

☐☐
Re: Subject: Thank You – Legal Aid Transfer & Trial Support
From: Rewired Rewired (re_wired@ymail.com)
To: lorraine32@blueyonder.co.uk
Date: Tuesday 14 October 2025 at 11:18 BST

Subject: Clarification of Legal Aid History & Court Proceedings – Thank You

Dear Ms Godfrey,

I want to begin by sincerely thanking you for your assistance in this matter. Your support, especially in preparing the letter requesting adjournment, made a real difference in court yesterday. It helped me feel heard and gave me something solid to stand on amidst the confusion.

When I presented your letter to the judge, he acknowledged it immediately. He confirmed that McLartys Solicitors had expressed intent to take over representation and that an adjournment was being requested to allow time for legal aid transfer. That moment shifted the tone in the courtroom—it gave weight to my position and exposed the procedural gaps that had led to this situation.

After reflecting further, I now understand what the judge meant when referencing Section 38 and the appointment of Tuckers Solicitors. Initially, I believed this was incorrect, as I thought I had legal aid from the police station. But I realise now that:

- I was arrested for harassment under the Protection from Harassment Act 1997, and legal aid was granted at that stage.
- My solicitor attended the interview with my appropriate adult but withdrew afterwards.
- The harassment charge was dropped, and legal aid was discontinued.
- A new charge—threats to cause criminal damage—was introduced without proper arrest or caution and interview.
- I was not re-arrested, and no solicitor was allowed to re-attend despite my request.
- My chosen appropriate adult was also denied access.
- I was detained without bail and taken to the police station, with no legal representation present.

Despite this, I was led to believe that legal aid was still active. But on the 13th of October 2025, the judge explained that Section 38 had been granted by the court due to a lack of representation, and that Tuckers Solicitors were appointed under that provision. This added to the confusion, especially given that Serco's wrongly issued a GPS tag error on the 26th of August 2025 and this then afterwards triggered a false warrant for breach of bail, which then led to a separate assault case that I am also innocent in as well.

For the wrongful GPS case that led to an assault case on the 26th of August 2025 and at the Highbury & Islington Court, I signed a legal aid form with David from Tuckers, believing this was a continuation for the initial case, but in truth, I had never been re-arrested, and the appointment process was never properly explained. Tuckers misled me, and I believe their frustration stems from the fact that I documented the meeting minutes, which exposed this contradiction.

Furthermore, I would like to note that the **Administration of Highbury & Islington Court**, under the direction of the judges presiding over the case, took it upon themselves to **contact Tuckers Solicitors directly by phone** to inquire about the reasons for their withdrawal. Tuckers refused to disclose any reason, citing **client confidentiality**.

As a result, the **trial was adjourned** to allow time for legal aid to be transferred to McLartys or another firm. The court instructed me to:

- Coordinate the legal aid transfer.
- Ensure my new solicitors bring all matters before the court prior to trial!
- Submit any witness statements, exhibits, or rebuttals through my new legal team.

 Evidential Clarity Once the CPS Files Are Obtained

Once the CPS files are disclosed, I believe they will confirm what I've consistently stated: that the original harassment allegation under the Protection from Harassment Act 1997 involved **no actual harassment**, and that the **only recorded interaction** between myself and the police was a **verbal caution issued through my closed front door**. This is supported by police statements and body-worn footage, which I expect to be included in the disclosure.

This interaction was not only informal, but it was procedurally unfair. A verbal caution delivered through a closed door:

- **Denied me the opportunity to hear the full allegation of harassment**, as disclosure now proves
- **Prevented any recorded response or rebuttal at the scene**
- Resulted in a **dropped harassment caution** that was never lawfully issued under proper arrest or caution protocol

There was **no fair arrest**, no fair **PACE-compliant interview**, and no opportunity for legal representation. The entire process bypassed the safeguards that exist to protect individuals from arbitrary or misinformed accusations.

This violates the legal precedent set in **R v O'Hara [1997] UKHL 19**, where the House of Lords 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 my case, **all officers stated harassment**, yet the charge was later substituted for **threats to cause criminal damage** without any legal basis or procedural restart

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

- I was **never properly arrested or cautioned** for the substituted charge
- I was **denied a fair interview**, with no solicitor present and no appropriate adult allowed
- The **representation confusion**, including the misapplication of Section 38 and the appointment of Tuckers without my consent, compounded the issue
- The **legal aid misdirection**, where I was led to believe I had representation when I did not, further obstructed my ability to prepare a defence

Taken together, these failures amount to a **miscarriage of justice**. They contaminated the procedural integrity of the case and denied me the basic protections afforded under **PACE** and **Article 6 of the European Convention on Human Rights**. This is not merely an administrative oversight, it is a **structural failure** that must be addressed before any fair trial can proceed.

⚠ **Public Interest & Fair Justice Concerns in Brief:**

I understand that until legal aid is granted and full case disclosure is made available to my new acting solicitors, the case cannot be fairly overviewed. However, considering the facts already known, and in the interest of justice, I believe the case must be brought back before the court and CPS for re-review. It is of utmost importance to raise the following points in the public interest:

- **Rebecca O'Hare is the sole alleged victim**, and her statement is the only supporting evidence.
- Her statement is **not signed by her**, which constitutes a breach of evidential protocol and undermines its admissibility.
- The statement was made in relation to the **harassment charge under the 1997 Act**, not the later **threats to cause criminal damage charge under the Criminal Damage Act 1971**—which mandates a **separate arrest and caution**, neither of which occurred.
- **Police statements are fabricated** or improperly timestamped:
 - One statement is dated **01-08-2025**, which is **before the alleged incident** on 02-08-2025 and was achieved twice and even with the day mentioned wrongly.
 - Another statement is dated **2022**, which is clearly unrelated and chronologically impossible.

These discrepancies raise serious concerns about procedural integrity, evidential reliability, and the fairness of the prosecution's case. I believe they warrant immediate attention and re-evaluation by both the court and CPS of the case in their hands.

I'm sharing this with you now to clarify the timeline and ensure that any future representation is grounded in the full truth of what occurred. Your support is and was most valuable, and I'm grateful for your willingness to step in under such short notice.

Please can you contact me back with the next steps forward!

Warm regards,
Simon Paul Cordell
☎ 07864 217519

✉ re_wired@ymail.com

On Friday 10 October 2025 at 17:11:54 BST, Rewired Rewired <re_wired@ymail.com> wrote:

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

From: Claire Godfrey <clairegodfrey@mclartyssolicitors.com>
To: Rewired Rewired <re_wired@ymail.com>
Sent: Friday 10 October 2025 at 16:15:04 BST
Subject: RE: Subject: Thank You – Legal Aid Transfer & Trial Support

Dear Simon Cordell,

Please find attached a self-explanatory email I have sent to the Court regarding your case requesting the matter is adjourned if we are to be appointed as acting as Solicitors on your case.

I would suggest you take this with you to Court since just because it has been emailed to the Court Admin and cc'd to the CPS it does not mean those in Court on Monday will have it on their file.

Please let me know the outcome as soon as possible.

Regards,

Ian

Claire Godfrey

PA to Ian McLarty

McLartys Solicitors

30-38 Hatherley Mews

Walthamstow E17 4QP

Tel 020 8223 9899 Emergency Out of Hours Number 07866 553 999

email: clairegodfrey@mclartyssolicitors.com.

secure: claire.godfrey@mclartys.cjsm.net

Please note we are no longer on the DX System

PLEASE CONSIDER THE ENVIRONMENT BEFORE PRINTING THIS EMAIL

The information contained in this email (and any attachments) is intended only for the individual to whom it is addressed. It may contain privileged and confidential information. If you are not the intended recipient, you must not copy, distribute or take any action in reliance on it, and should delete it and inform us. Reasonable precautions to minimise the risk of viruses have been taken, but any attachments should be checked before opening as no responsibility can be accepted. Electronic service cannot be accepted except by prior agreement. This e-mail address is not secure and should not be used for sensitive data.

From: Rewired Rewired <re_wired@ymail.com>
Sent: 10 October 2025 15:28
To: Claire Godfrey <clairegodfrey@mclartyssolicitors.com>
Subject: Subject: Thank You – Legal Aid Transfer & Trial Support

Subject: Trial Support & Legal Aid Transfer – Thank You

Dear Ms Godfrey,

Thank you again for speaking with me earlier today—it genuinely helped to feel heard and supported, especially after the unexpected withdrawal from Tuckers Solicitors this morning.

As discussed, my trial is listed for **Monday 13th October 2025 at 10:00 AM** at **Highbury & Islington Magistrates' Court**. I'll bring the letter you kindly offered to prepare, confirming your firm's intention to assist me moving forward. If

there's any possibility someone from your team could attend in person, I'd be incredibly grateful—but I completely understand if that's not possible at such short notice. Your written support will still make a real difference in helping me explain the situation clearly to the court.

I've attached the email from **Neil Allan at Tuckers**, sent at **10:37 AM today**, confirming their withdrawal, along with my response which outlines the technical misunderstandings and my request for full case file disclosure.

If there's anything else you need from me to help finalise the letter or support the Legal Aid transfer, I'm happy to provide it.

Thanks again for stepping in—I truly appreciate it.

Warm regards, **Mr. Simon Paul Cordell** 📞 07864 217519 📧 re_wired@ymail.com

Dear Sir/Madam

Further to the above we have been contacted by him this afternoon and asked if we would represent him in relation to his case.

He has shown us material that he has received from his existing Solicitors, Tuckers at 10.37 this morning saying that they are no longer prepared to act / are withdrawing from the case. Obviously, this gives insufficient time for any other Solicitor to take over the matter by the time of trial a lot less than 1 working day ahead. It is also not even clear whether Tuckers are saying they are withdrawing from the matter and therefore revoking Legal Aid or whether they are saying they required a request to transfer.

Furthermore, as things stand they will be on the Common Platform and without removing their name the paperwork cannot even be viewed.

Given that we received copies of the emails that the Defendant had received from Tuckers and one that as we understand it he has tried to forward to the Court this afternoon there is insufficient time to even explore these options.

Whilst we would be willing to take over the case whether that is by way of transfer if it is not objected to and would be the easiest way forward or by applying for Legal Aid in the event that it has already been revoked we require an adjournment of sufficient length (at least a month) to obtain a Representation Order in this firm's name, obtain access to the Common Platform, obtain paperwork, take instructions and if appropriate also proof witnesses etc.

For the avoidance of doubt, we would be willing to take on the case there has just been insufficient time for us to do so from being contacted this afternoon. Respectfully we would also suggest that the Defendant would not have been in a position to instruct new Solicitors given the proximity of trial from when the email was sent by the existing Solicitors saying that they were not longer prepared to act.

Should you require any further information please do not hesitate to contact our Mr McLarty.

Yours faithfully

McLartys

Claire Godfrey

PA to Ian McLarty

McLartys Solicitors

30-38 Hatherley Mews

Walthamstow E17 4QP

Tel 020 8223 9899 Emergency Out of Hours Number 07866 553 999

email: clairegodfrey@mclartyssolicitors.com.

secure: claire.godfrey@mclartys.cjsm.net

Please note we are no longer on the DX System

PLEASE CONSIDER THE ENVIRONMENT BEFORE PRINTING THIS EMAIL

The information contained in this email (and any attachments) is intended only for the individual to whom it is addressed. It may contain privileged and confidential information. If you are not the intended recipient, you must not copy, distribute or take any action in reliance on it, and should delete it and inform us. Reasonable precautions to minimise the risk of viruses have been taken, but any attachments should be checked before opening as no responsibility can be accepted. Electronic service cannot be accepted except by prior agreement. This e-mail address is not secure and should not be used for sensitive data.

Dear Sir/Madam

Further to the above we have been contacted by him this afternoon and asked if we would represent him in relation to his case.

He has shown us material that he has received from his existing Solicitors , Tuckers at 10.37 this morning saying that they are no longer prepared to act / are withdrawing from the case. Obviously, this gives insufficient time for any other Solicitor to take over the matter by the time of trial a lot less than 1 working day ahead. It is also not even clear whether Tuckers are saying they are withdrawing from the matter and therefore revoking Legal Aid or whether they are saying they required a request to transfer.

Furthermore, as things stand they will be on the Common Platform and without removing their name the paperwork cannot even be viewed.

Given that we received copies of the emails that the Defendant had received from Tuckers and one that as we understand it he has tried to forward to the Court this afternoon there is insufficient time to even explore these options.

Whilst we would be willing to take over the case whether that is by way of transfer if it is not objected to and would be the easiest way forward or by applying for Legal Aid in the event that it has already been revoked we require an adjournment of sufficient length (at least a month) to obtain a Representation Order in this firm's name, obtain access to the Common Platform, obtain paperwork, take instructions and if appropriate also proof witnesses etc.

For the avoidance of doubt, we would be willing to take on the case there has just been insufficient time for us to do so from being contacted this afternoon. Respectfully we would also suggest that the Defendant would not have been in a position to instruct new Solicitors given the proximity of trial from when the email was sent by the existing Solicitors saying that they were not longer prepared to act.

Should you require any further information please do not hesitate to contact our Mr McLarty.

Yours faithfully

McLartys

Claire Godfrey

**PA to Ian McLarty
McLartys Solicitors
30-38 Hatherley Mews
Walthamstow E17 4QP**

Tel 020 8223 9899 Emergency Out of Hours Number 07866 553 999

email: clairegodfrey@mclartyssolicitors.com.

secure: claire.godfrey@mclartys.cjsm.net

Please note we are no longer on the DX System

PLEASE CONSIDER THE ENVIRONMENT BEFORE PRINTING THIS EMAIL

The information contained in this email (and any attachments) is intended only for the individual to whom it is addressed. It may contain privileged and confidential information. If you are not the intended recipient, you must not copy, distribute or take any action in reliance on it, and should delete it and inform us. Reasonable precautions to minimise the risk of viruses have been taken, but any attachments should be checked before opening as no responsibility can be accepted. Electronic service cannot be accepted except by prior agreement. This e-mail address is not secure and should not be used for sensitive data.