

From: JOSEPHINE WARD [josephinewardsolicitor@gmail.com]

Sent: 07 April 2014 14:29

To: Lorraine Cordell

Subject: Re: Regina v. Simon Cordell for mention at Woolwich Crown Court 8th April 2014
Lorraine

The previous conviction discrepancies will be highlighted counsel to counsel between the prosecution and the defence. Tactically we have to withhold certain information in particular the email from the council. I have referred to the noise abatement officer attending and alluded to police also being in attendance.

The CPS is the organisation that makes the decision on continuing the prosecution and if the police are failing to investigate and we provide written representations with evidence in support then the prosecution may review on the grounds that there is no realistic prospect of conviction. This is the most sensible approach.

As advised earlier once my headache clears I will be drafting detailed representations with a view to the CPS reviewing the prosecution in this case.

Regards

Josephine

On Mon, Apr 7, 2014 at 1:53 PM, Lorraine Cordell <lorraine32@blueyonder.co.uk> wrote:

Hi Josey

Sorry to hear you are ill I hope you feel better soon.

I notice that nothing is in there for the bail application for the PNC and the failing to surrender that should not be on his record. Which he does have bail condition set for failing to surrender. And can the issues about his PNC be given in court tomorrow without it being in the bail application as I do feel the judge should be told about these errors on Simon record as there is also more than one error and these did have a deciding factor towards his bail condition in this case.

And are we showing the court the email from the council which does show the police was aware of the party before 04/05/2013 and that it was being squatted before Simon had even attended the building?

I was thinking that all this information would have been needed to show the judge how bad this case really is.

Will it be Jemi that will attend court tomorrow?

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

Sent: 07 April 2014 13:33

To: Lorraine Cordell

Subject: Fwd: Regina v. Simon Cordell for mention at Woolwich Crown Court 8th April 2014

FYI

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

From: **JOSEPHINE WARD** <josephinewardsolicitor@gmail.com>

Date: Mon, Apr 7, 2014 at 9:53 AM

Subject: Regina v. Simon Cordell for mention at Woolwich Crown Court 8th April 2014

To: croydonkingston&woolwichcrown@cps.gsi.gov.uk, listing@woolwich.crowncourt.gsi.gov.uk, "J.B. Akin-Olugbade" <j.akin-olugbade@nexuschambers.com>

Dear Sir or Madam

We refer to the above matter.

This case was last mentioned in court on 18th March 2014 and on that occasion the Learned Judge made a number of directions.

Statements and invoices regarding the repair of the wall to be served by 21st March 2014 - not served

Statements from council to be served by 29th March 2014 - not served

We attach a copy of the insurance file that we received from Mr Patel's insurance company and note will no doubt be taken of the dates of the previous break ins and the damage caused on previous dates prior to May 2013. You will also no doubt note that there were no invoices submitted for any repairs during that period of time and also the delay in the Patel's responding to the insurance claim.

It has always been our client's case that the damage caused to the wall and inside the building had already been committed before he hired out his sound system for the private party. Our client has always disputed causing the damage or having any knowledge as to how this damage was caused.

We further raise that other suspects forensically linked to the earlier offences were released with no further action been taken against them. Mr Cordell has always maintained that police officers attended with the noise abatement officers but we are yet to be provided with the officers contact details or indeed the reason for their attendance. Clearly the issue is why did the Police allow a party to go ahead if persons present were damaging a wall and removing property. Mr Cordell feels like he is being singled out and made a scapegoat in this case. He denies involvement in the burglary and this allegation is having an adverse effect not only on his business but also on his mental health. We attach a copy of a letter confirming his medical diagnosis from his GP.

We respectfully request that the curfew condition be removed in its entirety as the curfew of having an adverse effect on Mr Cordell's mental well being.

We request that the bail variation be addressed tomorrow at the pre-trial review hearing.

Please confirm the listing at your earliest convenience.

Yours faithfully

MICHAEL CARROLL & CO.