

From: Lorraine Cordell [lorraine32@blueyonder.co.uk]
Sent: 17 December 2013 11:02
To: 'josephinewardsolicitor@gmail.com'
Subject: RE: Meeting with barristerSimon Cordell
Hi Josey

Can we get an update to Simon case please and as to what's going on with the barrister and if he cant do Simon case which Barrister Simon will be using please. And any update to the emails I sent yesterday to you,

Lorraine / Simon

From: Lorraine Cordell [mailto:lorraine32@blueyonder.co.uk]
Sent: 16 December 2013 13:06
To: 'josephinewardsolicitor@gmail.com'
Subject: FW: Meeting with barristerSimon Cordell

Hi Josey

Please still read the below email.

But I also forgot to say that the barrister also said Simon needs to go over the tapes of his interview and highlight and mark anything that is wrong.

Also can I ask will the PNC check be updated as Simon has been found not guilty for at least 4 of the cases that show on there? So his last case should show as 2009.

Lorraine

From: Lorraine Cordell [mailto:lorraine32@blueyonder.co.uk]
Sent: 16 December 2013 12:43
To: 'JOSEPHINE WARD'
Subject: RE: Meeting with barristerSimon Cordell

Hello Josey

After Simon went to see the barrister on 13/12/2013 the barrister cannot do anything for Simon until at least 18/12/2013 as he is on a next case.

He also did not know anything about Simon case and had not had any papers from you.

He has asked Simon for some information here is the list

Anything from 16/02/2013 case including all

- All Cads
- List of items that were taken
- List of all damage to building
- And anything else to do with that case
- All crime scene pictures
- And any insurance claims

He also said he will need the same for the 04/05/2013 case

- All Cads
- List of items that were taken
- List of damage to building
- And anything else for that case

And any insurance claims

As the invoices that have been given are hear say due to the fact the guy would need proof that these items where still in fact inside the warehouse

He does not seem to understand when this went to court and the judge said that we can't have this information. So could you please talk with him and update him as to what has gone on at the court, as we did not know until last week that the judge had said this we cant have this information.

But at any case it seems the barrister needs updating about this case as he does not know anything and did not even understand why Simon had gone to see him when he was on a case already which was going to over run till this week at some point, but not before Wednesday. And Simon case is in the WL from 16/12/2013.

From what we have found out when Simon called the insurance company the claim for the insurance that was put in was only for the building and no content.

Simon called them on the 13/12/2013 and talked to someone as Nikki Diamond was not due back in the office until 16/12 2013.

The insurance company did tell |Simon both claims have been put into one as from what the lady could see who looked up the claim REF could see no one from the insurance saw the damage to the building until after 04/05/2013 which should not come down to Simon as Simon did not cause any damage on the build at any time.

Insurance details

Cunningham Lindsey

Person dealing with claim is Nikki Diamond **claim** ref 5005393

Address: Aquila House, 35 London Rd, Redhill, Surrey RH1 1NJ

Phone: 01737 784600

Email: nikki.diamond@cl-uk.com

They asked Simon to send anything over to them and if he had anything for the Feb 2013 case can he send any information over for this, and that Nikki Diamond would get it on Monday and to include a contact number that she can get hold of us.

He also asked about 3rd party discloser and was told Nikki Diamond could deal with this.

Many Thanks

Lorraine

From: JOSEPHINE WARD [mailto:josephinewardsolicitor@gmail.com]

Sent: 03 December 2013 02:41

To: Lorraine Cordell

Subject: Re: CPS response to secondary disclosure and confirmation of conference

Hi Lorraine

I am working through my emails slowly and by priority at the moment. I will endeavour to deal with this by Wednesday at the latest. I have been on duty all weekend and today I was in the police station from 9.30am until after midnight. I am aware of the documents being duplicated also. I will deal with each point you raise in due course.

Regards

Josephine

On Mon, Dec 2, 2013 at 2:57 PM, Lorraine Cordell <lorraine32@blueyonder.co.uk> wrote:
Hi Josey

I tried to call you today re Simon case not sure if you got the below email so I will send this again over to you.

There are some points I really do not understand and until the crown gives us information as to this it does seem to me that Simon case at court has the claim for Feb 2013 case in it as they are not giving a list of what was taken.

1. Both the invoices from Li-Lo Leisure products Ltd that have been given for Simon Case in May 2013 and the information that the crown has just given you are the same.
2. On the invoices the address that the items in the invoice was not delivered to the address the party was held in, in Feb 2013 and also May 2013 they were delivered to Marks wholesale which is a big shop, so how did they get to the address the party was held in I am sure Marks wholesale would have storage space and it does seem very funny that they would move items that were ordered to sell at one of his large shops?
3. There has never been a list of items that Mr Petal said was taken in May just an invoice so is Mr Petal saying that all the items on the list was taken at the party in May 2013
4. So far we do not even know the list of items that were taken in Feb 2013, and seeing at Mr Petal seems to be using the same invoice for both dates there should be 2 lists of items that were taken
5. What was the cost of the damage to the building in Feb 2013 as it seems from the emails Mr Petal has listed from his insurance they have put both claims into one which in fact would then go over to the date Simon hired his sound system out in May 2013-12-02
6. Why did the insurance company not pay the Feb 2013 claim out till after the claim in May 2013? Why did they only pay out after the May 2013 claim is it due that someone was arrested and they could put both claims over to the court case of Simon. As if you look at the dates of the insurance part it does not make any sense as the last date shows April 2013 yet it says they are paying out both claims, how could they pay out both claims when the party in May had not even happened yet. Or is it the case there was a next party after Feb 2013 and before May 2013.
7. What was the costs of damage to the building in Feb 2013 and the value of the items taken.
8. What was the damage to the building in May 2013 and the value of the items taken.

In short how could the property have been stolen in May 2013 if it had already been stolen in Feb 2013 as the invoice is the same?

Also the damage to the building from Feb 2013 seems to have been added to the costs to the May 2013 but yet Simon has not been charged with the party in Feb 2013.

It seems they have mixed both cases together and Simon is taking the blame for all of it within the costs.

The Crown does need to give us all the information to the Feb 2013 case including pictures so we can see ourselves the damage to the building and they need to tell us if anyone was charged in Feb 2013 and what was the outcome.

If the crown does not do this then this is an unfair trial they will be holding as to Simon case.

Also we need to see all the insurance claims to see the total costs of damage in Feb 2013 and also for the claim in May 2013 and the reasons as to why both cases have been linked together by the insurance company.

Also where is the insurance claim for the items within the warehouse that was meant to have been taken as so far I can only see a claim for the damage to the building?

Any claim would need to include a list of the items that were taken and would need to be replaced. Someone cannot just come up with a figure of a cost for items that were taken and so far it seems as if that has what has been done in both cases Feb 2013 and May 2013.

Lorraine / Simon

From: Lorraine Cordell [mailto:lorraine32@blueyonder.co.uk]
Sent: 28 November 2013 19:54
To: 'JOSEPHINE WARD'
Subject: RE: CPS response to secondary disclosure and confirmation of conference

Hi Josey

Thank you for the email I just got it so will let Simon look over this tomorrow.

Can I ask something the receipt from Li-Lo Leisure is that the receipt for the 16/02/2013 or the 04/05/2013 as it seems to be the same receipt.

What we want is a full list of items and amounts that were taken on the 04/05/2013 and also the same for the 16/02/2013 someone can't say an amount in £s of damage and items were taken yet not have a full list, or are they saying on each of the receipts for the 04/05/2013 and the 16/02/2013 all of the items listed on the receipts were taken it does not make sense as they seem to be the same receipts. There is also no invoices for the repair of the damage on the 16/02/2013 or the 04/05/2013 for someone to come up with the amounts that they have for the damages to the this so called building on the 04/05/2013, Which he would have had to get invoices for his insurance companies.

Also there is no information as to really anything for the 16/02/2013, And no information as to the people that were arrested and what happened to them.

There is also nothing to show any work was carried out on the building from 16/02/2013 so show anything was fixed as I am sure there should have been.

There is far too much data that is missing.

And I wonder why how can a police officer not have any full lists of items that were taken yet be able to have a total amount of damage that were caused how could they come to these sums?

There seems to me a lot in this case is being covered up by the police and I would like this addressed as how can someone have a fair trial without the full facts.

Lorraine

From: JOSEPHINE WARD [mailto:josephinewardsolicitor@gmail.com]
Sent: 28 November 2013 17:30
To: too smooth; Lorraine Cordell
Subject: CPS response to secondary disclosure and confirmation of conference

Dear Simon / Lorraine

Please see the CPS response to our defence case statement. This was received in the DX today. It does not advance our case.

I am also confirming that your barrister can only do a conference on 12th December 2013 at 10am at Nexus Chambers. He has personal appointments tomorrow and can not as previously advised to a conference at Croydon Crown Court. I have therefore booked a fixed conference for 12th December 2013 at 10am at Nexus Chambers so that he will not be caught up in a trial and there is no risk of you breaching your curfew.

Before that date I would also like to finalise your proof of evidence and I would hope to do that Tuesday afternoon or the following Monday.

Please do not hesitate to contact me should you have any further questions regarding this case.

Regards

Josephine