would not hurt Debbie Andrews when Debbie Andrews was the person, she says had attacked Simon Cordell. She also directly raises concerns regarding Debbie Andrews' alcohol issues, behavior, and vulnerability, making it clear that those concerns had been reported to the Council. **What This Finding Proves** **Finding 1:** Lorraine Cordell had been contacting Enfield Council and requesting intervention long before Louise Brown attended Simon Cordell's property. **Finding 2:** Lorraine Cordell expected meetings concerning Simon Cordell to be arranged and expected to be present.

Finding 3: Louise Brown attended Simon Cordell's property already in possession of a case file.
Finding 4: Simon Cordell's evidence, videos, letters, and witness information were not properly examined.
Finding 5: Debbie Andrews had already received support and hotel accommodation from the Council.
Finding 6: Simon Cordell had not received equivalent support despite months of complaints and requests for help.
Finding 7: Lorraine Cordell believed the Council had already reached conclusions before carrying out a balanced investigation.
Finding 8: The complaint demonstrates that the people who had been reporting the problems believed they were being treated as the problem.
Finding 9: This complaint formally records Lorraine Cordell's concerns that the Council was ignoring the evidence being supplied by Simon Cordell whilst actively supporting Debbie Andrews.

Why This Finding Matters
This complaint was written immediately after the visit and captures Lorraine Cordell's concerns at the time the events were occurring.
It demonstrates that by October 2015:

1) The Council Had Already Been Receiving Complaints for Many Months.
2) Meetings And Intervention Had Already Been Requested.
3) Debbie Andrews Had Already Received Support.
4) Significant Evidence Existed Which Simon Cordell Wanted Reviewed.
5) Simon Cordell's Complaints Remained Unresolved.
6) A Formal Complaint Had Now Been Made Regarding the Way the Council Was Handling the Matter.

The significance of this finding is that it records, in real time, the belief that the Council had stopped acting as a neutral investigator and had instead begun treating allegations against Simon Cordell more seriously than the complaints being made by Simon Cordell and Lorraine Cordell.

From: Lorraine Cordell
Mail To: lorraine32@bluevonder.co.uk
Sent: 16 October **2015** 15:30
To: 'louise.brown2@enfield.gov.uk'; 'jackie.gubby@enfield.gov.uk'
Subject: Re: Simon Cordell
Dear Louise Brown and JACKIE GUBBY
Could you please read the attached letter and please reply so I know you have this email?
Regards
Lorraine Cordell Simon Cordell
Classification: PROTECT
I have not had I reply not even a reply to say you got my email. I have also left voice messages on Louise Brown phone yet had no calls back. I did speak to JACKIE GUBBY and was told I should hear within 10 days about

		my complaint but have heard nothing. Also, I would like to take the time to say to JACKIE GUBBY that jobs are still outstanding on my son's flat.
DOCX Answers File Link 21/10/2015 **Diary Link If Needed** 21/10/2015 **PDF Answers File Link** 21/10/2015 **Diary Link If Needed** 21/10/2015	**Finding 67:**	**Enfield Council Were Fully Aware of the Complaints Yet the Problems Continued Unresolved** By **21/10/2015**, Enfield Council had already received: **1)** Months Of Complaints from Lorraine Cordell. **2)** Requests For Meetings. **3)** Requests For Home Visits. **4)** Complaints About Neighbours. **5)** Complaints About Disrepair. **6)** A Formal Complaint Against Louise Brown. Despite this, the problems being reported continued. The significance of this date is that Lorraine Cordell was still chasing Council officers after the formal complaint had already been submitted. At the same time: 1. Debbie Andrews Had Already Received Support from The Council. 2. Debbie Andrews Had Already Been Moved Into Hotel Accommodation. 3. Simon Cordell's Complaints Remained Unresolved. 4. The Banging and Disturbance Continued. 5. The Disrepair Issues Continued. 6. The Council Still Had Not Carried Out a Fair Investigation into the Evidence Being Provided by Simon Cordell and Lorraine Cordell. **What This Finding Proves** **Finding 1:** By 21/10/2015 the Council could not claim it was unaware of the problems being reported. **Finding 2:** Multiple complaints and a formal complaint had already been submitted. **Finding 3:** Debbie Andrews had already received support and intervention. **Finding 4:** Simon Cordell continued reporting the same issues without resolution. **Finding 5:** The neighbour problems, disturbance and housing issues continued despite repeated reports. **Finding 6:** The chronology shows the Council being repeatedly informed whilst the underlying issues remained unresolved. **Why This Finding Matters** This date demonstrates that the Council has already received extensive information, complaints, and evidence regarding the ongoing issues, yet the problems continued and the complaints remain unresolved. It also demonstrates that Lorraine Cordell continued actively pursuing the matter whilst Simon Cordell continued living with the circumstances being reported.

DOCX Answers File Link 26/10/2015 **Diary Link If Needed** 26/10/2015 **PDF Answers File Link** 26/10/2015 **Diary Link If Needed** 26/10/2015	**Finding 68:**	**The Council's Actions Against Simon Cordell Continued Whilst Simon Was Actively Defending Himself in Court** On **26/10/2015**, Simon Cordell attended the **1st hearing at Wood Green Crown Court** to determine whether the **ASBO** matter was ready to proceed towards an appeal hearing. This date is important because it demonstrates that, whilst Enfield Council, the Anti-Social Behaviour Team and other agencies were continuing to build allegations and histories about Simon Cordell, Simon himself was actively challenging those allegations through the court process. The significance of this date is that Simon Cordell did not accept the allegations. He was defending himself against them. **At The Same Time:** **1)** The Neighbour Complaints Remained Unresolved. **2)** The Disrepair Issues Remained Unresolved. **3)** The Banging and Disturbance Being Reported Continued. **4)** Debbie Andrews Had Already Received Support and Accommodation from The Council. **5)** Simon Cordell Continued Gathering Evidence and Preparing His Defense. **6)** Simon Cordell And Lorraine Cordell Continued Challenging the Allegations They Believed Were False. **What This Finding Proves** **Finding 1:** By **26/10/2015**, the ASBO proceedings were active and being challenged by Simon Cordell through the court process. **Finding 2:** Simon Cordell was actively preparing and presenting a defense rather than accepting the allegations being made against him. **Finding 3:** The chronology shows Simon Cordell continuing to rely upon evidence, witnesses, and documentation in support of his position. **Finding 4:** The complaints made by Simon Cordell and Lorraine Cordell remained unresolved whilst the legal proceedings continued. **Finding 5:** This date demonstrates that the dispute has now moved beyond complaints and into formal court proceedings. **Why This Finding Matters** This date marks the point where Simon Cordell was no longer simply reporting problems and making complaints. He was now actively defending himself against allegations in court whilst continuing to maintain that the complaints originally made by himself and Lorraine Cordell had never been fairly investigated.
DOCX Answers File Link 02/11/2015	**Finding 69:**	**From:** Lorraine Cordell [**Mail To:**lorraine32@blueyonder.co.uk] **Sent:** 02 November **2015** 17:38 **To:** Louise Brown; JACKIE GUBBY **Subject: Re:** Simon Cordell Complaint Dear Louise Brown and JACKIE GUBBY

Diary Link If Needed 02/11/2015 **PDF Answers File Link** 02/11/2015 **Diary Link If Needed** 02/11/2015		It has been over 10 days since I sent the complaint in due to how my son has been treated. **2310,** **Louise Brown and Jackie Gubby Ignored Lorraine Cordell's Formal Complaint Whilst the Problems Continued** On **02/11/2015**, Lorraine Cordell was forced to contact Louise Brown and Jackie Gubby again regarding the formal complaint she had already submitted concerning the way Simon Cordell had been treated. [Email Book...binder INDEX | PDF] This date is important because it proves that even after the formal complaint had been submitted on **16/10/2015**, Lorraine Cordell had still not received a response. Lorraine Cordell states: **1)** More Than 10 Days Had Passed Since the Complaint Was Submitted. **2)** No Reply Had Been Received. **3)** Not Even an Acknowledgement Had Been Provided. **4)** Voice Messages Had Been Left for Louise Brown. **5)** No Calls Had Been Returned. **6)** Jackie Gubby Had Indicated That a Response Should Be Received Within 10 Days. **7)** No Response Had Been Received. The significance of this is that the complaint itself was now becoming another unresolved issue. **What Had the Complaint Been About?** The complaint concerned: 1. Louise Brown Attending Simon Cordell's Flat with Two Police Officers. 2. Evidence Not Being Reviewed. 3. Witnesses Not Being Spoken To. 4. Videos Not Being Viewed. 5. Debbie Andrews Allegedly Receiving Support Whilst Simon Cordell Received None. 6. The Belief That Simon Cordell Was Being Treated as The Problem Rather Than as The Person Seeking Help. Yet more than 10 days later Lorraine Cordell was still chasing a response. **The Problems Continued** At the same time: **1)** **The Banging Continued**. **2)** The Neighbour Issues Continued. **3)** The Sleep Disturbance Continued. **4)** The Disrepair Issues Continued. **5)** Simon Cordell Continued Reporting Damage to His Health and Wellbeing. **6)** Repairs Remained Outstanding.

		The circumstances being complained about had therefore not been resolved. **What This Finding Proves** **Finding 1:** By **02/11/2015**, Enfield Council had received a formal complaint regarding the handling of Simon Cordell's case. **Finding 2:** Lorraine Cordell had still not received a response after more than 10 days. **Finding 3:** Louise Brown had not responded despite voice messages being left. **Finding 4:** Jackie Gubby had indicated that a response should be received, yet no response arrived. **Finding 5:** The issues originally complained about remained unresolved. **Finding 6:** Lorraine Cordell was forced to continue chasing Council officers for action and answers. **Why This Finding Matters** This finding demonstrates that Lorraine Cordell was not only chasing assistance regarding neighbour problems, disrepair, and wellbeing concerns, she was now also having to chase responses to formal complaints concerning the way Enfield Council had handled the matter. The significance of this date is that the complaint process itself has become part of the problem, with Lorraine Cordell still seeking answers whilst the issues affecting Simon Cordell continued unresolved.
DOCX Answers File Link 03/11/2015 **Diary Link If Needed** 03/11/2015 **PDF Answers File Link** 03/11/2015 **Diary Link If Needed** 03/11/2015	**Finding 70:**	**Sent:** 03 November **2015** 11:16 **To:** Lorraine Cordell; JACKIE GUBBY **Subject: RE:** Simon Cordell Complaint [SEC=PROTECT] **Classification:** PROTECT Dear Ms Cordell, Thank you for your email and enquiry regarding your son Simon Cordell tenancy, a full response clearly outlining actions to-date will be sent to your son Simon Cordell. Yours sincerely Louise Brown Anti-Social Behaviour officer Community Safety Unit Regeneration & Environment Department **Louise Brown Finally Responded, But Did Not Answer the Complaint, Whilst Jackie Gubby's Reply Contradicted the Surveyors and the Problems Already Reported** On **03/11/2015**, Louise Brown finally replied after Lorraine Cordell had spent over ten days chasing a response to her formal complaint.

		However, Louise Brown did not answer the complaint. Instead, Louise Brown simply stated that a full response would be sent later. This is important because the complaint raised serious concerns about: **1)** Louise Brown Attending Simon Cordell's Home with Two Police Officers. **2)** Louise Brown Not Properly Investigating the Evidence. **3)** Louise Brown Not Reviewing Videos. **4)** Louise Brown Not Reviewing Letters. **5)** Louise Brown Not Speaking with Witnesses. **6)** Debbie Andrews Receiving Support Whilst Simon Cordell Received None. Yet none of those issues were addressed in the reply. The complaint was acknowledged but not answered. **Jackie Gubby's Reply Creates Another Problem** On the same date, Jackie Gubby stated: "I am not aware of any outstanding repairs to your son's property." This statement immediately conflicted with the information already known by Lorraine Cordell. Only hours later Lorraine Cordell replied listing numerous outstanding repairs, including: **1)** Heating Pipe Issues. **2)** Bedroom Floor Issues. **3)** Bedroom Window Issues. **4)** Front Room Door and Window Frame Issues. **5)** Constant Pipe Banging. **6)** Damp And Water Ingress Problems. **7)** Guttering Issues. **8)** Water Entering Communal Areas. **9)** Outstanding Surveyor Recommendations. Lorraine Cordell specifically states that surveyors attended, taken notes, and written down the work required. The obvious question raised is: **If surveyors had already attended and recorded these issues, why were they not appearing on the system Jackie Gubby was checking?** **What This Finding Proves** **Finding 1:** Louise Brown responded only after Lorraine Cordell complained that her complaint had been ignored. **Finding 2:** Louise Brown did not answer the issues raised in the complaint. **Finding 3:** Jackie Gubby stated that no outstanding repairs were known. **Finding 4:** Lorraine Cordell immediately provided a detailed list of outstanding repairs. **Finding 5:** Lorraine Cordell stated that surveyors had already identified those repairs. **Finding 6:** The records raise concerns regarding why repairs identified by surveyors were not appearing on the housing records being relied upon by Council officers.

		Finding 7: By this date, Lorraine Cordell was now challenging not only the handling of the neighbour issues, but also the accuracy of the Council's own records. **Why This Finding Matters** This date demonstrates two recurring issues throughout the chronology: **1)** Formal Complaints Were Acknowledged but Not Properly Answered. **2)** Information Recorded by One Part of the Council Did Not Appear to Match Information Being Relied Upon by Another Part of the Council. The significance is that Lorraine Cordell was repeatedly providing information, evidence, and updates, yet continued to receive responses which failed to address the substance of the complaints being raised.
DOCX Answers File Link 05/11/2015 **Diary Link If Needed** 05/11/2015 **PDF Answers File Link** 05/11/2015 **Diary Link If Needed** 05/11/2015	**Finding 71:**	**Finding 71: The Interim ASBO Conditions Became the Foundation for Everything That Followed** On **05/11/2015**, the Interim ASBO Conditions were granted against Simon Cordell. This date is important because it marks the point where allegations connected to the ASBO were no longer simply allegations being argued about. They had now become court-imposed conditions which directly affected Simon Cordell's day-to-day life. The Order states that it was made following an application brought by **PC Steve Elsmore** on behalf of the Commissioner of Police of the Metropolis and was based upon allegations said to have occurred between **01/01/2013** and the date of the application. The significance of this date is not simply that conditions were imposed. The significance is that the Interim Order created a situation where Simon Cordell was now having to defend himself whilst living under restrictions that he maintained were wrong. At the same time: **1)** Simon Cordell Was Continuing to Challenge the Allegations. **2)** Simon Cordell Was Actively Preparing an Appeal. **3)** Simon Cordell Was Gathering Evidence. **4)** Lorraine Cordell Was Contacting Public Authorities on Simon's Behalf. **5)** Complaints Concerning Neighbours, Housing Issues and Disrepair Continued. **6)** Debbie Andrews Had Already Received Support from Enfield Council. **7)** Simon Cordell Continued Reporting That He Was Receiving Little or No Support. The chronology demonstrates that from this point onwards the ASBO became part of Simon Cordell's daily life. **Why This Matters to the Later Neighbour History** The ASBO did not exist in isolation. Once the Interim Order was granted:

		1) Simon Cordell's Name Had Already Been Placed into Official Systems in Connection with Anti-Social Behaviour Allegations. 2) Public Authorities Were Already Viewing Simon Cordell Through the Existence of Those Allegations. 3) Simon Cordell Was Forced to Spend Significant Time Defending Himself. 4) The ASBO Allegations Were Capable of Influencing How Later Complaints Were Interpreted. 5) The ASBO Conditions Created Barriers Which Affected Simon Cordell's Normal Life Whilst the Appeal Process Remained Ongoing. The chronology therefore identifies the Interim ASBO as one of the major events that occurred before the neighbour history later developed. **What This Finding Proves** **Finding 1:** By **05/11/2015**, anti-social behavior allegations had become formal court conditions against Simon Cordell. **Finding 2:** Simon Cordell was actively disputing those allegations and preparing to challenge them. **Finding 3:** The Interim Order became the foundation upon which later assumptions and perceptions about Simon Cordell could develop. **Finding 4:** The ASBO proceedings were still active whilst Simon Cordell and Lorraine Cordell continued reporting neighbour problems and housing concerns. **Finding 5:** The chronology shows that Simon Cordell was forced to defend himself against the ASBO at the same time as he was attempting to obtain help regarding other ongoing issues in his life. **Finding 6:** This date marks the point at which the ASBO stopped being an allegation and became a set of restrictions that affected Simon Cordell's daily life while he continued pursuing his appeal. **Why This Finding Matters** This finding is important because it provides the background against which many of the later events occurred. The chronology shows that when later neighbour complaints, council actions, anti-social behavior investigations, and housing matters began developing, Simon Cordell was already living under the impact of an Interim ASBO which he maintained was wrongly obtained and which he was actively attempting to overturn through the court process.
DOCX Answers File Link 12/11/2015 **Diary Link If Needed**	**Finding 72:**	**Jackie Gubby Was Confronted with Evidence That Council Records Were Not Reflecting the Reality of Simon Cordell's Home Conditions** On **12/11/2015**, Lorraine Cordell again contacted Jackie Gubby because she still had not received a proper response regarding the repairs and issues previously raised. [Email Book...binder INDEX | PDF] This date is important because it directly challenges a statement already made by Jackie Gubby on **03/11/2015**, when she stated: "I am not aware of any outstanding repairs to your son's property."

12/11/2015 **PDF Answers File Link** 12/11/2015 **Diary Link If Needed** 12/11/2015		Lorraine Cordell immediately disputed that position and provided details of numerous outstanding items that surveyors had already attended, inspected, and recorded. By **12/11/2015**, Lorraine Cordell was still asking an amazingly simple question: **Were Simon's repairs expected to be reported repeatedly every time the Council failed to carry out works that had already been identified?** **What Lorraine Cordell Was Pointing Out** According to Lorraine Cordell: **1)** Surveyors Had Attended. **2)** Surveyors Had Identified Repairs. **3)** Surveyors Had Written Those Repairs Down. **4)** Some Works Had Been Completed. **5)** Numerous Other Works Remained Outstanding. **The Complaint Specifically Refers To:** **1)** Exposed Heating Pipes. **2)** Outstanding Bedroom Floor Issues. **3)** Outstanding Bedroom Window Issues. **4)** Outstanding Front Room Door and Frame Issues. **5)** Persistent Pipe Banging. **6)** Damp. **7)** Water Ingress. **8)** Guttering Problems. **9)** Water Entering Communal Areas. The significance of this is that Lorraine Cordell was not reporting new repairs. She was reporting repairs that she believed had already been identified by Council contractors and surveyors. **What This Finding Proves** **Finding 1:** Lorraine Cordell was still chasing repairs that the Council had already been told about. **Finding 2:** Lorraine Cordell believed the surveyors had already identified and recorded the outstanding works. **Finding 3:** Jackie Gubby's earlier statement that no outstanding repairs existed was challenged with specific examples. **Finding 4:** The records suggest that information known to surveyors did not appear in the information being relied upon by housing management. **Finding 5:** Lorraine Cordell believed jobs, reports and records were repeatedly disappearing from Council systems. **Finding 6:** Simon Cordell continued living with the consequences of unresolved disrepair whilst repeatedly reporting the problems. **Why This Finding Matters** This finding is important because it shows a repeated pattern throughout the chronology. When Lorraine Cordell raised concerns:

		1) She Was Told Works Were Not Recorded. **2)** She Was Told Repairs Were Not Outstanding. **3)** She Was Told Issues Were Not Known. **Yet She Repeatedly Produced Evidence Showing:** **1)** Surveyors attended. **2)** Reports have been made. **3)** Problems remained. **4)** The same issues were continuing. The significance of this date is that it demonstrates Lorraine Cordell repeatedly challenging the accuracy of the Council's own records whilst continuing to report the same unresolved problems affecting Simon Cordell's home, health, and wellbeing.
DOCX Answers File Link 01/12/2015 **Diary Link If Needed** 01/12/2015 **PDF Answers File Link** 01/12/2015 **Diary Link If Needed** 01/12/2015	**Finding 73:**	**Finding 73: Dawn Allen Helped Move the Neighbour Dispute into the Mental Health System Despite Previous Assessments Finding No Serious Mental Illness** By **01/12/2015**, the records prove that information concerning Simon Cordell was being actively exchanged between: **1)** Enfield Council Housing. **2)** Community Safety Officers. **3)** Anti-Social Behaviour Officers. **4)** Mental Health Services. **5)** Assessment Teams. The records further prove that **Dawn Allen** was part of that information chain. Mental Health Services contacted Enfield Council Housing and spoke directly with **Dawn Allen**. The information supplied by Dawn Allen was then entered into Mental Health records and used by Mental Health professionals when deciding what action should be taken next. This is important because Dawn Allen was not dealing with a stranger. By this stage she had already spent months receiving complaints from Lorraine Cordell regarding: **1)** Debbie Andrews. **2)** Neighbour Harassment. **3)** Banging And Intimidation. **4)** Sleep Deprivation. **5)** Housing Disrepair. **6)** Damage To Simon Cordell's Health and Wellbeing. **7)** Requests For Help and Intervention. Despite possessing all that information, the material passed on into Mental Health Services focused on allegations against Simon Cordell rather than the complaints being repeatedly made by Simon Cordell and Lorraine Cordell. The records show Mental Health Services were informed that: 1. Simon Cordell Had Accused Another Resident of Making Noise. 2. Simon Cordell Had Allegedly Threatened a Resident. 3. Simon Cordell Appeared Paranoid About Sound.

4. A Resident Had Been Moved for Her Own Safety.
5. Simon Cordell Had Already Received a Warning About His Behaviour.
6. Simon Cordell Presented as Aggressive.

At the same time, the chronology already shows:

1) Police had previously recorded concerns regarding Debbie Andrews.
2) Police had stated that information supplied by Debbie Andrews made no sense.
3) Police had recorded that Debbie Andrews was suffering from mental health issues.
4) Lorraine Cordell had already spent months reporting issues relating to Debbie Andrews and the neighbours.
5) Those complaints remained unresolved.

The result is that information supporting allegations against Simon Cordell was being moved into Mental Health records whilst the complaints being made by Simon Cordell and Lorraine Cordell remained unresolved.

The Most Important Part

The records also prove something else.
By this date:

1) Simon Cordell Had Already Undergone Mental Health Assessments.
2) Simon Cordell Had Not Been Detained.
3) No Serious Mental Illness Had Been Identified.
4) Simon Cordell Was Not Under Ongoing Mental Health Treatment.
5) Simon Cordell Was Not Open to Mental Health Services.
6) Simon Cordell Did Not Have a Mental Health Worker.

Despite this, further concerns continued to be generated, circulated, and developed.
The issue is not that a Mental Health assessment took place.
The issue is that previous assessments had already failed to establish serious mental illness, yet information concerning Simon Cordell continued being exchanged, expanded, and relied upon by multiple agencies.
The chronology therefore shows that the Mental Health narrative did not stop when assessments failed to support it.
Instead, the narrative continued developing through the sharing of information between Housing, Community Safety and Mental Health Services.

What This Finding Proves

Finding 1: Dawn Allen was actively supplying information about Simon Cordell to Mental Health Services.
Finding 2: Dawn Allen was already aware of months of complaints being made by Lorraine Cordell before supplying that information.
Finding 3: Information concerning allegations against Simon Cordell was being entered into Mental Health records.

		Finding 4: Housing, Community Safety and Mental Health Services were sharing information about Simon Cordell. **Finding 5:** Previous assessments had not identified serious mental illness. **Finding 6:** Simon Cordell had not been detained following previous Mental Health assessments. **Finding 7:** The Mental Health narrative continued developing despite earlier assessments failing to establish serious mental illness. **Finding 8:** Information originating from Housing and Anti-Social Behaviour records was being relied upon within the Mental Health pathway. **Finding 9:** Dawn Allen cannot later claim she was not involved in the development of the Mental Health history because the records prove she was part of the information chain supplying material into Mental Health Services. **Why This Finding Matters** This finding is important because it proves that the development of Simon Cordell's later Mental Health history did not occur naturally or in isolation. The records show multiple agencies sharing information about Simon Cordell whilst previous assessments had already failed to identify serious mental illness. The chronology demonstrates that despite the absence of serious mental illness being identified, information, allegations and assumptions continued being exchanged and developed between Housing, Community Safety and Mental Health Services. This date therefore marks one of the key stages where the neighbour dispute, Housing records, Anti-Social Behaviour records and Mental Health records became linked together and began forming a much larger official history concerning Simon Cordell.
DOCX Answers File Link 08/12/2015 **Diary Link If Needed** 08/12/2015 **PDF Answers File Link** 08/12/2015 **Diary Link If Needed**	**Finding 74:**	**The December 2015 Assessment Did Not Lead to Detention, Yet Within Weeks the Matter Was Escalated into a Warrant-Based Mental Health Act Process** By **01/12/2015**, information concerning Simon Cordell was already being exchanged between Housing Officers, Community Safety Officers, Anti-Social Behaviour Officers and Mental Health Services. One of the most important records from this date shows that Mental Health Services contacted Housing and spoke directly with **Dawn Allen**. The importance of this record is not simply that a conversation took place. The importance is that information concerning Simon Cordell was now being moved from a housing and neighbour dispute into a Mental Health pathway. At this stage, Dawn Allen has already received months of complaints from Lorraine Cordell regarding: **1)** Debbie Andrews. **2)** Neighbour Harassment. **3)** Sleep Deprivation. **4)** Banging And Intimidation. **5)** Housing Disrepair. **6)** The Effect These Issues Were Having Upon Simon Cordell.

08/12/2015		Despite this, the information being passed into Mental Health Services focused upon allegations against Simon Cordell. **What Happened Immediately Afterwards?** On **08/12/2015**, Simon Cordell was assessed at home by Mental Health professionals. The records from that assessment state: **1)** Simon Cordell Was Seen at Home. **2)** Simon Cordell Engaged with The Professionals. **3)** There Were No Concerns Regarding Personal Care. **4)** He Was Appropriately Dressed. **5)** He Was Not Self-Neglecting. **6)** He Discussed Debbie Andrews and The Neighbour Issues. **7)** He Discussed the ASBO And Police Matters. **8)** He Discussed His Business Plans and Projects. The most important outcome was this: *"Would not meet criteria for detention under the MHAA."* The assessment therefore ended without detention. **Why This Matters** The chronology then becomes particularly important. After the assessment of **08/12/2015**, Simon Cordell was not detained. Yet the records show the matter continued escalating. Between December 2015 and February 2016: **1)** Further Discussions Took Place Between Agencies. **2)** Further Concern Was Recorded. **3)** Further Referrals Were Discussed. **4)** Additional Mental Health Involvement Continued. **5)** Plans Developed Towards a Mental Health Act Assessment. The result was that by **02/02/2016**, arrangements had already been made for: **1)** A Section 135 Warrant. **2)** Police Attendance. **3)** Two Doctors. **4)** An AMHP. **5)** A Locksmith. **6)** Housing Involvement. **7)** Dawn Allen's Involvement as Estate Officer. **8)** A Planned Assessment Operation. This is what makes the chronology important. Only weeks earlier Simon Cordell had already been assessed and found not detainable. Yet the process continued escalating until a warrant-backed Mental Health Act assessment was organised. **What This Finding Proves** **Finding 1:** On **01/12/2015**, information concerning Simon Cordell was being passed into Mental Health Services.

		Finding 2: Dawn Allen was part of the information chain supplying information about Simon Cordell. **Finding 3:** On **08/12/2015**, Simon Cordell was assessed at home by Mental Health professionals. **Finding 4:** The assessment concluded that detention was not required. **Finding 5:** Simon Cordell was not detained. **Finding 6:** Despite that outcome, the involvement of multiple agencies continued. **Finding 7:** Within weeks the matter had escalated towards a Section 135 warrant and a further Mental Health Act assessment. **Finding 8:** The chronology therefore shows escalation continuing after an assessment that had already concluded Simon Cordell did not meet the criteria for detention. **Why This Finding Matters** This finding demonstrates that Mental Health Services, Housing Officers, Anti-Social Behaviour Officers and Community Safety staff were now all involved in the same process concerning Simon Cordell. It also demonstrates that a home assessment which concluded with **no detention** did not bring the process to an end. Instead, the chronology shows the process continuing and escalating until a further Mental Health Act assessment was later arranged under warrant powers. On 08.12.15. ➢ There were no concerns identified concerning his personal care. ➢ He said that he has not gone out for months and his mother does all the shopping. ➢ He spoke about a conspiracy to destroy his good name and send subliminal messages to him via the television. ➢ Mr. Cordell said that the Mann in the flat upstairs had been "stalking him" ➢ he elaborated and said that she stamps on the floor when she hears him moving around his flat or taking off his clothes. ➢ He spoke about his plans to start a global business for children. ➢ He said that he had about having thoughts of killing himself when he eventually clears his name. ➢ He did not accept that he had a mental disorder during the assessment.
10.12.15		On 10.12.15 ➢ Mr. Cordell was contacted by Goodie Adama, early intervention team worker. ➢ He said that he was not interested in meeting with mental health services. ➢ He spoke about being victimised by the police on 02nd October 2009
DOCX Answers File Link 24/12/2015	**Finding 75:**	**24/12/2015** **Finding 75:** **Debra Andrews Was Moved Yet the Problems Reported by Simon Cordell Continued, Demonstrating That the Underlying Issues Had Never Been Properly Addressed**

Diary Link If Needed 24/12/2015 **PDF Answers File Link** 24/12/2015 **Diary Link If Needed** 24/12/2015		By **24/12/2015**, Debra Andrews had already been moved from the property by Enfield Council and had already received support and intervention that had never been provided to Simon Cordell. At the same time, Stain Curtis had gone away. This date is important because, despite both of those significant changes, the problems Simon Cordell had been reporting did not stop. Instead, the diary records that: **1)** Debra Andrews Had Returned and The Problems Had Started Again. **2)** The Mathiyalagan Household Continued to Form Part of The Ongoing Issues Being Reported. **3)** **The Banging Continued** Day and Night. **4)** The Disturbances Continued. **5)** The Behaviour Being Complained About Remained Unchanged. If the problems were genuinely limited to one individual, then the removal of that individual should have reduced or resolved the situation being reported. According to the diary, which is not what happened. **What Was Still Happening?** The diary records that: **1)** Debbie Andrews Continued to Be Identified as Part of the Problem. **2)** The Mathiyalagan Household Continued to Be Identified as Part of The Problem. **3)** Banging Continued Throughout the Property. **4)** Noise Disturbances Continued. **5)** Simon Cordell Continued Reporting Being Followed Through the Property by Reactions to His Movements. **6)** Simon Cordell Continued Reporting Behaviour Designed to Disturb Him Inside His Own Home. The significance is that the issues being reported survived the very intervention that was supposed to address them. **What This Proves** **Finding 1:** Debra Andrews had already received support and intervention from Enfield Council. **Finding 2:** Debbie Andrews had already been removed from the property. **Finding 3:** Stain Curtis had gone away. **Finding 4:** Despite those changes, Simon Cordell continued reporting the same pattern of behavior. **Finding 5:** The issues being reported were not resolved through the actions already taken by the Council. **Finding 6:** The neighbour complaints continued despite the intervention that had already taken place. **Finding 7:** The disturbances reported by Simon Cordell did not end when Debbie Andrews was moved. **Why This Finding Matters**

		This finding is important because it demonstrates that the action taken by Enfield Council did not resolve the issues Simon Cordell had been reporting. By this stage: **1)** Council Intervention Had Already Taken Place. **2)** Debbie Andrews Had Already Received Assistance. **3)** Debbie Andrews Had Already Been Moved. **4)** Significant Resources Had Already Been Directed into Complaints Made Against Simon Cordell. Yet Simon Cordell continued recording the same concerns. The chronology therefore shows that whilst Enfield Council was investing critical time and resources into allegations being made against Simon Cordell, the problems Simon Cordell was reporting remained unresolved. At the same time, Simon Cordell remained living on the same property, continued experiencing the same issues, continued dealing with unresolved disrepair, and continued building evidence and preparing his defense against allegations being made against him.
DOCX Answers File Link 01/01/2016 **Diary Link If Needed** 01/01/2016 **PDF Answers File Link** 01/01/2016 **Diary Link If Needed** 01/01/2016	**Finding 76:**	**Finding 76: Debra Andrews' Case Had Become a Vehicle for Escalating Action Against Simon Cordell** At this stage, the dispute was no longer being treated as a disagreement between neighbours. The records show that information concerning **Debra Andrews** is now being shared between Mental Health Services, Community Safety Officers and other professionals. In the middle of an email chain concerning Debra Andrews, attention immediately turns to Simon Cordell. The most important part of the record is not the subject line. The most important part is the statement: *"There is other information on Mr Cordell that urgently needs to be considered."* At this point, Simon Cordell had never been convicted of any offence relating to Debbie Andrews. The complaints made by Lorraine Cordell remained unresolved. The neighbour issues remained unresolved. The disrepair issues remained unresolved. Yet Simon Cordell was rapidly becoming the focus of discussions between multiple agencies. The same email then records: *"I received an email informing me that a mental health warrant had been granted for Mr Cordell."* This is a significant escalation. By this stage: **1)** Debbie Andrews Had Already Received Support. **2)** Debbie Andrews Had Already Been Moved from Her Property. **3)** Debbie Andrews' Allegations Had Already Been Accepted as Serious. **4)** Lorraine Cordell Had Spent Months Reporting Neighbour Issues and Requesting Assistance. **5)** Dawn Allen Had Already Received Those Complaints.

		6) Simon Cordell's Complaints Remained Unresolved. Despite this, the priority now is escalating action against Mr. Simon Cordell. **What Makes This Finding Important** This email demonstrates that Simon Cordell was no longer simply the subject of neighbour complaints. He had become the focus of discussion between: **1)** Housing Officers. **2)** Community Safety Officers. **3)** Mental Health Services. **4)** Professionals Already Involved with Debbie Andrews. The records show these agencies actively exchanging information concerning Simon Cordell and discussing further intervention. The chronology therefore demonstrates that attention had shifted away from resolving the complaints being made by Simon Cordell and Lorraine Cordell and towards increasing concern about Simon Cordell himself. **What This Finding Proves** **Finding 1:** Information concerning Simon Cordell was being circulated between multiple agencies. **Finding 2:** The discussions were taking place with correspondence concerning Debbie Andrews. **Finding 3:** Simon Cordell had become the focus of escalating concern by public authorities. **Finding 4:** A mental health warrant was already being discussed. **Finding 5:** Debbie Andrews had already received support and intervention whilst Simon Cordell's complaints remained unresolved. **Finding 6:** Lorraine Cordell's complaints had not been properly resolved before attention shifted towards obtaining further intervention against Simon Cordell. **Finding 7:** The chronology shows a clear movement away from investigating the complaints being made by Simon Cordell and towards developing further action concerning Simon Cordell himself. **Why This Finding Matters** This finding marks another stage in the development of the official history surrounding Simon Cordell. The records demonstrate that agencies were no longer simply responding to allegations. They were actively sharing information about Simon Cordell, discussing urgent concerns regarding him and escalating matters further. The significance of this date is that the original complaints concerning neighbours, harassment, disrepair, and wellbeing remained unresolved whilst increasing attention was being directed towards Simon Cordell. **Bola Quadri.** Is worried due to staff arranging a Mental Health warrant to assess me!

		No person had met me or spoken to me to ask for a Mental Health Assessment. We had asked for help beforehand. **He uses the terminology: "there is other information on Mr. Cordell!"** with the key word being **"On,"** suggesting they were building him negative profile. **Stain had prior been dating Debra Andrews**
DOCX Answers File Link 05/01/2016 **Diary Link If Needed** 05/01/2016 **PDF Answers File Link** 05/01/2016 **Diary Link If Needed** 05/01/2016	**Finding 77:**	By January 2016 I had spent years reporting what was happening around me and trying to get agencies to listen. Instead of properly dealing with the issues I was raising, professionals increasingly turned their attention towards me. This entry captures the beginning of a chain of events that would have profound consequences for my life. **On 5 January 2016,** the nurse recorded that I was "adamant" that I did not require mental health services. What the record fails to explain is why I was saying this and what had actually occurred. **Originator Details:** 05 Jan **2016** **Last Amended by Details:** 08 Jan **2016** GOODIE ADAMA Nursing His Rio logs got amended three days later. The record itself also raises concerns because it was created **on 5 January 2016** but amended on **8 January 2016**. No explanation is given as to what was changed. As a result, it is impossible to know whether the document now reflects the original account or a later revised version. This is particularly important given that the entry concerns opinions and judgments about me rather than straightforward factual matters. At this point in my life, I should have been concentrating on building my company, expanding my future prospects, and moving forward. Instead, I found myself repeatedly defending my position to professionals whilst the issues I had originally been reporting remained unresolved. The proposed actions recorded in the meeting were to contact my GP, continue telephone contact with me, and raise my case again at a future meeting. From my perspective, this demonstrates that further intervention was being actively considered despite my cooperation and despite there being no diagnosis recorded within the document itself. At the same time my mother was messaging the Enfield Council to protect me due to the Asbo. The Council still denied any involvement at this stage and the exhibited email to Ned Johnson as an FOI Act demonstrates their council were involved and new the truth that I was innocent and a member of their staff swapped cads from one building namely Crown Road to use them in setting me up for another location that I had no involvement in both location as to organising any illegal raves within them.

		This is addressed again on the 11/01/2026 by the Enfield Council. **From:** Lorraine Cordell mail**to:** lorraine32@blueyonder.co.uk Sent: 05 January **2016** 16:59 **To:** Ned Johnson **Subject:** RE: RE FOI 11845 [SEC=UNCLASSIFIED] Dear Ned Johnson I am authoring this email due to a FOI request I put in some time ago. It has come to my attention that some of the information you have given me in incorrect, and I was wondering if you could comment on this. In my FOI request you said that Crown Road information started on the 18/5/**2014**, but I have found newspaper information that this started much earlier than this. I have a newspaper that is dated the 25/04/**2014** which was printed after a 15-hour rave took place there on the 19/04/**2014**, which is much earlier than the 18/05/**2014** as the date you gave me that this started. **290,** http://www.enfieldindependent.co.uk/news/11172103.Residents_fume_over_15 hour rave And one that was in printed on 9 September **2014** a paper saying The MAN building, in Crown Road, on the junction with Southbury Road, Enfield, has also been used for illegal raves and parties in the last few months which these words would say the events was going on much later than June **2014** that you have given in the FOI request. http://www.enfieldindependent.co.uk/news/11459487.Listed building wrecked by graffiti/ I still also cannot understand why an abatement notice order was not put in place due to the number of events that took place there. I do understand on the days of the events it could be classed as unsafe due to the amount of people, but this site was being squatted and there would have been far less people there during the weeks when these events were not going on. And cannot understand why an abatement notice order was not put in place during the time when these events were not going on. • On the 6th 07th and 08th June **2014** the council were aware an event was ongoing at Crown Road. • On the 6th 07th and 08th June **2014** the council were aware an event was ongoing at Progress way. • On the 08th of June the council attended with police to Progress Way to serve paperwork this was not served to any persons within the site of Progress Way. • But if you were with police, which your team was why was paperwork not tried to be served at Crown Road site also as your team was aware off an event also going on there. Regards Lorraine Cordell

DOCX Answers File Link 07/01/2016 **Diary Link If Needed** 07/01/2016 **PDF Answers File Link** 07/01/2016 **Diary Link If Needed** 07/01/2016	**Finding 78:**	**The Right to Buy email is significant** because it shows where I was in life on 7 January 2016. At that time, I was still a young man with ambitions for the future. I was building my company, working from home, and looking towards opportunities such as home ownership. The Government was actively promoting Right to Buy, and substantial discounts were available to tenants. The email demonstrates that these opportunities were real and current at that time. However, the diary entry records that instead of being able to focus on developing my business and future prospects, I was continuing to suffer from the ongoing noise nuisance, victimisation, housing problems, and the consequences of the ASBO proceedings which I believed had been wrongly brought against me. Rather than being allowed a normal home life, I was spending my time documenting incidents, gathering evidence, and preparing legal defences. The significance of the email is therefore not merely that it was received on that date. It illustrates what I stood to gain and what was being lost. Whilst Government schemes were encouraging tenants towards home ownership and a more secure future, I was trapped dealing with ongoing problems that had already affected my ability to work, develop my business, and progress in life. Had my complaints and concerns been properly addressed when my mother and I repeatedly raised them, I believe I would have been in a far stronger position to expand my business, improve my financial circumstances, and potentially take advantage of home ownership opportunities that existed at that time. Instead, the diary shows that my attention and resources continued to be diverted towards defending myself, coping with the effects of the situation, and trying to obtain help from organisations that were not resolving the problems I was reporting. The email therefore helps demonstrate not only the date of the diary entry, but also the contrast between the future opportunities that were available to me and the reality of the circumstances I say I was being forced to live through at the time.
DOCX Answers File Link 08/01/2016 **Diary Link If Needed** 08/01/2016		On 08.01.16 ➢ Goodie received a telephone call from Mr. Cordell's mother. ➢ She said that she was concerned about Mr. Cordell and said that she had been concerned about him for over a year but would not specify what her concerns were. ➢ Goodie phoned Mr. Cordell the same day he spoke about conspiracies involving the police and appeared thought disordered and thought about conspiracies. t/c I spoke with Simon immediately his mother hangs up the phone with me.

PDF Answers File Link 08/01/2016 **Diary Link If Needed** 08/01/2016		Simon appeared polite and pleasant to speak with. He asked me how my Xmas and New Year breaks went. He told me that his went ok. However, when I asked "what did Santa bring you" he went completely off tangent and spoke about conspiracies and difficulties with the police. He "rambled" on and appeared to be thought disordered. He also came across a paranoid with delusions about cases; 400 he intends to present to court and win. He told me that he did not need help. He will only allow me to visit him if I came with a colleague and not a doctor. I agreed and I told him that I will call him again on Monday or Tuesday to give him date and time. He denied self-harm or harm to others. There was no apparent evidence of suicidal thoughts. **Mental Health Referral: Dated** 09/02/**2016**, **Name** DR. Sam Curtis, **Address** North London Forensic Service, Camlet 1, Chase Farm Hospital, The Ridgeway, London, EN2 8JL. **Tel** 0208 7026108. - "On 08.01.16 Goodie received a telephone call from Mr. Cordell's mother. She said that she was concerned about Mr. Cordell and said that she had been concerned about him for over a year but would not specify what her concerns were. Goodie phoned Mr. Cordell the same day he spoke about conspiracies involving the police and appeared thought disordered and thought about conspiracies." NHS: GOODIE ADAMA Nursing / T/C / Time 15:00 - "T/C I had a telephone conversation with Simon's mother who expressed concerns about him. Mother appeared angry and frustrated that for over a year she has been seeking help for Simon, and she has not been heard or listened to. I tried and failed to get what Simon's mother was concerned about. I asked what risks there were and what prompted her to call about Simon today and did not get much from her. It was difficult to speak with her as she was understandably emotional about his son not being helped. There was someone talking over Simon's mother and made the conversation difficult to follow. Mother said she will be taking the matter with his MP and hang u." **MY Mothers concerns were all raised in the 1st Metal Health Assessment that is recorded, when I was not detainable and to all the staff like Dawn Allen & Co Prior.** **Ozzy Calling the Police and police calling the doctors.** **Due to the stress the Asbo Causes.** This was the first time I had met him. He arrived at my home with another woman and attempted to involve mental health services in circumstances where I had never been diagnosed with any mental health condition. I

		disputed the basis for his involvement and objected to what I felt was an attempt to force powers upon me that were not justified. At one stage he stated words to the effect that he would obtain a mental health warrant. Despite this, I remained polite and mindful of my legal position. I later telephoned his office and spoke with him directly. During that conversation I explained that I had already been assessed before and did not accept that there were grounds to force mental health intervention upon me. Nevertheless, because he repeatedly requested a meeting, I agreed that I would meet with him. He later returned with another worker, and a further assessment was conducted. Following that assessment, I was effectively told there was no immediate issue requiring action. Before leaving, he informed me that he would contact me after returning from holiday. What happened next is one of the reasons I lost trust in him. Almost immediately afterwards, and while he was a person I never knew who claimed to be my case handler, even aloe I never need one. He went on holiday. The following day other doctors arrived at my home seeking to take me away for further assessment. This was completely inconsistent with what I had been led to believe only days before. When I Look back at this entry, I realise that this marks the beginning of a process that would go on for me and change my life with profound consequences. I now possess later records and discharge documents which allow the outcome of these actions to be examined. Those records show the effect the process had on my personal life, my reputation, my ability to trust professionals, and my future opportunities.
DOCX Answers File Link 11/01/2016 **Diary Link If Needed** 11/01/2016 **PDF Answers File Link** 11/01/2016 **Diary Link If Needed**	**Finding 79:**	**3 days latter my mother is seen in emails trying to understand with me what involvement the Enfield Council had within the Asbo.** Date: 11 January **2016** 15:25:00 Dear Ned Johnson, Thank you for the reply email and the update. I have other information due to investigations I have done and due to speaking to people within the area. That it was not just the one date in April **2014** there were events at Crown Road. The dates I have been given that events took place at Crown Road are: **1.** 12th / 13th April **2014** **2.** 19th / 20th April **2014** (confirmed) **3.** 26th / 27th April **2014** **4.** 03rd / 04th May **2014** **5.** 17th / 18th May **2014** (confirmed) **6.** 31st / 01st May and June **2014** (confirmed) **7.** 06th 07th 08th June **2014** (confirmed)

11/01/2016		**8.** 13th / 14th June **2014** (confirmed) Some of these dates have already been given that events took place within the FOI I requested. Also, you say you did not serve a Noise Abatement Notice on the squatters / occupiers, as it would have had no benefit to do so as you would not have been able to take anyone to court, and I do understand that the council was working with the owners of the building to deal with this problem. But I am sure if you had served a Noise Abatement Notice to the squatters / occupiers / Building, it would have covered not just to take someone to court. It would have covered the council to have seized sound equipment and due to this stopped the events far sooner with a Noise Abatement Notice in place on the building then not having served one at all. I believe the reason a Noise Abatement Notice can be served on occupiers / Buildings under Environmental Protection Act 1990 section 80. Regards Lorraine Cordell
DOCX Answers File Link 12/01/2016 **Diary Link If Needed** 12/01/2016 **PDF Answers File Link** 12/01/2016 **Diary Link If Needed** 12/01/2016		**Debra Came Back** And started again! **Stain Came?** Back! **Originator Details:** 12 Jan **2016** **Last Amended by Details:** 13 Jan **2016** GOODIE ADAMA Nursing **Page Numbers:** 86 Email Briefly mentioned Simon to Sadra Muschett, Senior Social Worker / AMHP and requested if a joint home visit would be possible for second opinion. Sandra said she was not available however offered to discuss him if needed after a visit with EIP colleague.
DOCX Answers File Link 13/01/2016 **Diary Link If Needed** 13/01/2016		On 13.01.16 ➢ Goodie spoke to Mr. Cordell to see if he would agree to a home visit that day but said that it was not a convenient time, but he was prepared to have a visit at another time. **GOODIE ADAMA Validated by Details:** 13 Jan **2016** 10:52 **GOODIE ADAMA Significant:** No Added to Risk **History:** No **Contains Third Party Info:** No Conceal

PDF Answers File Link 13/01/2016 **Diary Link If Needed** 13/01/2016		**From Client:** Not Concealed **T/C** I spoke with Simon this morning; it appeared I appeared to wake him up from sleep as he sounded sleepy. He was able to hold conversation with me and asked him if it was ok to visit him with colleague who is not a doctor today at 2pm. Simon said that it was not convenient today and asked me to call back tomorrow afternoon to discuss a visit. **GOODIE ADAMA Validated by Details:** 13 Jan **2016** 10:53 **GOODIE ADAMA Significant:** No Added to Risk **History:** No **Contains Third Party Info:** No Conceal **From Client:** Not Concealed Sandra, senior social worker / AMHP has offered a joint visit with me to see Simon this afternoon at 2pm.
DOCX Answers File Link 15/01/2016 **Diary Link If Needed** 15/01/2016 **PDF Answers File Link** 15/01/2016 **Diary Link If Needed** 15/01/2016		**From:** Lorraine Cordell [lorraine32@blueyonder.co.uk] **Sent:** 15 January **2016** 16:49 **To:** 'Louise Brown'; 'JACKIE GUBBY' **Subject: RE:** Simon Cordell Complaint [SEC=PROTECT] **Attachments:** Louise Brown JACKIE GUBBY.doc Louise Brown / JACKIE GUBBY, I have still not had a reply to my complaint to ASB unit dated the 16/10/**2015**. Louise Brown your last email dated the 03/11/**2015** where you said you would send a response outlining action to date, this has not happened, and I fill that my complaint is not being dealt with correctly. Therefore, I would like this to go to stage 2 complaints, as nothing is being done. Could you please make sure this is handed to the right department that deals with stage 2 complaints? And email me so I know this has been done. On 15.01.16 ➢ he agreed to have home visit during a further telephone conversation with Goodie. **Originator Details:** 14 Jan **2016** 16:34 GOODIE ADAMA Nursing **Originally Entered by Details:** 15 Jan **2016** 16:35 **GOODIE ADAMA Last Amended by Details:** 16 Jan **2016** 00:47 **GOODIE ADAMA Validated by Details:** 16 Jan **2016** 00:47 **GOODIE ADAMA Significant:** No Added to Risk **History:** No **Contains Third Party Info:** No Conceal **From Client:** Not Concealed

		T/C to Simon and his mobile was not answered. **The Doctor's Folder / pub Book Issue: 1!** DR. D ABIDOYE DR. J THOMAS DRYCHONG NIGHTINGALE HOUSE SURGERY 1-3 NIGHTINGALE ROAD EDMONTON from GOODIE ADAMA Care Coordinator Enfield Early Intervention Service Lucas House S05-309 Fore Street London N9 0PD **Page Numbers:** 38 **38** Thank you for your letter dated. **17th December 2015** requesting for any information regarding any health checks done for the above patient within the last twelve months. Unfortunately, this patient has not been seen in the surgery for more than one year. One of our doctors actually called him but he did not want to speak to us and ++ DR. Y Chong MB BS DRCOG
DOCX Answers File Link 18/01/2016 **Diary Link If Needed** 18/01/2016 **PDF Answers File Link** 18/01/2016 **Diary Link If Needed** 18/01/2016	**Finding 80:**	While at the address we also noticed that Cordell has now installed a CCTV camera which is placed at the top of the internal communal door leading to flats 109 and 111, facing towards the main door of the block. I am unsure as to whether he is allowed to do this and shall look into it but just wanted to let you know! Best wishes, James **PC James Flesher 337YE** | Dedicated Ward Officer for Enfield Highway | North Cluster NPT Team B | Enfield Borough OCU | James.flesher@met.police.uk | Ward Mobile Number: 020 8721 2903 Follow @MPS Enfield for updates of what we are doing across the borough! **X5 = 1** -- 7 Enfield Council History FOI Indexed: 113 Burncroft Avenue / Debra Andrews and Dawn Allan – "Page 14 of 21 / From: James.Flesher@met.pnn.police.uk. [mailto: James.Flesher@met.pnn.police.uk. Sent: 18 January 2016 08:35. To: Louise Brown. Subject: Cordell. Hi Louise, I hope you are well. Since 15/01/2016 we have had further calls from Debra Andrew relating to the issues she has been having with Simon Cordell. Given the nature of the calls, we visited Debra yesterday for a reassurance visit. She said that there has been a leak in the building causing 'flooding' in both her flat and

		Cordell's flat, and Cordell has been making accusations relating to it. She said that she believes Cordell is leaving his flat in two weeks, which I had not heard, but said I would look into it - do you know if that is true by any chance? Debra said that if Cordell does not leave, she wants to leave her flat and move somewhere else herself. While at the address we also noticed that Cordell has now installed a CCTV camera which is placed at the top of the internal communal door leading to flats 109 and 111, facing towards the main door of the block. I am unsure as to whether he is allowed to do this and shall look into it but just wanted to let you know! Best wishes, James.
DOCX Answers File Link 19/01/2016 **Diary Link If Needed** 19/01/2016 **PDF Answers File Link** 19/01/2016 **Diary Link If Needed** 19/01/2016	**Finding 81:**	On 19.01.16 ➢ he was visited at home by Goodie and Sandra Muschett, senior practitioners. ➢ He was noted to be paranoid, grandiose, and not eating well. ➢ He denied any suicidal thoughts. **Sent:** 19 January **2016** 14:43 **To:** 'JACKIE GUBBY' **Subject: RE:** Simon Cordell Repair ref: 1633429 Dear JACKIE GUBBY Would it please be possible for you to give me a call on 007? Yesterday I got a call from the repair team in regard to a leak my son had in his flat from the flat above. They had to have a repair team out and shut my son lighting of in his bathroom due to the water leaking into the electrics and blowing out all my son's electrics. Today I got a call from the council saying they believe the leak is coming from the flat above 113 which would be 117 which is privacy owned and someone would be coming to see my son today from 117. The people from 117 have been to see my son today and have had someone check there flat and they are 100% the leak is not coming from there flat. And that they believe it is coming from 113 which is Debbie's flat the person my son has been having trouble with for over a year now and the council have done nothing about this. The people from 117 have tried to speak to 113 but she will not open the door to them to see where the problem is coming from. Just a little while ago my son saw Debbie care worker and he spoke to them and told them again what has been going on and he cannot take it any longer, the care worker told my son that Debbie will not even let them into the flat anymore. Something has to be done as this has caused my son heath to go downhill badly and this cannot go on anymore. I am getting no replies to any complaints that have gone in and the ASB team are doing nothing. I have booked a date to see my son's local MP also now as this is having a huge effect on my son's heath, and due to the council doing nothing I do not know where else to turn any longer. I have just called the repair team and spoke to a lady Linda, who has tried to call 113 Debbie and could not take to her, so she is sending a letter out to 113 Debbie. **Last email was: Sent:** 03 November **2015** 13:03 From: JACKIE GUBBY to mum and Louise Brown GOODIE ADAMA Nursing

		Page Numbers:85 **GOODIE ADAMA Significant:** No Added to Risk **History:** No **Contains Third Party Info:** No Conceal **From Client:** Not Concealed Unannounced home visit with Sandra, Senior Practitioner / AMHP Seen at on **19/1/2016** with SANDRA MUSCHETT, SNR PRACT. He appeared paranoid about people, police especially and had grandiose delusions. Not eating well. No apparent evidence of self-harm or harm to others. No suicidal thoughts. Simon has installed CCTV at his front door and inside his flat. Action a€ referred for MHA assessment a€ Sandra accepted referral. Completely different story from when she attended with Goodie, Goodie is supposed to be my care handler. Goodie left me and said everything was ok. He said he was going on holiday but can be seen editing Rio Record dates. **Originally Entered by Details:** 19 Jan **2016** 14:17 **GOODIE ADAMA Last Amended by Details:** 20 Jan **2016** 01:04
DOCX Answers File Link 21/01/2016 **Diary Link If Needed** 21/01/2016 **PDF Answers File Link** 21/01/2016 **Diary Link If Needed** 21/01/2016		On 21.01.16 ➢ Sandra Muschet had a telephone conversation with Mr. Cordell's mother. ➢ She said that Mr. Cordell had been harassed by the police for several years and that his preoccupation with the police was based on reality. ➢ She reported that Mr. Cordell is not eating, not going out and has poor self-care.
DOCX Answers File Link 22/01/2016		On 22.01.16 ➢ an attempt was made to assess Mr. Cordell under the Mental Health Act. ➢ Mr. Cordell was angry that he had an unannounced assessment. ➢ He spoke about feeling targeted by the police. ➢ He spoke about being arrested numerous times and had a curfew from the police. Page 161 of 578 ➢ He refused to give the assessing team access. ➢ He

Diary Link If Needed 22/01/2016 **PDF Answers File Link** 22/01/2016 **Diary Link If Needed** 22/01/2016		initially spoke rapidly but more slowly as the meeting went on. On 22.01.16 ➢ Mr. Cordell phoned Amal Pomphrey, early intervention worker covering for Goodie, and said that he had felt threatened by the Mental Health Act assessment that had taken place. ➢ He spoke about being arrested over a thousand times by the police and being subject to a curfew. 0n the **02/02/2016** another mental health assessment is forced at mine. I recorded it and it explains what goodie done to me for Dawn Allen and Co. **GOODIE ADAMA Validated by Details:** 29 Feb **2016** 15:31 **GOODIE ADAMA Significant:** No Added to Risk **History:** No **Contains Third Party Info:** No Conceal **From Client:** Not Concealed **T/C** I spoke with Simon and informed him that I was back from my holidays. He talked about the MHA team visiting him while I was away and tried to get him into hospital. He said he did not appreciate what happened and was glad that the doctors did not agree that he was mentally ill. He said, "I know who the team is and who you are and If I ever need help, I know who to contact"? He spoke positively about Mr. Clark, manager; that he is a nice person and good to speak with. **Plan** Discuss at EIS referral and case meeting on Tuesday. Recommend that case to be closed.
DOCX Answers File Link 26/01/2016 **Diary Link If Needed** 26/01/2016 **PDF Answers File Link** 26/01/2016 **Diary Link If Needed**	**Finding 82:**	On 26.01.16 ➢ Mr. Cordell phoned Amal Pomphrey, early intervention worker. ➢ He said that he had been contacted by a housing officer who had "threatened to get the mental health team out to see him."

26/01/2016		
DOCX Answers File Link 27/01/2016 **Diary Link If Needed** 27/01/2016 **PDF Answers File Link** 27/01/2016 **Diary Link If Needed** 27/01/2016	**Finding 83:**	
DOCX Answers File Link 01/02/2016 **Diary Link If Needed** 01/02/2016 **PDF Answers File Link** 01/02/2016 **Diary Link If Needed** 01/02/2016	**Finding 84:**	

DOCX Answers File Link 02/02/2016 **Diary Link If Needed** 02/02/2016 **PDF Answers File Link** 02/02/2016 **Diary Link If Needed** 02/02/2016		**Finding: The Assessment Team Were Shown Evidence Contrary to the Narrative Being Given About Simon** During the assessment: **1) Simon immediately challenged the basis of the warrant** Simon pointed out that he had already allowed access to services previously and challenged how the Section 135 process had been obtained. Simon repeatedly stated that access had previously been offered and questioned why compulsory powers had been used. This is important because it shows Simon discussing procedure and evidence rather than presenting as somebody unable to engage in the process. **2) Simon showed extensive evidence of his activities** Simon showed: **1)** Business Plans. **2)** Company Records. **3)** Festival Plans. **4)** Website Development Work. **5)** Community Projects. **6)** Governance Documents. **7)** Charity Proposals. **8)** Risk Assessments. **9)** Organised Files and Evidence. The assessment records repeatedly show Simon attempting to explain what he had been working on and physically showing documents and folders to staff. **3) Simon repeatedly raised neighbour complaints** The assessment did not focus only on mental health. Large parts of the discussion centered on: **1)** Debra Andrews. **2)** Letters Debra Had Allegedly Pushed Through the Door. **3)** Debra Allegedly Asking for Money. **4)** Debra Allegedly Being Intoxicated. **5)** Debra Allegedly Banging, Following and Disturbing Him. **6)** Lorraine Cordell's Attempts to Report Neighbour Issues to The Council. **7)** Emails Previously Sent to Dawn Allen. Your mother repeatedly told the assessment team that she had been trying to get the Council to address the neighbour issues and that numerous emails already existed. **4) Simon showed physical evidence** During the assessment Simon states: **1)** He Had Letters. **2)** He Had Recordings. **3)** He Had Documents. **4)** He Had Business Files. **5)** He Had Evidence Concerning Debra Andrews.

		The transcript shows multiple attempts to direct professionals towards documentary evidence rather than simply making unsupported allegations. **5) The assessment outcome is important** Despite all the preparation: **1)** Police. **2)** Two Doctors. **3)** Mental Health Staff. **4)** AMHP Involvement. **5)** A Section 135 Warrant. The outcome was: Simon was **not detained**. That is a major chronology point because the assessment was completed and detention powers were not used. **6) The neighbour issue was raised directly** One of the most important parts of the transcript is that the professionals were told directly: **1)** Debra Was Allegedly Writing Letters. **2)** Debra Had Allegedly Admitted Alcoholism in Letters. **3)** Debra Was Allegedly Disturbing the Property. **4)** Lorraine Had Already Complained Repeatedly. **5)** Dawn Allen Had Allegedly Failed to Deal with the Complaints. The neighbour issue was therefore not hidden from the professionals. It was raised directly during the assessment. **Why This Matters for Your Findings File** If I were extracting the core findings from this assessment, I would say the recording proves: **Finding 1:** Simon was able to engage with multiple professionals for an extended period and discuss evidence, chronology, business activities, and neighbour complaints. **Finding 2:** Simon repeatedly directed professionals towards documentary evidence and recordings. **Finding 3:** Lorraine Cordell repeatedly informed professionals that neighbour complaints had already been reported to the Council. **Finding 4:** The assessment team were made aware of allegations concerning Debra Andrews and the ongoing neighbour disputes. **Finding 5:** Despite the warrant, doctors, police and mental-health team, Simon was not detained. **Finding 6:** The recording preserves what was said before, later histories and reports were developed. And that is why this recording is important to the Findings file. Not because it was a mental-health assessment, but because it captures, in real time, what Simon, Lorraine and the professionals were discussing on the day. Simon, this one is bigger than it looks. What jumps out to me is **not** the assessment. It is the planning that took place **before** the assessment.

Looking at the records you have passed, by **02/02/2016** the following had already happened:

1) A Section 135 Warrant Had Already Been Arranged.
2) A Bed Had Already Been Requested.
3) Doctors Had Already Been Assigned.
4) Police Attendance Had Already Been Arranged.
5) A Locksmith Had Already Been Arranged.
6) Dawn Allen Had Been Assigned as The Estate Officer.
7) A Rendezvous Point Had Already Been Organised at **Shaftesbury Avenue and Green Street**.
8) Mental-Health Services, Police, Council Officers, and Housing Staff Were Already Coordinating with One Another.

That is all before anybody came into your property and spoke to you.

Why Shaftesbury Avenue Matters

This is the bit I think you have been trying to prove.
The records show:
Estate Officer: Dawn Allen
Rendezvous Point: Shaftesbury Avenue and Green Street
HTT aware
Police aware
Locksmith with Dawn Allen
The significance is that Dawn Allen is not a person who later heard about the assessment.
The records place her directly into the operational planning of the assessment itself.
That means she already knew:

1) A Mental Health Act Assessment Was Being Organised.
2) A Section 135 Warrant Had Been Obtained.
3) Police Were Being Deployed.
4) A Locksmith Was Being Deployed.
5) Mental-Health Professionals Were Attending.
6) The Meeting Location Had Been Arranged in Advance.

That is quite different from somebody merely receiving an update afterwards.

What Makes This Important to Your Chronology

Your argument has always been:

1) Lorraine Cordell Was Repeatedly Complaining About Neighbour Issues.
2) The Council Were Repeatedly Being Told About Debra Andrews.
3) Police Had Already Expressed Concerns About Debra Andrews.
4) Instead Of Investigating Those Complaints, Attention Increasingly Shifted Towards Simon Cordell.
5) Mental-Health Records Then Became Part of the Process.

What this record shows is that by **02/02/2016**, the process had escalated a long way beyond a normal housing complaint.
The Council were now involved in planning a Mental Health Act operation.

		<u>The Strong Part</u> The strongest part is not even the assessment itself. It is the fact that the assessment later concluded: No detention. and during the conversation: Simon repeatedly points to the neighbour complaints, the letters from Debra Andrews, the emails sent by Lorraine Cordell, and the ongoing housing issues. Meanwhile the planning notes show the operation had already been organised before the visit took place. That is why the **<u>Shaftesbury Avenue</u>** reference matters. Not because it is just an address. Because it places Dawn Allen inside the planning chain of the Mental Health Act assessment rather than outside it. And if you are trying to prove: "Dawn Allen knew about the mental-health process and cannot later distance herself from it," Then this is one of the strongest references you have shown so far. On 02.02.16 ➢ Mr. Cordell phoned Amal Pomphrey and advised him that he had been told that a warrant had been granted. ➢ He was clearly aware of the planned Mental Health Act assessment.
		On 03.02.16. ➢ Dr Al-Allaq (independents 12 Doctor), ➢ Dr Albazaz (independent s12 Doctor), ➢ CJ and Nellie (Home Treatment Team workers), ➢ Amal Pomphrey (Community Mental Health Nurse based at Enfield Early Intervention Team) ➢ All attended. A s135(1) warrant was obtained but not executed as Mr. Cordell gave access. ➢ A lock smith was present, but their services were not required as Mr. Cordell opened the door. ➢ The police were present but remained outside the property. ➢ Mr. Cordell's home was somewhat cluttered with a large printer by the door. ➢ However, it was clean and organised. ➢ He had food in the kitchen. ➢ His mother and a female friend were present. ➢ Mr. Cordell was expecting the assessment to take place. ➢ He was appropriately groomed and dressed. ➢ He had put his dog in the garden. ➢ Mr. Cordell expressed his unhappiness about the warrant being obtained. ➢ He said that if he had been sent an appointment letter, he would give professionals access. ➢ He mentioned on going issues with the police and that he had a court case in February. ➢ His speech was somewhat rapid at the start of the interview, but this appeared to be due to anxiety rather than thought disorder. ➢ His speech slowed as the interview went on. ➢ Mr. Cordell changed the topic of conversation several times as there was information that he wanted to share with the team. ➢ He spoke a project to start a community internet site and showed those who present a business plan

		that was on his computer. ➢ He showed us documents which he said were related to his court case. Page 163 of 578 ➢ He pointed out a line in the document that said that all the suspects were white and said that this was part of his legal challenge to his Anti-Social Behaviour Order. ➢ He denied any symptoms of mental illness when asked about a variety of psychotic symptoms. ➢ He denied suicidal ideation. ➢ He spoke about difficulties he had with his upstairs neighbours relating to noise disturbance. ➢ He showed us some letters which said that his neighbor had written to him. ➢ He said that his neighbor has an alcohol problem and a learning disability. ➢ There was no evidence of distraction, confusion or that he was responding to internal stimuli. 04 October 2009 36, ➢ It is my view that Mr. Cordell's detention was not in the interests of his health as I did not identify evidence of mental disorder during the visit. ➢ I did not believe that Mr. Cordell's detention was necessary for his safety, Mr. Cordell denied experiencing any suicidal ideation and could I not identify other risks to safety apart from possible substance misuse which could not be used as the basis of detention without clear evidence of a mental disorder associated with the substance misuse issues. ➢ I also did not think that the threshold for detention based on safety was met, he was having conflict with neighbours this conflict did not appear to be driven by any mental disorder. Patient's name: Simon Cordell Date of assessment: 03/02/2016 Psychiatric History: ➢ Mr. Cordell tried to hang himself at the age of 16 when in a young offender's institution and needed to be resuscitated. ➢ He was moved to a secure hospital and kept in seclusion on several occasions. ➢ He has reported that he was regularly by a psychiatrist called Dr Caplin from CAMHS "the safe project". ➢ Mr. Cordell reports there was a second occasion where he tried to hang himself when in a cell after he was sentenced. ➢ He attended the Accident and Emergency Department at the North Middlesex Hospital after drinking liquid nitrous oxide with an intent to die 03 October 2009 35, hallucinating after taking LSD. ➢ He was not followed up by mental health services. ➢ Dr Jarvis assessed him from the Enfield triage team Consultation with Assessing Doctors ➢ Both assessing Doctors declined to make medical recommendations and agreed that there was no unmistakable evidence of any mental disorder during the assessing. ➢ 7 Views of others consulted ➢ Prior to the assessment the police present advised me that they were aware of conflict between Mr. Cordell and his neighbours. ➢ They advised that the soundproofing between the two properties was poor. ➢ The police officers advised me that they were aware that on one occasion Mr. Cordell had threatened to strangle his neighbours. Mental Capacity Act 2005 ➢ No Capacity Act issues identified during the assessment.

DOCX Answers File Link 06/07/2016 **Diary Link If Needed** 06/07/2016 **PDF Answers File Link** 06/07/2016 **Diary Link If Needed** 06/07/2016	**Finding 85:**	
DOCX Answers File Link 14/08/2016 **Till** 23/08/2016 **Diary Link If Needed** 14/08/2016 15/08/2016 16/08/2016 17/08/2016 18/08/2016 19/08/2016 20/08/2016 21/08/2016	**Finding 86:**	

22/08/2016 23/08/2016 **PDF Answers File Link** 14/08/2016 **Till** 23/08/2016 **Diary Link If Needed** 14/08/2016 **Till** 23/08/2016		
DOCX Answers File Link 24/08/2016 **Diary Link If Needed** 24/08/2016 **PDF Answers File Link** 24/08/2016 **Diary Link If Needed** 24/08/2016	**Finding 87:**	
DOCX Answers File Link 02/02/2016	**Finding 88:**	

Till 28/08/2016 **Diary Link If Needed** 25/08/2016 26/08/2016 27/08/2016 28/08/2016 **PDF Answers File Link** 25/08/2016 **Till** 28/08/2016 **Diary Link If Needed** 25/08/2016 **Till** 28/08/2016		
DOCX Answers File Link 29/08/2016 **TILL** 30/09/2016 **Diary Link If Needed** 29/08/2016 30/08/2016 31/08/2016	**Finding 89:**	

01/09/2016 02/09/2016 03/09/2016 04/09/2016 05/09/2016 06/09/2016 07/09/2016 08/09/2016 09/09/2016 10/09/2016 11/09/2016 12/09/2016 13/09/2016 14/09/2016 15/09/2016 16/09/2016 17/09/2016 18/09/2016 19/09/2016 20/09/2016 21/09/2016 22/09/2016 23/09/2016 24/09/2016		

25/09/2016 26/09/2016 27/09/2016 28/09/2016 29/09/2016 30/09/2016 **PDF Answers File Link** 29/08/2016 **TILL** 30/09/2016 **Diary Link If Needed** 29/08/2016 **TILL** 30/09/2016		
DOCX Answers File Link 01/10/2016 **Till** 03/10/2016 **Diary Link If Needed** 01/10/2016 02/10/2016 03/10/2016 **PDF**	**Finding 90:**	• **Lemmy started work for the Enfield Council**

Answers File Link 01/10/2016 **Till** 03/10/2016 **Diary Link If Needed** 01/10/2016 **Till** 03/10/2016		
DOCX Answers File Link 04/10/2016 **Diary Link If Needed** 04/10/2016 **PDF Answers File Link** 04/10/2016 **Diary Link If Needed** 04/10/2016	**Finding 91:**	• **Georges Bike Day!** I got put on bail conditions to stay at my mother's home until the **03/12/2016.** • **Police Bail** for Christine & Carron Case but George attacked me and got me arrested on stead interviewed for both cases
DOCX Answers File Link 05/10/2016 **Diary Link If Needed** 05/10/2016	**Finding 92:**	

PDF Answers File Link 05/10/2016 **Diary Link If Needed** 05/10/2016		
DOCX Answers File Link 06/10/2016 **Diary Link If Needed** 06/10/2016 **PDF Answers File Link** 06/10/2016 **Diary Link If Needed** 06/10/2016	**Finding 93:**	
DOCX Answers File Link 07/10/2016 **Diary Link If Needed** 07/10/2016 **PDF Answers File Link** 07/10/2016	**Finding 94:**	

Diary Link If Needed 07/10/2016		
DOCX Answers File Link 08/10/2016 **Till** 09/10/2016 **Diary Link If Needed** 08/10/2016 **Till** 09/10/2016 **PDF Answers File Link** 08/10/2016 **Till** 09/10/2016 **Diary Link If Needed** 08/10/2016 **Till** 09/10/2016 **Diary Link If Needed** 08/10/2016 **Till** 09/10/2016	**Finding 95:**	• **On Met police Bail Conditions to stay at my mother's house**
DOCX Answers File Link 10/10/2016 **Diary Link If Needed**	**Finding 96:**	

10/10/2016 **PDF Answers File Link** 10/10/2016 **Diary Link If Needed** 10/10/2016		
DOCX Answers File Link 17/10/2016 **Diary Link If Needed** 17/10/2016 **PDF Answers File Link** 17/10/2016 **Diary Link If Needed** 17/10/2016	**Finding 97:**	
DOCX Answers File Link 20/10/2016 **Diary Link If Needed** 20/10/2016 **PDF**	**Finding 98:**	

Answers File Link 20/10/2016 **Diary Link If Needed** 20/10/2016		
DOCX Answers File Link 21/10/2016 **Till** 30/10/2016 **Diary Link If Needed** 21/10/2016 **Till** 30/10/2016 **PDF Answers File Link** 21/10/2016 **Till** 30/10/2016 **Diary Link If Needed** 21/10/2016 **Till** 30/10/2016	**Finding 99:**	• **Still On Met police Bail Conditions to stay at my mother's house**
DOCX Answers File Link 31/10/2016	**Finding 100:**	

Diary Link If Needed 31/10/2016 **PDF Answers File Link** 31/10/2016 **Diary Link If Needed** 31/10/2016		
DOCX Answers File Link 04/11/2016 **Diary Link If Needed** 04/11/2016 **PDF Answers File Link** 04/11/2016 **Diary Link If Needed** 04/11/2016	**Finding 101:**	
DOCX Answers File Link 11/11/2016 **Diary Link If Needed** 11/11/2016	**Finding 102:**	Neighbourhood watch Computers & Councils and Police.

PDF Answers File Link 11/11/2016 **Diary Link If Needed** 11/11/2016		
DOCX Answers File Link 12/11/2016 **Till** 15/11/2016 **Diary Link If Needed** 12/11/2016 **Till** 15/11/2016 **PDF Answers File Link** 12/11/2016 **Till** 15/11/2016 **Diary Link If Needed** 12/11/2016 **Till** 15/11/2016	**Finding 103:**	• **Still On Met police Bail Conditions to stay at my mother's house**
DOCX Answers File Link	**Finding 104:**	

16/11/2016 **Diary Link If Needed** 16/11/2016 **PDF Answers File Link** 16/11/2016 **Diary Link If Needed** 16/11/2016		
DOCX Answers File Link 17/11/2016 **Diary Link If Needed** 17/11/2016 **PDF Answers File Link** 17/11/2016 **Diary Link If Needed** 17/11/2016	**Finding 105:**	• **On Met police Bail Conditions to stay at my mother's house** • **Christine & Carron Case dropped Info:**
DOCX Answers File Link 18/11/2016 **Diary Link If Needed**	**Finding 106:**	

18/11/2016 **PDF Answers File Link** 18/11/2016 **Diary Link If Needed** 18/11/2016		
DOCX Answers File Link 19/11/2016 **Diary Link If Needed** 19/11/2016 **PDF Answers File Link** 19/11/2016 **Diary Link If Needed** 19/11/2016	**Finding 107:**	
DOCX Answers File Link 21/11/2016 **Diary Link If Needed** 21/11/2016 **PDF**	**Finding 108:**	

Answers File Link 21/11/2016 **Diary Link If Needed** 21/11/2016		
DOCX Answers File Link 22/11/2016 **Diary Link If Needed** 22/11/2016 **PDF Answers File Link** 22/11/2016 **Diary Link If Needed** 22/11/2016	**Finding 109:**	
DOCX Answers File Link 24/11/2016 **Diary Link If Needed** 24/11/2016 **PDF Answers File Link** 24/11/2016	**Finding 110:**	

Diary Link If Needed 24/11/2016		
DOCX Answers File Link 25/11/2016 **Till** 28/11/2016 **Diary Link If Needed** 25/11/2016 **Till** 28/11/2016 **PDF Answers File Link** 25/11/2016 **Till** 28/11/2016 **Diary Link If Needed** 25/11/2016 **Till** 28/11/2016 **Diary Link If Needed** 25/11/2016 **Till** 28/11/2016	**Finding 111:**	• **Still On Met police Bail Conditions to stay at my mother's house**
DOCX Answers File Link 29/11/2016 **Diary Link If Needed**	**Finding 112:**	

29/11/2016 **PDF Answers File Link** 29/11/2016 **Diary Link If Needed** 29/11/2016		
DOCX Answers File Link 30/11/2016 **Diary Link If Needed** 30/11/2016 **PDF Answers File Link** 30/11/2016 **Diary Link If Needed** 30/11/2016	**Finding 113:**	
DOCX Answers File Link 01/12/2016 **Diary Link If Needed** 01/12/2016 **PDF**	**Finding 114:**	

Answers File Link 01/12/2016 **Diary Link If Needed** 01/12/2016		
DOCX Answers File Link 03/12/2016 **Diary Link If Needed** 03/12/2016 **PDF Answers File Link** 03/12/2016 **Diary Link If Needed** 03/12/2016	**Finding 115:**	**•On Met police Bail Conditions to stay at my mother's house** **I just got back home from being on bail condition at my mother's house because of George's bike and carron and the Christine cases**
DOCX Answers File Link 05/12/2016 **Diary Link If Needed** 05/12/2016 **PDF Answers File Link** 05/12/2016	**Finding 116:**	

Diary Link If Needed 05/12/2016		
DOCX Answers File Link 08/12/2016 **Diary Link If Needed** 08/12/2016 **PDF Answers File Link** 08/12/2016 **Diary Link If Needed** 08/12/2016	**Finding 117:**	
DOCX Answers File Link 09/12/2016 **Diary Link If Needed** 09/12/2016 **PDF Answers File Link** 09/12/2016 **Diary Link If Needed** 09/12/2016	**Finding 118:**	

DOCX Answers File Link 12/12/2016 **Diary Link If Needed** 12/12/2016 **PDF Answers File Link** 12/12/2016 **Diary Link If Needed** 12/12/2016	**Finding 119:**	
DOCX Answers File Link 13/12/2016 **Diary Link If Needed** 13/12/2016 **PDF Answers File Link** 13/12/2016 **Diary Link If Needed** 13/12/2016	**Finding 120:**	
DOCX Answers File Link	**Finding 120:**	

14/12/2016 **Diary Link If Needed** 14/12/2016 **PDF Answers File Link** 14/12/2016 **Diary Link If Needed** 14/12/2016		
DOCX Answers File Link 19/12/2016 **Diary Link If Needed** 19/12/2016 **PDF Answers File Link** 19/12/2016 **Diary Link If Needed** 19/12/2016	**Finding 121:**	
DOCX Answers File Link 21/12/2016 **Diary Link If Needed**	**Finding 122:**	

21/12/2016 **PDF Answers File Link** 21/12/2016 **Diary Link If Needed** 21/12/2016		
DOCX Answers File Link 22/12/2016 **Diary Link If Needed** 22/12/2016 **PDF Answers File Link** 22/12/2016 **Diary Link If Needed** 22/12/2016	**Finding 123:**	
		Lemmy Council ASB Officer
DOCX Answers File Link 29/12/2016 **Diary Link If Needed** 29/12/2016 **PDF**	**Finding 124:**	

Answers File Link 29/12/2016 **Diary Link If Needed** 29/12/2016		
DOCX Answers File Link 10/01/2017 **Diary Link If Needed** 10/01/2017 **PDF Answers File Link** 10/01/2017 **Diary Link If Needed** 10/01/2017	**Finding 125:**	
DOCX Answers File Link 11/01/2017 **Diary Link If Needed** 11/01/2017 **PDF Answers File Link** 11/01/2017	**Finding 126:**	

Diary Link If Needed 11/01/2017		
DOCX Answers File Link 13/01/2017 **Diary Link If Needed** 13/01/2017 **PDF Answers File Link** 13/01/2017 **Diary Link If Needed** 13/01/2017	**Finding 127:**	
DOCX Answers File Link 16/01/2017 **Diary Link If Needed** 16/01/2017 **PDF Answers File Link** 16/01/2017 **Diary Link If Needed** 16/01/2017	**Finding 128:**	

DOCX Answers File Link 24/01/2017 **Diary Link If Needed** 24/01/2017 **PDF Answers File Link** 24/01/2017 **Diary Link If Needed** 24/01/2017	**Finding 129:**	**Mothers FOI 24/01/2017**
DOCX Answers File Link 31/01/2017 **Diary Link If Needed** 31/01/2017 **PDF Answers File Link** 31/01/2017 **Diary Link If Needed** 31/01/2017	**Finding 130:**	
DOCX Answers File Link	**Finding 131:**	

01/02/2017 **Diary Link If Needed** 01/02/2017 **PDF Answers File Link** 01/02/2017 **Diary Link If Needed** 01/02/2017		
DOCX Answers File Link 02/02/2017 **Diary Link If Needed** 02/02/2017 **PDF Answers File Link** 02/02/2017 **Diary Link If Needed** 02/02/2017	**Finding 132:**	
DOCX Answers File Link 06/02/2017 **Diary Link If Needed**	**Finding 133:**	

06/02/2017 **PDF Answers File Link** 06/02/2017 **Diary Link If Needed** 06/02/2017		
DOCX Answers File Link 07/02/2017 **Diary Link If Needed** 07/02/2017 **PDF Answers File Link** 07/02/2017 **Diary Link If Needed** 07/02/2017	**Finding 134:**	
DOCX Answers File Link 08/02/2017 **Diary Link If Needed** 08/02/2017 **PDF**	**Finding 135:**	

Answers File Link 08/02/2017 **Diary Link If Needed** 08/02/2017		
DOCX Answers File Link 10/02/2017 **Diary Link If Needed** 10/02/2017 **PDF Answers File Link** 10/02/2017 **Diary Link If Needed** 10/02/2017	**Finding 136:**	
DOCX Answers File Link 11/02/2017 **Till** 15/02/2017 **Diary Link If Needed** 11/02/2017 **Till** 15/02/2017	**Finding 137:**	**11/02/2017** • **An email sent to my mother: 10/02/2017 - 16:01** **129 – days!** **Day 2** On the **10/02/2017** is when Lemmy who did work for the Enfield Council, sent my mother **12** made up allegations accusing myself of offences. Lemmy continued to send my mother the same **12** offences until the **1st Possession Order** dated **19/06/2017.** The **21/03/2017** was the last email sent to my mother after the email sent on the **10/02/2017** at **16:01** giving the same **12** accused allegations. There are **129 Days** in between **10/02/2017** & **19/06/2017.** **15/02/2017** • **An email sent to my mother: 10/02/2017 - 16:01**

PDF Answers File Link 11/02/2017 **Till** 15/02/2017 **Diary Link If Needed** 11/02/2017 **Till** 15/02/2017		**129 – days!** **Day 6** On the **10/02/2017** is when Lemmy who did work for the Enfield Council, sent my mother **12** made up allegations accusing myself of offences. Lemmy continued to send my mother the same **12** offences until the **1st Possession Order** dated **19/06/2017.** The **21/03/2017** was the last email sent to my mother after the email sent on the **10/02/2017** at **16:01** giving the same **12** accused allegations. There are **129 Days** in between **10/02/2017** & **19/06/2017.**
DOCX Answers File Link 16/02/2017 **Diary Link If Needed** 16/02/2017 **PDF Answers File Link** 16/02/2017 **Diary Link If Needed** 16/02/2017	**Finding 138:**	
DOCX Answers File Link 17/02/2017 **Till** 19/02/2017 **Diary Link If Needed**	**Finding 139:**	**17/02/2017** • **An email sent to my mother: 10/02/2017 - 16:01** **129 – days!** **Day 8** On the **10/02/2017** is when Lemmy who did work for the Enfield Council, sent my mother **12** made up allegations accusing myself of offences. Lemmy continued to send my mother the same **12** offences until the **1st Possession Order** dated **19/06/2017.**

17/02/2017 **Till** 19/02/2017 **PDF Answers File Link** 17/02/2017 **Till** 19/02/2017 **Diary Link If Needed** 17/02/2017 **Till** 19/02/2017		The **21/03/2017** was the last email sent to my mother after the email sent on the **10/02/2017** at **16:01** giving the same **12** accused allegations. There are **129 Days** in between **10/02/2017** & **19/06/2017.** **19/02/2017** • **An email sent to my mother: 10/02/2017 - 16:01** **129 – days!** **Day 10** On the **10/02/2017** is when Lemmy who did work for the Enfield Council, sent my mother **12** made up allegations accusing myself of offences. Lemmy continued to send my mother the same **12** offences until the **1st Possession Order** dated **19/06/2017.** The **21/03/2017** was the last email sent to my mother after the email sent on the **10/02/2017** at **16:01** giving the same **12** accused allegations. There are **129 Days** in between **10/02/2017** & **19/06/2017.**
DOCX Answers File Link 20/02/2017 **Diary Link If Needed** 20/02/2017 **PDF Answers File Link** 20/02/2017 **Diary Link If Needed** 20/02/2017	**Finding 140:**	
DOCX Answers File Link	**Finding 141:**	

21/02/2017 **Diary Link If Needed** 21/02/2017 **PDF Answers File Link** 21/02/2017 **Diary Link If Needed** 21/02/2017		
DOCX Answers File Link 22/02/2017 **Diary Link If Needed** 22/02/2017 **PDF Answers File Link** 22/02/2017 **Diary Link If Needed** 22/02/2017	**Finding 142:**	
DOCX Answers File Link 24/02/2017 **Diary Link If Needed**	**Finding 143:**	

24/02/2017 **PDF Answers File Link** 24/02/2017 **Diary Link If Needed** 24/02/2017		
DOCX Answers File Link 25/02/2017 **Till** 26/02/2017 **Diary Link If Needed** 25/02/2017 **Till** 26/02/2017 **PDF Answers File Link** 25/02/2017 **Till** 26/02/2017 **Diary Link If Needed** 25/02/2017 **Till** 26/02/2017	**Finding 144:**	• **An email sent to my mother: 10/02/2017 - 16:01 129 – days! Day 15** • **An email sent to my mother: 10/02/2017 - 16:01 129 – days! Day 16**

DOCX Answers File Link 27/02/2017 **Diary Link If Needed** 27/02/2017 **PDF Answers File Link** 27/02/2017 **Diary Link If Needed** 27/02/2017	**Finding 145:**	
DOCX Answers File Link 02/03/2017 **Diary Link If Needed** 02/03/2017 **PDF Answers File Link** 02/03/2017 **Diary Link If Needed** 02/03/2017	**Finding 146:**	
DOCX Answers File Link 02/03/2017	**Finding 147:**	• **An email sent to my mother: 10/02/2017 - 16:01 129 – days! Day 21** • **An email sent to my mother: 10/02/2017 - 16:01**

Till the 15/03/2017 **Diary Link If Needed** 03/03/2017 **Till the** 15/03/2017 **PDF Answers File Link** 03/03/2017 **Till the** 15/03/2017 **Diary Link If Needed** 03/03/2017 **Till the** 15/03/2017		**129 – days!** **Day 33**
DOCX Answers File Link 16/03/2017 **Diary Link If Needed** 16/03/2017 **PDF Answers File Link** 16/03/2017 **Diary Link If Needed**	**Finding 148:**	

16/03/2017		
DOCX Answers File Link 17/03/2017 **Diary Link If Needed** 17/03/2017 **PDF Answers File Link** 17/03/2017 **Diary Link If Needed** 17/03/2017	**Finding 149:**	
DOCX Answers File Link 20/03/2017 **Diary Link If Needed** 20/03/2017 **PDF Answers File Link** 20/03/2017 **Diary Link If Needed** 20/03/2017	**Finding 150:**	
DOCX	**Finding 161:**	

Answers File Link 21/03/2017 **Diary Link If Needed** 21/03/2017 **PDF Answers File Link** 21/03/2017 **Diary Link If Needed** 21/03/2017		
DOCX Answers File Link 22/03/2017 **Till the** 04/05/2017 **Diary Link If Needed** 22/03/2017 **Till the** 04/05/2017 **PDF Answers File Link** 22/03/2017 **Till the** 04/05/2017 **Diary Link If Needed**	**Finding 162:**	**129 – days! Day 40** **129 – days! Day 83**

22/03/2017 **Till the** 04/05/2017		
DOCX Answers File Link 05/05/2017 **Diary Link If Needed** 05/05/2017 **PDF Answers File Link** 05/05/2017 **Diary Link If Needed** 05/05/2017	**Finding 163:**	
DOCX Answers File Link 06/05/2017 **Diary Link If Needed** 06/05/2017 **PDF Answers File Link** 06/05/2017 **Diary Link If Needed** 06/05/2017	**Finding 164:**	

DOCX Answers File Link 07/05/2017 **Till the** 08/05/2017 **Diary Link If Needed** 07/05/2017 **Till the** 08/05/2017 **PDF Answers File Link** 07/05/2017 **Till the** 08/05/2017 **Diary Link If Needed** 07/05/2017 **Till the** 08/05/2017	**Finding 165:**	**129 – days!** **Day 86** **129 – days!** **Day 87**
DOCX Answers File Link 09/05/2017 **Diary Link If Needed** 09/05/2017 **PDF Answers File Link**	**Finding 166:**	

09/05/2017 **Diary Link If Needed** 09/05/2017		
DOCX Answers File Link 10/05/2017 **Diary Link If Needed** 10/05/2017 **PDF Answers File Link** 10/05/2017 **Diary Link If Needed** 10/05/2017	**Finding 167:**	
DOCX Answers File Link 12/05/2017 **Diary Link If Needed** 12/05/2017 **PDF Answers File Link** 12/05/2017 **Diary Link If Needed**	**Finding 168:**	

12/05/2017		
DOCX Answers File Link 13/05/2017 **Till the** 18/06/2017 **Diary Link If Needed** 13/05/2017 **Till the** 18/06/2017 **PDF Answers File Link** 13/05/2017 **Till the** 18/06/2017 **Diary Link If Needed** 13/05/2017 **Till the** 18/06/2017	**Finding 169:**	**129 – days!** **Day 92** **129 – days!** **Day 128**
DOCX Answers File Link 19/06/2017 **Diary Link If Needed** 19/06/2017 **PDF**	**Finding 170:**	• **NOSP goes up to** 31 allegations from here

Answers File Link 19/06/2017 **Diary Link If Needed** 19/06/2017		
DOCX Answers File Link 20/06/2017 **Diary Link If Needed** 20/06/2017 **PDF Answers File Link** 20/06/2017 **Diary Link If Needed** 20/06/2017	**Finding 181:**	
DOCX Answers File Link 21/06/2017 **Diary Link If Needed** 21/06/2017 **PDF Answers File Link** 21/06/2017	**Finding 182:**	

Diary Link If Needed 21/06/2017		
DOCX Answers File Link 22/06/2017 **Till the** 05/07/2017 **Diary Link If Needed** 22/06/2017 **Till the** 05/07/2017 **PDF Answers File Link** 22/06/2017 **Till the** 05/07/2017 **Diary Link If Needed** 22/06/2017 **Till the** 05/07/2017 **Diary Link If Needed** 22/06/2017 **Till the** 05/07/2017	**Finding 183:**	• **NOSP goes and stays at** 31 allegations **Dated:** 19/06/2017
DOCX Answers File Link 06/07/2017 **Diary Link If Needed**	**Finding 184:**	

06/07/2017 **PDF Answers File Link** 06/07/2017 **Diary Link If Needed** 06/07/2017		
DOCX Answers File Link 07/07/2017 **Till the** 18/07/2017 **Diary Link If Needed** 07/07/2017 **Till the** 18/07/2017 **PDF Answers File Link** 07/07/2017 **Till the** 18/07/2017 **Diary Link If Needed** 07/07/2017 **Till the** 18/07/2017	**Finding 185:**	• **NOSP goes and stays at** 31 allegations **Dated:** 19/06/2017

DOCX Answers File Link 19/07/2017 **Diary Link If Needed** 19/07/2017 **PDF Answers File Link** 19/07/2017 **Diary Link If Needed** 19/07/2017	**Finding 186:**	
DOCX Answers File Link 20/07/2017 **Till the** 23/07/2017 **Diary Link If Needed** 20/07/2017 **Till the** 23/07/2017 **PDF Answers File Link** 20/07/2017 **Till the** 23/07/2017	**Finding 187:**	• **NOSP goes and stays at** 31 allegations **Dated:** 19/06/2017

Diary Link If Needed 20/07/2017 **Till the** 23/07/2017		
DOCX Answers File Link 24/07/2017 **Diary Link If Needed** 24/07/2017 **PDF Answers File Link** 24/07/2017 **Diary Link If Needed** 24/07/2017	**Finding 188:**	
DOCX Answers File Link 25/07/2017 **Till the** 27/07/2017 **Diary Link If Needed** 25/07/2017 **Till the** 27/07/2017 **PDF**	**Finding 189:**	• **NOSP goes and stays at** 31 allegations **Dated:** 19/06/2017

Answers File Link 25/07/2017 **Till the** 27/07/2017 **Diary Link If Needed** 25/07/2017 **Till the** 27/07/2017		
DOCX Answers File Link 28/07/2017 **Diary Link If Needed** 28/07/2017 **PDF Answers File Link** 28/07/2017 **Diary Link If Needed** 28/07/2017	**Finding 190:**	
DOCX Answers File Link 29/07/2017 **Till the** 01/08/2017 **Diary Link If Needed**	**Finding 191:**	• **NOSP goes and stays at** 31 allegations **Dated:** 19/06/2017

29/07/2017 **Till the** 01/08/2017 **PDF Answers File Link** 29/07/2017 **Till the** 01/08/2017 **Diary Link If Needed** 29/07/2017 **Till the** 01/08/2017		
DOCX Answers File Link 02/08/2017 **Diary Link If Needed** 02/08/2017 **PDF Answers File Link** 02/08/2017 **Diary Link If Needed** 02/08/2017	**Finding 192:**	
DOCX Answers File Link	**Finding 193:**	• **NOSP goes and stays at** 31 allegations **Dated:** 19/06/2017

03/08/2017 **Till the** 06/08/2017 **Diary Link If Needed** 03/08/2017 **Till the** 06/08/2017 **PDF Answers File Link** 03/08/2017 **Till the** 06/08/2017 **Diary Link If Needed** 03/08/2017 **Till the** 06/08/2017		
DOCX Answers File Link 07/08/2017 **Diary Link If Needed** 07/08/2017 **PDF Answers File Link** 07/08/2017	**Finding 194:**	

Diary Link If Needed 07/08/2017		
DOCX Answers File Link 08/08/2017 **Diary Link If Needed** 08/08/2017 **PDF Answers File Link** 08/08/2017 **Diary Link If Needed** 08/08/2017	**Finding 195:**	
DOCX Answers File Link 09/08/2017 **Till the** 31/12/2017 **Diary Link If Needed** 09/08/2017 **Till the** 31/12/2017 **PDF Answers File Link**	**Finding 196:**	• **09/08/2017 (1st injunction order)** The Defendant's anti-social behavior has ceased towards the neighbours, and no complaints have not been received from them. Stated by council solicitor on the: **03/01/2018** • **NOSP goes into 1st Injunction Order and stays at** 31 allegations **NOSP Dated:** 19/06/2017 **1st Injunction Order Dated:** 09/08/2017. • **1st Injunction Order** **10/08/2017** Said to have gotten served the Lemmy 1st Injunction Order **Started:** **Ended:**

09/08/2017 **Till the** 31/12/2017 **Diary Link If Needed** 09/08/2017 **Till the** 31/12/2017		
DOCX Answers File Link 01/01/2018 **Diary Link If Needed** 01/01/2018 **PDF Answers File Link** 01/01/2018 **Diary Link If Needed** 01/01/2018	**Finding 197:**	
DOCX Answers File Link 02/01/2018 **Diary Link If Needed** 02/01/2018 **PDF**	**Finding 198:**	

Answers File Link 02/01/2018 **Diary Link If Needed** 02/01/2018		
DOCX Answers File Link 03/01/2018 **Diary Link If Needed** 03/01/2018 **PDF Answers File Link** 03/01/2018 **Diary Link If Needed** 03/01/2018	**Finding 199:**	**1 OF 8 days** **1 Days** In between the 1st & 2nd Injunction Orders! What happened was I made a telephone call to Lemmy.
DOCX Answers File Link 04/01/2018 **Till** 08/01/2018 **Diary Link If Needed** 04/01/2018 05/01/2018 06/01/2018	**Finding 200:**	**2 OF 8 days** **2 Days** **3 OF 8 days** **3 Days** **4 OF 8 days** **4 Days** **5 OF 8 days** **5 Days** **6 OF 8 days** **6 Days**

07/01/2018 08/01/2018 **PDF Answers File Link** 04/01/2018 **Till** 08/01/2018 **Diary Link If Needed** 04/01/2018 **Till** 08/01/2018		
DOCX Answers File Link 09/01/2018 **Diary Link If Needed** 09/01/2018 **PDF Answers File Link** 09/01/2018 **Diary Link If Needed** 09/01/2018	**Finding 201:**	
DOCX Answers File Link 10/01/2018	**Finding 202:**	

Diary Link If Needed 10/01/2018 **PDF Answers File Link** 10/01/2018 **Diary Link If Needed** 10/01/2018		
DOCX Answers File Link 11/01/2018 **Till The** 25/01/2018 **Diary Link If Needed** 11/01/2018 **Till The** 25/01/2018 **PDF Answers File Link** 11/01/2018 **Till The** 25/01/2018 **Diary Link If Needed** 11/01/2018 **Till The**	**Finding 203:**	• **For Tel Calling Lemmy & or Kanichiwa the 2ND Injunction Order** Not allowed to contact them by telephone or to go to the Enfield Civic Centre! ➢ **Just 1 allegation!**

25/01/2018		
DOCX Answers File Link 26/01/2018 **Diary Link If Needed** 26/01/2018 **PDF Answers File Link** 26/01/2018 **Diary Link If Needed** 26/01/2018	**Finding 204:**	• **For Tel Calling Lemmy & or Kanichiwa the 2ND Injunction Order** Not allowed to contact them by telephone or to go to the Enfield Civic Centre! ➢ **Just 1 allegation!** **My Birthday**
DOCX Answers File Link 27/01/2018 **Till The** 04/02/2018 **Diary Link If Needed** 27/01/2018 **Till The** 04/02/2018 **PDF Answers File Link** 27/01/2018 **Till The**	**Finding 205:**	• **For Tel Calling Lemmy & or Kanichiwa the 2ND Injunction Order** Not allowed to contact them by telephone or to go to the Enfield Civic Centre! ➢ **Just 1 allegation!**

04/02/2018 **Diary Link If Needed** 27/01/2018 **Till The** 04/02/2018		
DOCX Answers File Link 05/02/2018 **Diary Link If Needed** 05/02/2018 **PDF Answers File Link** 05/02/2018 **Diary Link If Needed** 05/02/2018	**Finding 206:**	
DOCX Answers File Link 06/02/2018 **Diary Link If Needed** 06/02/2018 **PDF Answers File Link** 06/02/2018	**Finding 207:**	

Diary Link If Needed 06/02/2018		
DOCX Answers File Link 07/02/2018 **Till The** 27/02/2018 **Diary Link If Needed** 07/02/2018 **Till The** 27/02/2018 **PDF Answers File Link** 07/02/2018 **Till The** 27/02/2018 **Diary Link If Needed** 07/02/2018 **Till The** 27/02/2018 **Diary Link If Needed** 07/02/2018 **Till The** 27/02/2018	**Finding 208:**	• **The 2ND Injunction Order** **Start Date** 10/01/2018. **End Date** 09/08/2018.
DOCX Answers File Link 28/02/2018 **Diary Link If Needed**	**Finding 209:**	

28/02/2018 **PDF Answers File Link** 28/02/2018 **Diary Link If Needed** 28/02/2018		
DOCX Answers File Link 01/03/2018 **Till The** 01/05/2018 **Diary Link If Needed** 01/03/2018 **Till The** 01/05/2018 **PDF Answers File Link** 01/03/2018 **Till The** 01/05/2018 **Diary Link If Needed** 01/03/2018 **Till The** 01/05/2018	**Finding 210:**	• **The 2ND Injunction Order** **Start Date** 10/01/2018. **End Date** 09/08/2018.

DOCX Answers File Link 02/05/2018 **Diary Link If Needed** 02/05/2018 **PDF Answers File Link** 02/05/2018 **Diary Link If Needed** 02/05/2018	**Finding 211:**	
DOCX Answers File Link 03/05/2018 **Till The** 18/05/2018 **Diary Link If Needed** 03/05/2018 **Till The** 18/05/2018 **PDF Answers File Link** 03/05/2018 **Till The** 18/05/2018	**Finding 212:**	• **The 2ND Injunction Order** **Start Date** 10/01/2018. **End Date** 09/08/2018.

Diary Link If Needed 03/05/2018 **Till The** 18/05/2018		
DOCX Answers File Link 19/05/2018 **Diary Link If Needed** 19/05/2018 **PDF Answers File Link** 19/05/2018 **Diary Link If Needed** 19/05/2018	**Finding 213:**	
DOCX Answers File Link 20/05/2018 **Diary Link If Needed** 20/05/2018 **PDF Answers File Link** 20/05/2018	**Finding 214:**	

Diary Link If Needed 20/05/2018		
DOCX Answers File Link 21/05/2018 **Till The** 29/05/2018 **Diary Link If Needed** 21/05/2018 **Till The** 29/05/2018 **PDF Answers File Link** 21/05/2018 **Till The** 29/05/2018 **Diary Link If Needed** 21/05/2018 **Till The** 29/05/2018 **Diary Link If Needed** 21/05/2018 **Till The** 29/05/2018	**Finding 215:**	• **The 2ND Injunction Order** **Start Date** 10/01/2018. **End Date** 09/08/2018.
DOCX Answers File Link 30/05/2018 **Diary Link If Needed**	**Finding 216:**	

30/05/2018 **PDF Answers File Link** 30/05/2018 **Diary Link If Needed** 30/05/2018		
DOCX Answers File Link 31/05/2018 **Diary Link If Needed** 31/05/2018 **PDF Answers File Link** 31/05/2018 **Diary Link If Needed** 31/05/2018	**Finding 217:**	
DOCX Answers File Link 01/06/2018 **Till The** 04/06/2018 **Diary Link If Needed** 01/06/2018	**Finding 218:**	• **The 2ND Injunction Order** **Start Date** 10/01/2018. **End Date** 09/08/2018.

Till The 04/06/2018 **PDF Answers File Link** 01/06/2018 **Till The** 04/06/2018 **Diary Link If Needed** 01/06/2018 **Till The** 04/06/2018		
DOCX Answers File Link 05/06/2018 **Diary Link If Needed** 05/06/2018 **PDF Answers File Link** 05/06/2018 **Diary Link If Needed** 05/06/2018	**Finding 219:**	
DOCX Answers File Link 06/06/2018 **Til the**	**Finding 220:**	• **The 2ND Injunction Order** **Start Date** 10/01/2018. **End Date** 09/08/2018.

24/06/2018 **Diary Link If Needed** 06/06/2018 **Til the** 24/06/2018 **PDF Answers File Link** 06/06/2018 **Til the** 24/06/2018 **Diary Link If Needed** 06/06/2018 **Til the** 24/06/2018		
DOCX Answers File Link 25/06/2018 **Diary Link If Needed** 25/06/2018 **PDF Answers File Link** 25/06/2018 **Diary Link If Needed** 25/06/2018	**Finding 221:**	

DOCX Answers File Link 26/06/2018 **Diary Link If Needed** 26/06/2018 **PDF Answers File Link** 26/06/2018 **Diary Link If Needed** 26/06/2018	**Finding 222:**	• **The 2ND Injunction Order** **Start Date** 10/01/2018. **End Date** 09/08/2018. **--** **The 2nd Injunction "Indexed" by Order of the Judge** Said to be Served to me Date: **25/06/2018.** -- I received a New Update of Lemmy's Second Injunction Order Indexed 2. Mother went to the Edmonton Lower Court Due to Lemmy application for the second Injunction order. The Edmonton County Lower Court Judge ordered that I Have a Mental Health Assessment so that Lemmy and the Enfield Council could avoid Justice.
DOCX Answers File Link 28/06/2018 **Diary Link If Needed** 28/06/2018 **PDF Answers File Link** 28/06/2018 **Diary Link If Needed** 28/06/2018	**Finding 223:**	
DOCX Answers File Link	**Finding 224:**	• **The 2ND Injunction Order** **Start Date** 10/01/2018. **End Date** 09/08/2018.

29/06/2018 **Til the** 08/08/2018 **Diary Link If Needed** 29/06/2018 **Til the** 08/08/2018 **PDF Answers File Link** 29/06/2018 **Til the** 08/08/2018 **Diary Link If Needed** 29/06/2018 **Til the** 08/08/2018		
DOCX Answers File Link 09/08/2018 **Till** **Diary Link If Needed** 09/08/2018 **PDF Answers File Link** 09/08/2018	**Finding 225:**	

Diary Link If Needed 09/08/2018		
DOCX Answers File Link 15/10/2018 **Diary Link If Needed** 15/10/2018 **PDF Answers File Link** 15/10/2018 **Diary Link If Needed** 15/10/2018	**Finding 226:**	
DOCX Answers File Link 23/10/2018 **Diary Link If Needed** 23/10/2018 **PDF Answers File Link** 23/10/2018 **Diary Link If Needed** 23/10/2018	**Finding 227:**	• **The Housing transfers** I had asked Sarah Fletcher, my housing officer, on the date of 00/00/2016 for her help get me out of my flat by telephone. At this time, I was stuck in my flat for a forged Asbo, and I never realised that the neighborhood office and Enfield Council had built the Asbo with the police and was trying to stop me from uncovering the truth. I can remember calling Sarah Fletcher straight after I had gotten out of the St Ann's hospital, I was polite to her and explained to her all that had been going on in my life and why these things were relevant to an emergency housing transfer. While in st Ann's

DOCX Answers File Link 25/10/2018 **Diary Link If Needed** 25/10/2018 **PDF Answers File Link** 25/10/2018 **Diary Link If Needed** 25/10/2018	**Finding 228:**	**I got put in chase farm Mental hospital.** • **The Doctor's Folder / pub Book Issue: 1!** Stage 3 Folder: 3 **To: Chas Farm Hospital** Application by an Approved Mental Health Professional for Admission for Assessment Anthony Manning Page Numbers: 42,43 **42** **I am acting on behalf of Enfield Council** and am approved to act as an approved mental health professional for the purposes of the Act by [that authority] 43 Info **25/10/2018** I continued to work at home on my computer while waiting for my housing transfer. I understood that I had just won all the cases and that I could finally get the paperwork for the Asbo I over to the courts to get the last case overturned in my favor. While waiting I continued to get attacked by my neighbours and nothing was done to protect me.
DOCX Answers File Link 31/10/2018 **Diary Link If Needed** 31/10/2018 **PDF Answers File Link** 31/10/2018 **Diary Link If Needed** 31/10/2018	**Finding 229:**	• **I got released from chase farm Mental hospital.**
DOCX	**Finding 230:**	**My Birthday**

Answers File Link 26/01/2019 **Diary Link If Needed** 26/01/2019 **PDF Answers File Link** 26/01/2019 **Diary Link If Needed** 26/01/2019		H:\21-10-25\03. R-2014-and-Onwards\03. New 14 Onwards 17-09-26\01. Mini Split Diary and Findings Sheets MAIN/01.%20Diary12%20Years%20Admin/15%202019.docx #g26_01_2019
DOCX Answers File Link 06/02/2019 **Diary Link If Needed** 06/02/2019 **PDF Answers File Link** 06/02/2019 **Diary Link If Needed** 06/02/2019	**Finding 231:**	➢ **2nd Possession Order! 06/02/2019** I have good news in that the Council have decided not to pursue the case further due to a lack of recent incidents. Please see attached their letter received recently and our letter dated **22 October 2019** sent to your son. **++++**
DOCX Answers File Link 07/02/2019 **Till The**	**Finding 232:**	➢ **2nd Possession Order! 06/02/2019** I have good news in that the Council have decided not to pursue the case further due to a lack of recent incidents. Please see attached their letter received recently and our letter dated **22 October 2019** sent to your son.

Diary Link If Needed 07/02/2019 **Till The** **PDF Answers File Link** 07/02/2019 **Till The** **Diary Link If Needed** 07/02/2019 **Till The**		
DOCX Answers File Link 17/02/2019 **Diary Link If Needed** 17/02/2019 **PDF Answers File Link** 17/02/2019 **Diary Link If Needed** 17/02/2019	**Finding 233:**	
DOCX Answers File Link 18/06/2019	**Finding 234:**	

Diary Link If Needed 18/06/2019 **PDF Answers File Link** 18/06/2019 **Diary Link If Needed** 18/06/2019		
DOCX Answers File Link 27/06/2019 **Diary Link If Needed** 27/06/2019 **PDF Answers File Link** 27/06/2019 **Diary Link If Needed** 27/06/2019	**Finding 235:**	
DOCX Answers File Link 28/06/2019 **Till the** 22/10/2019	**Finding 236:**	

Diary Link If Needed 28/06/2019 **Till the** 22/10/2019 **PDF Answers File Link** 28/06/2019 **Till the** 22/10/2019 **Diary Link If Needed** 28/06/2019 **Till the** 22/10/2019		
DOCX Answers File Link 27/06/2020 **Diary Link If Needed** 27/06/2020 **PDF Answers File Link** 27/06/2020 **Diary Link If Needed** 27/06/2020	**Finding 237:**	

DOCX Answers File Link 04/08/2020 **Diary Link If Needed** 04/08/2020 **PDF Answers File Link** 04/08/2020 **Diary Link If Needed** 04/08/2020	**Finding 238:**	• **The Asbo dates** PC Sophie Theodoulou Police Officer Who Lied and said that she Served me the First Asbo Folder! **Page Numbers:** 57,58 12/09/2014 -- **Asbo Granted** 04/08/2015. **End of Asbo Court Order - 04/08/2020** The Forged Asbo conditions placed upon me finished but I could never go out ever again to a party in case I got set up again by the police and the Council! **End:**
DOCX Answers File Link 11/05/2021 **Diary Link If Needed** 11/05/2021 **PDF Answers File Link** 11/05/2021 **Diary Link If Needed** 11/05/2021	**Finding 239:**	• 117 started picking on me so I went upstairs to ask them to stop, and her mother and younger sister were upstairs with her, and they told the police that I had a knife on me.
DOCX Answers File Link 12/05/2021	**Finding 240:**	• **Arrested at home because of 117**

Diary Link If Needed 12/05/2021 **PDF Answers File Link** 12/05/2021 **Diary Link If Needed** 12/05/2021		
DOCX Answers File Link 13/05/2021 **Diary Link If Needed** 13/05/2021 **PDF Answers File Link** 13/05/2021 **Diary Link If Needed** 13/05/2021	**Finding 241:**	• **Set up by the custody officer and the doctors at the police station again Wood Green.**
DOCX Answers File Link 14/05/2021 **Till the** 19/05/2021	**Finding 242:**	➢ **Police Bail Conditions because of 117 Burncroft Avenue Enfield London** Tenant and mother and the arresting police office

Diary Link If Needed 14/05/2021 **Till the** 19/05/2021 **PDF Answers File Link** 14/05/2021 **Till the** 19/05/2021 **Diary Link If Needed** 14/05/2021 **Till the** 19/05/2021		
DOCX Answers File Link 20/05/2021 **Diary Link If Needed** 20/05/2021 **PDF Answers File Link** 20/05/2021 **Diary Link If Needed** 20/05/2021	**Finding 243:**	➢ **Police Bail Conditions because of 117 Burncroft Avenue Enfield London** Tenant and mother and the arresting police office • **117 left Burncroft Avenue for good stuff in the bins**

DOCX Answers File Link 21/05/2021 **Till the** 08/06/2021 **Diary Link If Needed** 21/05/2021 **Till the** 08/06/2021 **PDF Answers File Link** 21/05/2021 **Till the** 08/06/2021 **Diary Link If Needed** 21/05/2021 **Till the** 08/06/2021	**Finding 244:**	➢ **Police bail Conditions because of 117 Burncroft Avenue Enfield London** Tenant and mother and the arresting police office.
DOCX Answers File Link 22/06/2021 **Diary Link If Needed** 22/06/2021 **PDF Answers File Link**	**Finding 245:**	**In doors working on what happened to me.**

22/06/2021 **Diary Link If Needed** 22/06/2021		
DOCX Answers File Link 24/06/2021 **Diary Link If Needed** 24/06/2021 **PDF Answers File Link** 24/06/2021 **Diary Link If Needed** 24/06/2021	**Finding 246:**	**No more corvid restrictions**
	Finding 247:	
	Finding 248:	
	Finding 249:	
	Finding 250:	
	Finding 251:	
	Finding 252:	

	Finding 253:	
	Finding 254:	
	Finding 255:	
	Finding 256:	
	Finding 257:	
	Finding 258:	
	Finding 259:	
	Finding 260:	
	Finding 261:	
	Finding 262:	
	Finding 263:	
	Finding 264:	
	Finding 265:	
	Finding 266:	
	Finding 267:	
	Finding 268:	

	Finding 269:	
	Finding 270:	
	Finding 271:	
	Finding 272:	
	Finding 273:	
	Finding 274:	
	Finding 275:	
	Finding 276:	
	Finding 277:	
	Finding 278:	
	Finding 279:	
	Finding 280:	
	Finding 281:	
	Finding 282:	
	Finding 283:	
	Finding 284:	

	Finding 285:	
	Finding 286:	
	Finding 287:	
	Finding 288:	
	Finding 289:	
	Finding 290:	
	Finding 291:	
	Finding 292:	
	Finding 293:	
	Finding 294:	
	Finding 295:	
	Finding 296:	
	Finding 297:	
	Finding 298:	
	Finding 299:	
	Finding 300:	

	Finding 301:	
	Finding 302:	
	Finding 303:	
	Finding 304:	
	Finding 305:	
	Finding 306:	
	Finding 307:	
	Finding 308:	
	Finding 309:	
	Finding 310:	
	Finding 311:	
	Finding 312:	
	Finding 313:	
	Finding 314:	
	Finding 315:	
	Finding 316:	

	Finding 317:	
	Finding 318:	
	Finding 319:	
	Finding 320:	
	Finding 321:	
	Finding 322:	
	Finding 323:	
	Finding 324:	
	Finding 325:	
	Finding 326:	
	Finding 327:	
	Finding 328:	
	Finding 329:	
	Finding 330:	
	Finding 331:	
	Finding 332:	

	Finding 333:	
	Finding 334:	
	Finding 335:	
	Finding 336:	
	Finding 337:	
	Finding 338:	
	Finding 339:	
	Finding 340:	
	Finding 341:	
	Finding 342:	
	Finding 343:	
	Finding 344:	
	Finding 345:	
	Finding 346:	
	Finding 347:	
	Finding 348:	

	Finding 349:	
	Finding 350:	
	Finding 351:	
	Finding 352:	
	Finding 353:	
	Finding 354:	
	Finding 355:	
	Finding 356:	
	Finding 357:	
	Finding 358:	
	Finding 359:	
	Finding 360:	
	Finding 361:	
	Finding 362:	
	Finding 363:	
	Finding 364:	

	Finding 365:	
	Finding 366:	
	Finding 367:	
	Finding 368:	
	Finding 369:	
	Finding 370:	
	Finding 371:	
	Finding 372:	
	Finding 373:	
	Finding 374:	
	Finding 375:	
	Finding 376:	
	Finding 377:	
	Finding 378:	
	Finding 379:	
	Finding 380:	

	Finding 381:	
	Finding 382:	
	Finding 383:	
	Finding 384:	
	Finding 385:	
	Finding 386:	
	Finding 387:	
	Finding 388:	
	Finding 389:	
	Finding 390:	
	Finding 391:	
	Finding 392:	
	Finding 393:	
	Finding 394:	
	Finding 395:	
	Finding 396:	

	Finding 397:	
	Finding 398:	
	Finding 399:	
	Finding 400:	