From: Lorraine Cordell <lorraine32@blueyonder.co.uk>
Sent: 25 October 2018 14:48
To: Nawal@stuartmillersolicitors.co.uk
Subject: Fwd: (DPS:1:CR:326592:9V) Simon's Assessment Report
Attachments: image001.jpg; ATT00164.htm; image002.jpg; ATT00167.htm; image003.jpg; ATT00170.htm; image004.jpg; ATT00173.htm; image005.jpg; ATT00176.htm; image006.png; ATT00179.htm; image007.png; ATT00182.htm; ATT00185.pdf; ATT00188.htm

Hi Nawal

Pls see report for simon

Lorraine

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

> **From:** Trishna Kerai <Trishna@stuartmillersolicitors.co.uk>
> **Date:** 20 July 2018 at 16:28:13 BST
> **To:** 'Lorraine Cordell' <lorraine32@blueyonder.co.uk>
> **Subject: (DPS:1:CR:326592:9V) Simon's Assessment Report**
>
> Dear Lorraine,
>
> Please find attached Simon's medical assessment report. Please note that this works in our favour as it will allow us to possibly get rid of the Injunction Order completely.
>
> Kind regards,
>
> Trishna Kerai | Caseworker | Magistrates Court Department
> T: 0208 888 5225 M: 07790 993 860
> E: trishna@stuartmillersolicitors.co.uk
> W: www.stuartmillersolicitors.co.uk

STUARTMILLER
Solicitors
Fraud | Cybercrime | Criminal Defence

LEGAL 500
MODERN LAW AWARDS 17/18
SHORTLISTED
CRIME TEAM OF THE YEAR
CELEBRATING EXCELLENCE
SHORTLISTED
Lexcel
INVESTORS IN PEOPLE
Modern LAW Awards 2016
SHORTLISTED
Crime Team of the Year
LEGAL 500

The information in this email is confidential and may be legally privileged. It is intended solely for the addressee and access to this email by anyone else is unauthorised. Any views or opinions presented are those of the author only and do not necessarily represent those of Stuart Miller Solicitors. If you are not the intended recipient; any disclosure, copying, distribution or any action taken in reliance of this email or attachments, is prohibited and may be unlawful. To avoid incurring legal liabilities, you must not distribute or copy the information in this email without the express permission of the sender. When addressed to our clients, any opinions or advice contained in this email or attachments are subject to the terms and conditions expressed in the governing client engagement letter or contract and terms of business. If you have received this email in error please notify Stuart Miller Solicitors by telephone on 020 8888 5225, by fax on 020 8889 5871 or by email at info@stuartmillersolicitors.co.uk Stuart Miller Solicitors do not accept service of documents by email. The security of this email and any attachments cannot be guaranteed. It is your responsibility to take all necessary steps to ensure this email and any attachments or transmissions are free from viruses. Stuart Miller Solicitors do not accept any responsibility for damage incurred as a result of internet transmissions and viruses. Only the Directors are authorised to conclude binding agreements on behalf of Stuart Miller Solicitors by email. Stuart Miller Solicitors do not accept responsibility for unauthorised agreements reached with other employees or agents. Stuart Miller Solicitors may use your personal data for marketing purposes. If you do not want us to use your personal data and contact you by electronic means and / or by post, please opt-out by emailing us at info@stuartmillersolicitors.co.uk Stuart Miller Solicitors Limited is authorised and regulated by the Solicitors Regulation Authority (ID No. 533277). Stuart Miller Solicitors is a trading name for Stuart Miller Solicitors Limited. Incorporated in England & Wales (Company No. 07161343). Stuart Miller Solicitors is a VAT registered company (VAT No. 990 0197 14).

ENFIELD Connected

ENFIELD Council

Please reply to: Legal Services
PO Box 50, Civic Centre
Silver Street,
Enfield EN1 3XA

E-mail: Ludmilla.lyavoo@enfield.gov.uk
Phone: 0208 379 8323
DX: 90615 Enfield 1
Fax: 0208 379 6492
My Ref: LS/C/LI/155584
Your Ref:
Date: 10th July, 2018

Edmonton County Court
DX 136686 Edmonton 3

Also by email

Dear Sirs **URGENT**

Re: The London Borough of Enfield v Cordell
Claim number: E00ED049- Edmonton County Court

We write further to the Order made by District Judge Dias following the hearing on 26th June 2018.

Paragraph 1 of the order states the following: *'By 4pm on 10 July 2018 the Defendant shall undergo a mental capacity assessment by a Consultant Psychiatrist at an appointment to be arranged of which the Defendant shall be given at least 24 hours' notice and a report shall be prepared in relation to the Defendant's capacity to litigate and capacity to understand the meaning of the interim injunction dated 09 January 2018 and that report shall be filed at court and served on each party to the litigation'.*

We confirm that the Defendant was assessed by Dr Dhinakaran, a psychiatrist consultant on 5th July 2018. A copy of her assessment report is attached to this email and it confirms that the Defendant lacks capacity to litigate/ understand the terms of the injunction order.

The Claimant was also directed to file a witness statement in response to this assessment if so advised by 10th July 2018. We confirm that the Claimant has no comments to make at this stage. We have asked the Defendant's solicitors to contact the Enfield Assessment Mental Health team and instruct them to release the Defendant's medical documents so the Claimant could consider them and make further comments. However we have had no confirmation from the Defendant's solicitors as to whether the Defendant has provided the relevant consent and we therefore reserve the right to make further submissions until these documents are received by the Claimant.

Yours faithfully,

Ludmilla Iyavoo
Lawyer
For the Director of Law and Governance

Psychiatric Report On
Mr Simon Cordell
109 Burncroft Avenue
Enfield EN3 7JQ

1. Introduction

This report is prepared at the request of London Borough of Enfield, Antisocial Behaviour Team following directions from the Edmonton County Court to undertake an assessment on Mr Cordell. My instructions were received in a letter dated 5 July 2018 and outlined as below:

1. Whether the defendant has the mental capacity to litigate and give instructions in his defence.
2. Whether the defendant understands the terms of the injunction order dated 9 January 2018.

2. Details of current proceedings

The current proceedings relate to an interim injunction order issued against Mr Cordell, at the Edmonton County Court on 9 January 2018. This followed numerous complaints from neighbours about Mr Cordell's acts of harassment and antisocial behaviour. However it has been reported that Mr Cordell has continued to breach the order. It has been reported that a neighbour has been assaulted, harassed and has received threats from Mr Cordell. He has also made threats towards certain council employees. The local authority issued applications for committal due to Mr Cordell's breach of the injunction, however the applications could not be considered due to concerns about his mental capacity.

3. Sources of information

3.1 I was provided with the following information to aid in the assessment:

1. Claim form for an injunction with supporting documents
2. Order for an injunction dated 9.1.2018
3. Report of Angela Hague from the Enfield Assessment Team
4. Court order made by DJ Dias, Edmonton County Court at the hearing on 30.05.2018 and 26.6.2018.

3.2 I assessed Mr Cordell on 6 July 2018, at his flat 109 Burncroft Avenue, Enfield EN3 7JQ, accompanied by two officers from the Enfield Housing Team. I can confirm that prior to my assessment; I explained to Mr Cordell my role and the purpose of my visit. I also explained to him that I was acting on the instructions of the Enfield Council at the directions of the Court.

4. Assessment of Mr Cordell

4.1 Mr Cordell spoke to us for a few minutes outside his flat and upon explaining the purpose of the visit, he allowed us into his flat. He agreed to tie the dog outside in the garden. The flat although disorganised with papers and folders scattered around, did not appear overly cluttered. Mr Cordell presented as a young, slim built, mixed race male with reasonable hygiene. We explained our roles and the purpose of our visit. Mr Cordell informed us that he was recording our conversation.

4.2 Mr Cordell seemed very keen and enthusiastic to talk and we had to explain the reason of our visit several times to maintain some structure and focus. He maintained appropriate eye contact and we managed to establish a rapport after a while. His demeanour was polite and appropriate. There was evidence of psychomotor agitation as he appeared generally restless and overactive. Mr Cordell described his appetite and sleep pattern as fine. Objectively I would regard his mood as labile, rapidly fluctuating between euthymia (normal mood) and irritability.

4.3 Mr Cordell's comprehension of information presented to him appeared adequate. He was able to understand the queries presented to him. His responses however were very elaborate and circumstantial. His speech was very pressured, difficult to interrupt and at times frankly rambling. There was clear evidence of thought disorder with flight of ideas (rapid shift of ideas with some superficial apparent connection). Mr Cordell struggled to sustain his goal of thinking as he often derailed to themes of relevance to him, digressing away from the topic of discussion. It was very difficult to obtain a direct response to the queries posed to him and follow his thread of conversation.

4.4. Mr Cordell's thought content was replete with various delusional beliefs of persecutory and grandiose nature. He spoke of an elaborate conspiracy which involves the Enfield local authority and the metropolitan police, dating back since 2013, when he claimed that he was arrested for putting up a gazebo in his garden which led to him being barred from visiting

places in central London and placed on a curfew from 10 pm. Mr Cordell informed that he followed these restrictions imposed on him for about a year and returned to Court and won the case. Mr Cordell then went on to talk about Sally Gillcrest, the legal executive for the metropolitan police who he alleged set him up for a million pounds and brought on an ASBO against him, which ended with him being imposed on a nine year curfew. Mr Cordell stated that Sally Gillcrest in conjunction with the borough commander Jane Johnson and the community officer started spreading rumours that he was "*suffering from herpes and has hurt a woman"* which the neighbours in his block became aware of and started sending him messages addressing him as "*you black boy*". Mr Cordell implied that Sally Gillcrest colluded with the neighbours as she had a vested interest in getting him out of this country. He stated that the neighbours above him deliberately bang on his ceiling and have also subject him to other forms of harassment since 2014. Mr Cordell implied that the neighbours were responsible for the miscarriage suffered by his then girlfriend and also held them responsible for the separation from his previous girlfriends. He further stated that between 2014 and 2016, his mother has made numerous complaints to the council regarding the harassment he has been subject to and he has won a criminal case against his neighbours

4.5 Mr Cordell then went on to elaborate his grievance against Lemmi, the officer who works for the Enfield local authority. He claimed that he received an email from Lemmi threatening that he would obtain a possession order against him and asking him to attend a meeting. He then stated that the ASBO that was served against him was not valid due to lack of signature. Therefore Lemmi built a false case against him by using "*lower grade cases*" to pursue a possession order and subsequently an injunction order, by falsifying statements and using "*statements from dead cases".* According to Mr Cordell this was declared as invalid by a Judge, however Lemmi has continued to produce false orders against him in the way of a second injunction, which he claimed has never been served on him. Mr Cordell described this as *"targeted malice*" by Lemmi as he has used the injunction as a smoke screen to cover up the ASBO by providing false statements and witnesses.

4.6 In addition, Mr Cordell also described a number of grandiose beliefs, stating that he was building a constitution on CIC, which he explained to be Community Interest Company. He also spoke of a number of other businesses. He was keen to show us the various documents, emails and recordings he has accrued as evidence to support his case.

5. Opinion and Recommendations

Mr Cordell is a resident at the Enfield borough, who was served an injunction on 9 January 2018, following numerous complaints by his neighbours of antisocial behaviour and harassment. Despite this, Mr Cordell has continued to breach the order with further incidents of harassment, threats and assault against the neighbours. In addition, it has been reported that some council employees have also received threats from Mr Cordell. According to available information, Mr Cordell has had sporadic contact with the mental health services and has been recently assessed by the Enfield Mental Health Assessment Service. During my assessment, Mr Cordell was preoccupied with a number of persecutory and grandiose delusional beliefs. In addition, he also presented with other symptoms such as labile mood, pressured speech, overactivity and flight of ideas. In my view, Mr Cordell's current presentation is consistent with Schizoaffective Disorder, which is recognised as an enduring mental illness.

I have received specific instructions to address the following issues:

1. Whether Mr Cordell has the mental capacity to litigate and give instructions to his defence?

As highlighted above, Mr Cordell's mental state is replete with complex persecutory delusional belief system. During my assessment, Mr Cordell was convinced that the local authority and the police have been colluding alongside his neighbours to pursue false claims and allegations against him. In his view, the possession order and the injunction order were based on false statements, created against him and this did not stand up in Court and therefore an injunction was not issued against him. In my view, although there are no significant deficits in Mr Cordell's comprehension or retention of information, his ability to process information relevant to the current proceedings is likely to be influenced by his underlying delusional beliefs. During my interaction, it was evident that his interpretation of events and actions of others are influenced by his abnormal beliefs. Mr Cordell perceives himself as a victim and is aggrieved by the injustice carried out against him. In my view, Mr Cordell's ability to weigh the information relevant to the current proceedings is impaired due to his tendency to misinterpret any information presented to him to fit into his entrenched persecutory delusional beliefs. Moreover Mr Cordell presents with significant thought disorder and it is unlikely that he will be able to give coherent instructions to the defence.

It is therefore my opinion that Mr Cordell lacks capacity to litigate and give appropriate instructions to the defence.

2. Whether Mr Cordell understands the terms of the injunction order dated 9 January 2018?

Mr Cordell is currently suffering from symptoms of Schizoaffective Disorder and presents with florid psychotic symptoms. His thinking and behaviour are influenced by his underlying persecutory beliefs. Mr Cordell is convinced that the injunction order is a cover up by the local authority for the errors and mistakes of the ASBO and therefore did not stand up in Court. Mr Cordell is convinced that the injunction order has been falsified by certain individuals (particularly Lemmi possibly in conjunction with others). He therefore does not value the order or the contents contained within it. In my opinion Mr Cordell's capacity to process the information relevant to the order is again impacted by his delusional beliefs.



Dr Dhara Dinakaran, MBBS, MSc, MRCPsych
Consultant Psychiatrist
Approved under Section 12 (2) of MHA

08.07.2018