



Re: Subject: Urgent Defence Complaint and Disclosure Request – Case Ref: 01YE1300125
From: Rewired Rewired (re_wired@ymail.com)
To: contactcivil@justice.gov.uk; windelen@tuckerssolicitors.com; info@tuckerssolicitors.com; tuckers@tuckerssolicitors.com
Date: Wednesday 8 October 2025 at 12:39 BST



Disclosure Follow-Up: Misrepresentation, Collusion, and Legal Breach

Please reply, as I do not deserve to be treated this way—nor to be set up, as the attached file clearly demonstrates through coordinated actions by police and Rebecca O’Hare. I regret that I omitted this document from my previous email, where it should have been included as part of my formal disclosure request. This file is still being updated in accordance with prior instructions, and its contents remain central to my defence.



What the Attached File Contains

This document includes timestamped screenshots, mobile phone records, spatial overlays, and contradiction maps that expose:



Police Misconduct and Identity Contradictions

- **PC Calvin Chan** is listed under **two badge numbers**:
 - **1405NA** in PC Obsiye’s statement
 - **2464NA** in PC Williams’s and PC Wilson-Wallis’s statementsThis discrepancy undermines the integrity of the arrest record and raises serious concerns about identity misattribution and procedural cover-up.
- **Chan’s role is actively suppressed** in Wilson-Wallis’s account:
 - He refers only to “2464NA” without naming Chan
 - He implies Chan was passive, despite Chan’s own statement confirming he used the enforcer, drew his taser, and initiated physical contact
- **PC Obsiye (1543NA)** claims to have arrested me for **harassment**, yet all subsequent documentation—including the charge sheet—lists **Threats to Cause Criminal Damage**, which was never mentioned at the time of arrest
- **PC Williams (1675NA)** confirms Chan led the breach and drew his taser, contradicting Wilson-Wallis’s implication that Chan was not leading
- **PC Wilson-Wallis (1456NA)** introduces **PC 2546NA**, an officer not mentioned in any other statement, suggesting either fabrication or undocumented presence
- **Additional officers NA22N and NA1L** are described as taking over due to my distress, yet their actions are not documented—raising concerns about undocumented handovers and accountability gaps



Legal Breach: Charge Substitution and O’Hara v RUC

The arrest was explicitly for **harassment**, as confirmed by:

- PC Chan’s statement: “PC Obsiye arrested Simon through the door for harassment”
- PC Obsiye’s statement: “I arrested the suspect... and gave the grounds as harassment”
- PC Williams’s statement: “PC Obsiye explained to the resident... they were under arrest and cautioned them through the door”

Yet the charge later substituted was **Threats to Cause Criminal Damage**, which was **never articulated at the time of arrest**.

This violates the legal precedent set in **O’Hara v Chief Constable of the RUC (House of Lords, 1997)**, which ruled:

“Suspicion by itself will not justify an arrest. There must be a factual basis for it... and the arresting officer must be able to articulate what offence they believed was being committed.”

In plain terms:

- You cannot arrest someone for one offence and later switch it to another
- The arresting officer must clearly state the offence at the time—not retroactively
- In your case, **all officers stated harassment**, yet the charge was substituted without legal basis

This is not a technical error, it is a **procedural breach** that invalidates the arrest and undermines the legitimacy of the prosecution.



Coordinated Harassment and Collusion

- **Rebecca O’Hare’s involvement is central:**

- Just Eat order logs place her near the property during key incidents
- Mobile screenshots confirm her coordination with known associates
- Council tenancy records show her unlawful occupation of Flat 115
- Surveillance footage and spatial overlays align her movements with police arrival times
- The file includes **architectural overlays and timestamped camera logs** showing:
 - Harassment from Flats 111, 113, 115, and 117
 - Shiftwork-style targeting by Christine Smith, Hassan Ozman, and John Irving
 - Police arrival times aligned with O'Hare's movements
- **Contradictions in O'Hare's statements** are mapped against police CAD logs and BWV metadata, exposing a pattern of escalation designed to provoke arrest.

Kind regards Your client Mr. Simon Paul Cordell.

Ps. Also I have not received a copy of my defence statement and my witness have still to be contacted by yourselves as I keep requesting and there is only 5 days left till trial, this is unfair!

On Tuesday 7 October 2025 at 18:10:48 BST, Rewired Rewired <re_wired@ymail.com> wrote:

----- Forwarded message -----

From: Rewired Rewired <re_wired@ymail.com>

To: windelen@tuckerssolicitors.com <windelen@tuckerssolicitors.com>; info@tuckerssolicitors.com <info@tuckerssolicitors.com>; tuckers@tuckerssolicitors.com <tuckers@tuckerssolicitors.com>; seniorcasemanager@legalaid.gov.uk <seniorcasemanager@legalaid.gov.uk>

Sent: Tuesday 7 October 2025 at 16:53:48 BST

Subject: Subject: Urgent Defence Complaint and Disclosure Request – Case Ref: 01YE1300125

Subject: Urgent Defence Complaint and Disclosure Request – Case Ref: 01YE1300125

To: Nichole Windele, Tuckers Solicitors; windelen@tuckerssolicitors.com; info@tuckerssolicitors.com; tuckers@tuckerssolicitors.com

CC: seniorcasemanager@legalaid.gov.uk; Legal Aid Agency.

And as needed to them by Nichole Windele, Tuckers Solicitors, Senior Case Manager, Legal Aid Agency to the: Crown Prosecution Service

Dear Nichole,

I am writing to formally escalate a series of unresolved procedural breaches and failures in legal representation that have critically undermined my ability to prepare a fair defence for the upcoming trial on **13 October 2025**.

Despite repeated communications—including my MG11 witness statement and supporting files sent via secure webserver on **7 August 2025**, and further emails throughout August and September—there has been no substantive response, no confirmation of receipt, and no disclosure of agreed materials. Legal aid was only granted on **Monday 1 September 2025 at 12:35 BST**, leaving an unreasonably short timeframe to prepare.

Our **first meeting took place on 2 October 2025**, as recorded in **36. Draft-Minutes-of-the-Meeting-02-10-25**. Following that, I made a direct telephone call on **6 October 2025 at 17:45**, seeking a response to my last four or five emails. To date, **none have been answered**, and **no disclosure has been provided** as previously agreed.

In that meeting, you stated that **you do not open weblinks sent by clients**, citing security concerns. This is procedurally unfair and inconsistent with the duty of disclosure and parity, especially as clients are required to open links and attachments from solicitors. My MG11 statement was refused as inadmissible, and a substitute version—barely explained and never disclosed to me—was taken instead. I have no knowledge of its contents and was denied the right to review or amend it.

I now formally request the following:

1. Disclosure of Body-Worn Video (BWV) Footage

Under the **Criminal Procedure and Investigations Act 1996**, I request full BWV recordings from:

- PC Chan (CKC/01)

- PC Obsiye (HAO/01)
- PC Williams (RAW/01)
- Any other attending officers

These recordings must be provided in a **watchable format**, compatible with standard playback software. The current versions are inaccessible and breach my right to review evidence.

In our meeting, you stated that **you had personally watched just one of the BWV footages**, I request this and the rest that are missing as well as confirmation while in due process! However, I was previously informed by the solicitor who served me the case files via email that **the BWV links do not work**. I followed up by email requesting access and was told the same. This contradiction must be resolved immediately.

I have waited and repeatedly contacted my witnesses, who confirm they **have not been contacted by your office**. I therefore request a **mobile number** I can pass to them so they can reach you directly and provide their statements.

2. Transcript of ROH_01.mp4 (Rebecca O'Hare's Video)

This is not her written statement but a **video exhibit**. I require a full transcript with:

- Spoken dialogue
- Timestamps
- Contextual notes

Under **Criminal Justice Act 1967, Section 9**, only official transcripts are admissible. My own transcription attempts were dismissed.

3. Witness Statements – Jamaine Edwards and Saheed

These two witnesses are **critical to my defence**. I request:

- Immediate contact and formal statement collection
- A mobile number for your office so I can instruct them to call directly

Their testimonies address misidentification, prior incidents, and procedural misconduct.

4. Copy of My Interview – Audio and Transcript

I request the **full and unedited audio recording** and a **complete transcript** of my police interview conducted under caution for harassment. These are essential for:

- Verifying procedural accuracy
- Confirming the scope and framing of the questioning
- Establishing the correct statutory basis for the original charge

This will also confirm that **no caution or interview was conducted for Threats to Cause Criminal Damage**, as required under **PACE Code C**.

5. Response to Procedural Breach – Incorrect Arrest Offence

I was arrested solely for **harassment**, as confirmed by all attending officers' statements. The charge was later reframed to **Threats to Cause Criminal Damage** under the **Criminal Damage Act 1971**, without:

- A fresh arrest
- A new caution
- A corresponding interview

This violates **PACE Code C**, which requires a lawful arrest and caution for each distinct offence unless bundled at the time of arrest. I request written clarification on:

- Why the arrest did not reflect the correct statutory offence
- Whether this was reviewed by a supervising officer
- The impact on admissibility and framing of the case

6. Managerial Review and Accountability

Given the lack of email responses post-meeting, the refusal to engage with submitted evidence, and the absence of agreed disclosures, I request:

- A formal review by a supervising solicitor or case manager
- Written confirmation of all actions taken
- Disclosure of the defence statement currently held on file

7. Additional Evidence and Support Requests

- I possess **video evidence of Rebecca O'Hare physically attacking me and other neighbours while I'm inside my home** and she and they are inside of their homes. This footage is emotionally distressing to review alone, and I request **professional assistance in reviewing, preparing, and presenting this material for court**. The content is traumatic and must be handled with care and legal precision.
- I also request urgent support in addressing my **fraudulently recorded PNC (Police National Computer) history**, which contains **inaccuracies and misrepresentations** that have not been corrected despite repeated formal notice. These errors compromise my legal standing and must be rectified immediately.
- I hereby submit the following exhibit for **formal inclusion and review**:

Title: *115 – Rebecca Key Screenshot – Just Eat and Mobile Phone Evidence*

Link: [Title 115 – Rebecca Key PDF](#)

Or as:

Link: <https://server2.pointto.us/Durants/0.%20Title%20115-Rebecca%20-Key.pdf>

(Also attached via email)

This document contains **critical evidence** including:

- **Tenancy fraud indicators**
- **Mobile phone and Just Eat data trails**
- **Spatial layout of my estate, car park, and indoor corridors**
- **Contradictions between Rebecca O'Hare's statement and those of attending police officers**

It directly supports my claim of **coordinated harassment, fabricated allegations, and motive rooted in tenancy manipulation**. This exhibit must be **reviewed in full and integrated into the defence file** without delay.

8. Court Attendance of All Involved Officers as well as the Alleged Victim!

I formally request that **all police officers involved in the incident and arrest**—including but not limited to PC Chan, PC Obsiye, PC Williams, and PC Wilson-Wallis—be required to **attend court in person** for direct questioning. Given the contradictions across their statements, timestamp anomalies, and procedural inconsistencies, their presence is essential to ensure transparency, accountability, and the integrity of the judicial process.

Legal References

- **PACE Code C** – Caution and interview procedures
- **Criminal Procedure and Investigations Act 1996** – Disclosure obligations
- **Criminal Justice Act 1967, Section 9** – Admissibility of written statements
- **Equality Act 2010** – Disability safeguards and appropriate adult access

Please confirm receipt of this message and provide a timeline for delivery of the above items. With only **six days remaining until trial**, further delay risks a miscarriage of justice.

This defence remains **unfinished**, and I formally request that it be reviewed by management. No one has yet constructed a proper defence that reflects the obvious contradictions, procedural breaches, and evidentiary weight I have submitted.

P.S.

As this correspondence may be forwarded to external governing bodies for verification, oversight, and correction, I am re-sharing the secure links to my hosted case files for transparency and ease of access:

-  **Direct Link to Case Files for 02/08/2025 and 26/08/2025:**


- a. **Link1:** [View Case Timeline and Evidence](#)
- b. **Link2:** <https://horrificcorruption.com/Server2/Another-Police-Case-03-08-2025/index01a.asp>

- 📁 **Full Archive of My Life's Case Documentation:**

- a. **Link1:** [Access Complete Hosted Files](#)
- b. **Link2:** <https://horrificcorruption.com/Server2/>

These repositories contain timestamped exhibits, video evidence, contradiction maps, and spatial overlays. All materials are curated for legal scrutiny and public accountability. I reserve the right to update and expand these archives as new evidence emerges.

Kind regards,
Simon Paul Cordell



- 0. Title 115-Rebecca -Key.pdf

5.7 MB