

 Letter to Tuckers Solicitors

From: Simon Paul Cordell

Subject: Urgent Clarification and Accountability Regarding Legal Aid Misrepresentation and Abandonment of Representation as well as Procedural Breach Regarding Substituted Charge!

Date of Birth: 26/01/1981

URN: 01YE1300125

Court: Highbury Corner Magistrates' Court

Date of 1st Order (Harassment 1997): 02/08/2025

Date of 2nd Order (Assault Charge): 26/10/2025

Date of this Letter: 19/10/2025.

Re: Legal Aid Misrepresentation and Procedural Abandonment – Arrest on 17/10/2025

Subject: Formal Complaint

To: McLartys Solicitors, Tuckers Solicitors, Legal Aid Team,

Dear Tuckers Solicitors,

I am writing to formally address a series of serious procedural failures and misrepresentations concerning your firm's involvement in my recent and ongoing legal matters.

On **17/10/2025**, I was arrested for an alleged breach of bail. During this time, my family contacted **McLartys Solicitors**, my newly appointed legal representatives. They informed me that they were unable to act on my behalf due to your firm's claim that **Legal Aid was already in place** for this case — a claim that is demonstrably false.

 Legal Aid History

I have signed Legal Aid forms with Tuckers Solicitors on “**Two Occasions Only**” :

1. **Initial arrest for harassment 1997 on the (02/08/2025):**

I signed Legal Aid in the interview room with a Tuckers representative, specifically for the harassment charge and no other charges existed at that time. The solicitor then left, as did my appropriate adult. The police subsequently dropped the harassment charge.

When the **new charge of Threats to Cause Criminal Damage 1971** was first mentioned to me, there was **no solicitor present**, nor was I allowed to speak to one by phone. No appropriate adult of my own was provided, despite my explicit request.

2. **Second arrest (26/08/2025) for breach of bail and a fabricated assault allegation:**

It was falsely claimed that I deliberately touched a police officer on the shoulder during

an arrest. In truth, I was retreating into a dead-end front room for safety and had no intent to make contact.

After being held overnight in custody, I was taken to court the next morning **(27/08/2025)**, where I met a solicitor from your firm named **David**, who asked me to sign Legal Aid for the second time. This new case involved a breach of bail and wrongful assault allegation which was brought to court for first appearance and the breach of bail charge was dropped while the assault charge was separated from the initial arrest and assigned its own trial date.

Court Confirmation of Abandonment

At **Highbury and Islington Magistrates' Court**, the **three lay judges** overseeing my case confirmed the following:

- Your representative from Tuckers Solicitor Firm, spoke to CPS outside the courtroom, then **disappeared** and could not be located — even after the judges ordered their return.
- The judges **telephoned your firm directly** during the hearing and were told that **you would no longer act on my behalf**.
- It was made clear that **no Legal Aid had been signed or submitted** under the 2012 Act for the substituted charge of **Threats to Cause Criminal Damage (1971)**. Therefore, under **Sections 36 and 38 of the Legal Aid, Sentencing and Punishment of Offenders Act 2012**, your firm was **not legally bound to represent me**.
- Despite this, I was led to believe I was fully covered, beforehand — a belief fostered by your firm's misleading communication and the absence of a third Legal Aid application, which should have been completed prior to trial on **13/10/2025**.

Legal Aid Misrepresentation and Charge Substitution

It is critical to clarify that the original charge of **harassment** was later **substituted** for **Threats to Cause Criminal Damage (1971)** and without a lawful arrest process. I was **not cautioned, not interviewed, and not provided a solicitor** at any stage for this substituted charge. No Legal Aid was signed or submitted for it.

Despite this, your firm continued to act as if I was covered and therefore misleading myself. This is procedurally indefensible.

Your firm clearly understood the correct protocol, as evidenced by the events of **26/08/2025**, when I was arrested for breach of bail. At that time, an **additional criminal charge of assault** was introduced, and your solicitor asked me to sign Legal Aid again. This confirms the Second signed legal aid form by me and that:

- You knew Legal Aid must be signed for **each new Criminal charge**.
- You were aware that **Threats to Cause Criminal Damage 1971 Act of Law** had never been properly processed or covered.

- You gave the **false impression** that I was legally protected for a Criminal charge that had never been lawfully initiated.

Bail Continuity Under Lawful Arrest and Legal Process

Had I been lawfully arrested and processed for the original harassment charge which would have included being cautioned, interviewed, and then charged and throughout represented by a solicitor with legal aid put in place for harassment and then brought before the court and put on a GPS Tag for The harassment charge, then any subsequent breach of bail (such as violating GPS tag conditions) would be treated as a **procedural extension of that same case** of Harassment.

In such circumstances:

- The bail conditions would remain active and enforceable under the **original Legal Aid certificate** for Harassment.
- Representation would continue uninterrupted for the Harassment, charge.
- No new Legal Aid application would be required unless a **separate, unrelated charge** was introduced such as the current allegation I am defending myself against: **“Threats to Cause Criminal Damage (1971)”**, a separate statutory offence under **“Criminal Law.”**

This continuity is standard practice and ensures that defendants are not left unrepresented for procedural developments stemming from the same legal matter.

Evidence Exhibited

Legal Aid Timeline and Offence Breakdown

Offence	Date	Legal Aid Signed	Representation Order Issued	Solicitor Present
Harassment (Protection from Harassment Act 1997)	02/08/2025	✅ Signed in interview room	❌ No Representation Order issued	✅ Present during interview
Threats to Cause Criminal Damage (Criminal Damage Act 1971)	02/08/2025 (introduced later)	❌ Not signed	❌ No Representation Order issued	❌ No solicitor present
Assault with Intent to Resist Arrest	26/08/2025	✅ Signed	✅ Representation Order issued (28/08/2025)	✅ Solicitor present

1. Representation Order – Assault Charge

- Issued on **28/08/2025** for the offence dated **26/08/2025**.
- Solicitor: **Chloe Birkhead**, Tuckers Solicitors LLP.
- This confirms Legal Aid was properly granted for the third charge only.

2. Emails from Tuckers Solicitors – 21/08/2025 and 22/08/2025

- Tuckers requested **proof of benefits** and **National Insurance Number** to initiate Legal Aid.
- This proves Legal Aid had **not yet been granted** for the substituted charge (Threats to Cause Criminal Damage).
- Quote:
“Once we have proof of your benefits we will be entitled to exercise the powers devolved to us by the Legal Aid Agency to grant a Representation Order...”

3. MG11 Statements – PC Chan, PC Obsive, PC Reece Williams, PC George Wilson-Wallis

- All confirm the **original arrest was for harassment**.
- No mention of the Criminal Damage Act or threats charge.
- No second caution, interview, or solicitor presence tied to the substituted charge.
- This confirms the **threats charge was introduced later**, violating **PACE 1984** and **LASPO 2012**.

4. Email Sent by Myself to Tuckers Solicitors

- I explicitly stated:
 “The charge was added later and swapped without arrest or interview. I was never cautioned or represented for this new allegation.”
- This was ignored, and the firm continued to act as if Legal Aid was in place.

⚠ Procedural Breach Summary

- The **harassment charge was dropped**, and the **threats charge was introduced without caution, interview, or solicitor**.
- Tuckers Solicitors **never submitted Legal Aid** for the substituted charge yet continued to act as if coverage existed.
- The **CPS charge sheet merges two distinct separate offences, falsely as one when the table clearly shows it was added on as a separate charge**, masking the substitution and procedural breach.

⚖ Charges – Legal Context and Offence Codes

⚖ Original CPS Charge Table: --

“You are Charged with the Offence(s) shown below. You do not have to say anything, but it may harm your defence if you do not mention now something which you later rely on in court. Anything you do say may be given in evidence.”

Charge Description	CCCJS Offence Code
On 02/08/2025 at ENFIELD in the Borough of Enfield, caused Rebecca O'Hare to fear that violence would be used against her by your course of conduct, which	PH97009

Charge Description	CCCJS Offence Code
you knew or ought to have known would cause fear of violence to Rebecca O'Hare on each occasion in that January and 02/08/25.	
On 02/08/2025 at Enfield in the Borough of Enfield, without lawful excuse, threatened Rebecca O'Hare that he would blow up the vehicle belonging to her , intending that she would fear that the threat would be carried out. Contrary to sections 2(a) and 4 of the Criminal Damage Act 1971.	CD71043

1. As web linked here: [https://server2.pointto.us/Durants/0.%20orig-archive%20\(1\)/12.%20Simon_CORDELL_Charges_pdf.pdf](https://server2.pointto.us/Durants/0.%20orig-archive%20(1)/12.%20Simon_CORDELL_Charges_pdf.pdf)

Forensic Breakdown – What This Table Reveals

1. Two Distinct Charges, Falsely Merged

- The table presents **two separate statutory offences**:
 - 1+ **PH97009**: Harassment causing fear of violence under the *Protection from Harassment Act 1997*
 - 2+ **CD71043**: Threats to cause criminal damage under the *Criminal Damage Act 1971*
- Yet they are formatted as a **single charge sheet**, implying they were both present at the time of arrest and solicitor interview. This is **false**.

2. Substitution Timeline Is Masked

- The **first charge (PH97009)** was the basis for arrest and interview on 02/08/2025.
- The **second charge (CD71043)** was **added later**, after Tuckers Solicitors exited the case.
- CPS records and MG11 statements confirm that **only PH97009 was present** when Legal Aid was signed and your solicitor was present.

3. Retrospective Amendment of Context

- The phrase “on each occasion in that January and 02/08/25” was **retrospectively inserted** into the harassment charge to imply a pattern of conduct.
- This is legally problematic:
 - 1+ Harassment requires **two distinct incidents**.
 - 2+ The amendment attempts to **retroactively justify continuity**, without specifying dates or evidence.
 - 3+ It **obscures the fact that the harassment charge was dropped**, and the threats charge was substituted without proper procedure.

4. No Legal Aid for Substituted Charge

- Legal Aid was **only signed for the harassment charge** during the interview.
- The **threats charge was introduced later**, without:
 - 1+ A new caution
 - 2+ A solicitor's present
 - 3+ A signed Legal Aid application

- Tuckers Solicitors **never submitted Legal Aid** for CD71043, yet CPS documentation falsely implies coverage.

5. Violation of Legal Safeguards

- The substitution and merged formatting violate:
 - 1+ **PACE 1984** – no caution or interview for the substituted charge
 - 2+ **LASPO 2012** – no Legal Aid application or approval
 - 3+ **Article 6 of the Human Rights Act 1998** – denial of fair trial and representation

What Readers Should Examine

- **Was the second row (CD71043) present when the solicitor was in the room?**
→ No. It was added later, after Tuckers exited and legal aid was discontinued!
- **Does the first row (PH97009) contain a retroactive amendment?**
→ Yes. The phrase “each occasion in that January and 02/08/25” was wrongfully amended to imply continuity.
- **Was Legal Aid signed for both charges?**
→ No. Only PH97009 was signed during interview. CD71043 was never signed, submitted, or represented.
- **Does the table structure obscure the substitution?**
→ Yes. By merging both charges into a single sheet, and separate table rows it falsely implies procedural continuity and masks the breach of the additional charge being added later unless detected!

-
- Also, the **emails received requesting benefit proof** from Tuckers solicitors confirms Legal Aid was not in place for the **Threats Charge** and was requested afterwards but the following was never issued to me:
 - 1+ **A Legal Aid Authorities form to apply for Legal Aid.**
 - The **Representation Order issued on 28/08/2025** applies only to the assault charge, that I signed while in Highbury and Islington Courts cells and not the substituted threats charge, as this was never signed for by me.
-

Comparative Table of Offences

This table clarifies the legal distinctions between the charges involved in my case and exposes how procedural safeguards were bypassed. It shows what each offence legally requires—and what was never done.

 Offence Summary	Section 4A Public Order Act 1986	Harassment Causing Fear of Violence (PH97009)	Harassment (Non-Violent) (PH96001)	Threats to Cause Criminal Damage (CD71043)
Statute	Public Order Act 1986, Section 4A	Protection from Harassment Act 1997, Section 4	Protection from Harassment Act 1997, Section 2	Criminal Damage Act 1971, Section 2

 Offence Summary	Section 4A Public Order Act 1986	Harassment Causing Fear of Violence (PH97009)	Harassment (Non-Violent) (PH96001)	Threats to Cause Criminal Damage (CD71043)
CCCJS Code	PU73001	PH97009	PH96001	CD71043
Offence Title	Intentional harassment, alarm or distress	Harassment causing fear of violence	Harassment without violence	Threats to destroy or damage property
Classification	Summary offence (Magistrates' Court only)	Either-way offence	Either-way offence	Either-way offence
Required Conduct	One-off act or words causing distress	Course of conduct causing fear of violence	Course of conduct causing harassment	Threat made to destroy or damage property
Mental Element	Intent to cause distress	Knew or ought to have known conduct would cause fear	Knew or ought to have known conduct was harassing	Intent or recklessness as to whether threat would be carried out
Victim Impact	Actual harassment, alarm or distress	Fear that violence will be used	Distress or alarm (non-violent)	Fear of property damage or destruction
Examples	Shouting abuse, threats in public	Repeated threats, intimidation, stalking	Repeated unwanted contact, verbal abuse	Saying "I'll blow up your car" or "I'll smash your windows"
Police Action Required	Arrest and caution for Section 4A	Evidence of repeated behaviour + fear of violence	Evidence of repeated behaviour	Evidence of threat + property context
Interview & Charge Implications	Must be cautioned and interviewed for this specific offence	Requires separate caution and interview for fear-based conduct	Requires interview addressing repeated conduct	Must be cautioned and interviewed with reference to threat and property context

Why This Table Matters in My Case

- I was arrested for PU73001 (Section 4A), but later No Further Actioned for that and PH97009 but the police illegally swapped the criminal offence again without fair procedure and charged me with CD71043.
- I was **never booked into custody** for PH97009 or CD71043.
- I was **never cautioned for any offence but through a closed front door I have seen in body worn footage that a caution was said for harassment PH97009** and not for the

following two separate criminal offences PU73001 or CD71043, as the police MG11 statements also confirm.

- **In the interview I did not understand that I was only booked into the police station for a Public Order Act 1986, offence and that Section 4A with a CCCJS CODE: of PU73001 and not anything else as the police mislead me into confusion to believe by re applying the Harassment 1997 allegation and not explain what they had done wrong.**
- **I never got cautioned, arrested nor booked into the police station and then after interviewed for any Criminal Damage Act 1971, offence especially leading towards a Section 2, and with a CCCJS CODE: of CD71043.**
- I was only interviewed about **harassment under the 1997 Act**, which was later dropped by police and the CPS.
- The following formal procedures were missed:
 - a. No arrest record for PH97009 or CD71043 must exist as they never were created as the detention logs prove but by law must be!
 - b. No custody booking for either charge took a place.
 - c. No correct police cautions took place under PACE for the three alleged criminal offences!
 - d. No solicitor present for the last substituted offence.
 - e. No Legal Aid application submitted for CD71043
 - 1+ MG11 statements and BWV footage do not support a course of conduct or a credible threat created by me.
 - 2+ One MG11 authored by PC Chan is falsely dated 01/08/2025, before the incident
 - 3+ PC George Wilson-Wallis Another MG11 from, dated 2022, was previously NFA'd, and then reused without lawful basis.

📁 **File Name: “Crown Prosecution Service – Rex V Simon Cordell Charges!”**

- **Web link:** <https://server2.pointto.us/Durants/New-02-08-25-Created-02-10-25/Disclosed-After-Solicitor-Left-10-10-25/>
- Due to two different sets of other police officers taking over while I was in hospital and the second set change being due to officer's work shifts, they were all unaware of the original caution wrongly given through my front door by **PC Obsiye**, accompanied by **PC Chan** and others that was for harassment 1997 only.
- This led to me falsely being processed as for being booked into at Wood Green custody on **03/08/2025 at 07:43**, instead of the actual arrest time:
 - a. “The detainee was arrested at 109 Burncroft Avenue, Enfield, on 02/08/2025 at 21:10 by PC 01 P243682 Obsiye”
- **At the police station on the 03/08/2025, “The detainee arrived at 07:43 on 03/08/2025.” After the hospital the two male police officers both told the custody officer what the arrest was for:**
 - a. “Section 4A Public Order Act 1986 – Intentional Harassment/Alarm/Distress”

- Yet, I was never cautioned or arrested for Section 4A, and the original Harassment 1997 police Caution was invalid as it was wrongly issued through my closed front door, breaching Code C and identification protocols.

PACE Code G – Arrest Necessity

- **G 2.9 (c)(i):**
 - a. *“To prevent the person in question causing physical injury...”*
But custody records confirm:
 - 1+ I was compliant and at no time did I do anything out of the normal, even aloe police officers have fabricated the record to look like otherwise.
 - 2+ No risk to self or others, I was indoors and could not move due to a surgical operation , police arrived an hour after fake allegations were made.
 - 3+ No COZART testing
 - 4+ Fit for interview as deemed by medical examining reviews.
→ leading to an Invalid arrest ground
- **G 2.9 (e)(i)(b):**
 - a. *“To allow prompt and effective investigation...”*
But:
 - 1+ Interview delayed until **03/08/2025** at **15:49** from time of detainee arrived at the police station: **07:43 on 03/08/2025.**
 - 2+ Officer in case listed as **NA VCT** at **09:19** as all notes must have been compiled on the **02/08/2025** and as dated the **01/08/2025** and **2022** and so on!
 - 3+ These raised concerns all prove No investigative continuity!
 - 4+ CD71043, Threats to cause Criminal Damage Act 1971 was recklessly inserted post-interview and with deliberate intent.

Fabricated “Past Year” Narrative

- **As quoted in detention logs:**
 - a. *“He was going to blow up the car, previously threatened her to beat her up and over the “Past Year” shouted threats...”*
- This narrative was used to justify the harassment 1997 caution that was issued while I was retrieving my medical note to slide under the door and did not hear.
- **The logs falsely imply two incidents, but:**
 - a. **PC Obsiye**, who is said to have given the account, was not present at custody as the time logs state.
 - 1+ 03/08/2025 - 08:08 - b. The officer giving the account of the arrest was PC 01P243682 Obsiye.
 - 2+ 03/08/2025 - 08:21 - A Normal Search of the detainee was carried out at 07:58 on 03/08/2025. - The search was conducted by PC 01 P243682 Obsiye.

- No associated crime number was specified, as she was not present.
- I was booked into the wood green police custody suite for **Section 4A**, and not **Harassment 1997**, nor **Threats To Cause Criminal Damage**.
- The harassment charge was swapped back in an interview, then dropped by CPS as the alleged victims exhibited video never showed any **“Past Year”** threats as she lied and said it did, the video proved her own claims never really happened and weren't recorded like she said did when doing her formal statement under oath.

Charge Substitution and Disclosure Manipulation

- I was booked for Section 4A, which never occurred.
- The harassment charge was introduced at interview, and all the missing police officer BWV footage will prove this.
- I was never booked for harassment under the 1997 Act, and the caution was issued through a closed door.
- My solicitor drafted my defence based on Crown records showing I was defending:
 - a. “Section 4A Public Order Act 1986”
- After interview, CPS dropped the harassment charge.
- Yet the charge sheet was amended to show a single offence date:
 - a. “02/08/25” Erasing the January allegation and making it appear as if I was booked and charged for Section 4A.
- Due to CPS dropping this, another charge was swapped in:
 - a. “Threats to Cause Criminal Damage 1971”

Final Evidential Contradictions

- CD71043 added post-interview, without caution or solicitor
- MG11 reused from prior harassment case (NFA'd)
- “Past year” claim unsupported by:
 - 1+ MG11s
 - 2+ Notebook entries
 - 3+ BWV footage
 - 4+ MG11 falsely dated 01/08/2025 (PC George Wilson-Wallis)
 - 5+ MG11 from 2022 reused without lawful basis
 - 6+ No solicitor present for substituted charge
 - 7+ No Legal Aid application submitted for CD71043
 - 8+ No custody booking for PH97009 or CD71043
 - 9+ No caution or interview for either offence

Request for Immediate Action

I formally request the following:

1. **A written explanation of your firm's position regarding Legal Aid coverage** for all relevant charges — including the substituted charge of *Threats to Cause Criminal Damage (1971)*.

This matter would have required **three separate Legal Aid applications**, unless I had been arrested at the scene for all charges simultaneously or processed for them at the police station prior to your arrival — which I was not.

2. **A copy of the only two Legal Aid applications I lawfully signed** with your firm, along with any other claims that may have been submitted on my behalf **without my legal consent**.

If any application was made for the substituted charge of *Threats to Cause Criminal Damage (1971)*, I request full supporting documentation, timestamps, and confirmation of whether my signature was used without authorisation.

3. **A formal statement of accountability** regarding your representative's unexplained disappearance from *Highbury and Islington Magistrates' Court* on **17/10/2025**, during proceedings for the newest alleged bail breach (which was subsequently dropped). If your firm maintains that you were still acting for me in relation to this charge, I require a clear explanation of:

- Why your representative failed to comply with judicial orders to return to court.
- Why no replacement counsel or follow-up correspondence was provided. This absence directly contributed to the **abandonment of my case on 13/10/2025**, despite the court's verbal instructions and direct contact attempts from the bench.

4. **Confirmation that your firm has withdrawn any claim to Legal Aid coverage** that may be obstructing *McLarty's Solicitors* from acting on my behalf. This is essential to ensure that my right to fair representation is no longer hindered by procedural misrepresentation.

Request for Acknowledgement and Correction

I respectfully request that the record be corrected to reflect the following:

1. Legal Aid was **never signed or granted** for the substituted charge of *Threats to Cause Criminal Damage (1971)*.
2. The charge was introduced **without lawful arrest, caution, or solicitor presence**.
3. Tuckers Solicitors **misrepresented Legal Aid coverage**, thereby blocking alternative representation and violating my rights under:
 - **PACE 1984** (Police and Criminal Evidence Act)
 - **LASPO 2012** (Legal Aid, Sentencing and Punishment of Offenders Act)
 - **Article 6 of the Human Rights Act 1998** (Right to a fair trial and legal representation)

This letter will form part of my **master chronology and evidential record**. I expect a response within **7 days** of receipt. Failure to respond will be noted and escalated accordingly.

Yours sincerely,

Simon Paul Cordell

[Contact details]

[Case reference number, if applicable]

P.S. For your additional awareness:

The **third alleged breach of bail**, dated **17/10/2025**, was formally **dropped by the CPS**, as were the **two prior breach allegations** that led to separate arrests on **14/08/2025** and **26/08/2025**. In all three instances, **no legal representation from Tuckers Solicitors was present in court**, despite your firm having previously acted in relation to the **initial harassment charge** — the **only charge other than the 26/08/25** for which **Legal Aid was properly signed and submitted**.

That harassment charge was later **dropped by police** and subsequently **substituted for Threats to Cause Criminal Damage (1971)**, a charge introduced **without caution, without interview, and without any legal representation** from your firm at the police station. At no point was Legal Aid **applied for, signed, or granted** in relation to this substituted charge, nor for the three breach-related arrests that followed. This confirms that **Legal Aid was not granted or validly processed on three other separate occasions**, despite your firm's continued procedural involvement and misleading assertions of coverage.

I am prepared to submit all supporting documents, MG11 statements, emails, and signed Legal Aid forms to substantiate this claim.

Yours sincerely, **Simon Paul Cordell**

Address: 109 Burncroft Avenue, PO BOX EN3 7JQ

Email Address: Re_wired@ymail.com

Received: Fri 10 Oct at 12:26

Dear Mr. Cordell,

The below link will allow you to access the material that we have in your case.

Please be aware that "unused material" is private to the parties in the case. It cannot be provided to any other party. Therefore, it must not be uploaded onto any internet site which can be accessed by the public.

I would advise you against uploading the material to any internet site at all.

Regards,

Neil Allan

Magistrates Court

London Supervisor

T: 07983430259

M: 07983430259

Email: allann@tuckerssolicitors.com

• **Files Disclosed First:**

1. [01. Case Summary pdf.pdf](#)
2. [02. CORDELL Simon 01YE1267925 Section 9 pdf.pdf](#)
3. [03. Defendant Notice of Grant of Bail pdf.pdf](#)
4. [04. Let to Client Magistrates Court Trial Advice.docx](#)
5. [05. PC Chan pdf.pdf](#)
6. [06. PC obsiye pdf.pdf](#)
7. [07. PC Williams pdf.pdf](#)
8. [08. PC Wilson Wallis pdf.pdf](#)
9. [09. Rebecca O HARE 2nd pdf.pdf](#)
10. [10. Rebecca O hare pdf.pdf](#)
11. [11. ROH 01 mp4.mp4](#)
12. [12. Simon CORDELL Charges pdf.pdf](#)
13. [13. Simon CORDELL Pre Cons pdf.pdf](#)
14. [13. Simon CORDELL Pre Cons pdf pages.docx](#)
15. [output.doc](#)
16. [signature-transparent-bg bd3b4ec2-9608-4754-bd6a-54dd565a5306.png](#)

• **Files Disclosed Second:**

1. [01. CORDELL Simon 01YE1267925 Initial Details Pros Case 22-09-2025.pdf](#)
2. [02. CORDELL Simon 01YE1267925 Unused Material Disclosure 22-09-2025--
.docx](#)
3. [02. Original-CORDELL Simon 01YE1267925 Unused Material Disclosure 22-
09-2025-.pdf](#)
4. [02. Return CORDELL Simon 01YE1267925Unused Material Disclosure22-09-
2025.pdf](#)
5. [03. CKC 01 Witnessing arrest of Simon Cordell.mp4](#)
6. [04. Rebbeca O-Hare's-Video-11. ROH 01 mp4.docx](#)
7. [04. Rebbeca O-Hare's-Video-11. ROH 01 mp4.pdf](#)
8. [04. Rebbeca O-Hare's-Video-11. ROH 01 mp4.mp4](#)
9. [04. Rebbeca O-Hare's-Video.docx](#)
10. [05. Axon Interview Interview Room 7 Camera 1 mp4.mp4](#)
11. [06. CORDELL Simon 01YE1267925 Section 9 05-08-2025.pdf](#)

• **Weblink for case Ratio Files:**

1. <https://server2.pointto.us/Durants1/01.%20Send-03-10-25-Tuckers/01.%2002-08-2025-Another-Case/00.%20CPS-caseratio-co-uk-Case-Files-02-08-25/>

• **Web linked ***** Files:**

1. <https://server2.pointto.us/Durants1/>

• **Files Not Been Disclosed First and Requested:**

Body Cams

• **Files Not Been Disclosed Second and Requested:**

Complete Working Copy of the Interview

Received: Fri, 10 Oct at 12:23

Dear Mr. Cordell,

I attach the documents that we have in connection with your second case (trial currently listed

11/11/25)

I would advise you against uploading the material to any internet site at all.

Regards,

Neil Allan

Magistrates Court

London Supervisor

T: 07983430259

M: 07983430259

Email: allann@tuckerssolicitors.com

1. **Files Disclosed:**

1+ CORDELL_Simon_Paul_01YE1300125_Application_to_vacate_hearing.

2+ CORDELL_Simon_Paul_01YE1300125_Initial_Details_Pros_Case_pdf!

3+ signature-transparent-bg_bd3b4ec2-9608-4754-bd6a-54dd565a5306.