OUR REQUEST SHEET

POLICE MARKERS: -

1. **OUR REQUEST SHEET: --**
   A. **ABOUT OUR REQUEST SHEET:**
   - The reason for including the "OUR REQUEST SHEET" in this document is to ensure clarity and specificity in the Claimant's requests to relevant authorities regarding the handling of their data and records.

   B. **NATIONAL SYSTEMS - DELETION (PNC, IDENT1, NDNAD):**
   - The Claimant's primary request within this section is the deletion of their data from the national systems, which encompass vital databases such as the Police National Computer (PNC), IDENT1, and the National DNA Database (NDNAD).

   C. **PNC RECORD AMENDMENTS:**
   - Within this request, the Claimant seeks amendments to any records present on the Police National Computer (PNC) that relate to this case. This is to ensure that the data accurately reflects the events and circumstances involved.

   D. **LOCAL SYSTEMS DELETION:**
   - The Claimant's request for the deletion of their data from local police systems is vital in safeguarding their privacy and ensuring that their personal information is not misused or retained unnecessarily.

   E. **LOCAL SYSTEMS - AMENDMENT OF INFORMATION CONTAINED WITHIN:**
   - To achieve accuracy and completeness, the Claimant also requests amendments to any information contained within local police systems concerning this case. This ensures that the data held at the local level aligns with the facts and details presented.

2. **ABOUT POLICE IDENTIFICATION MARKERS:**
   A. **About police identification markers:**
   - The inclusion of information regarding police identification markers is crucial due to its significance in this case. These markers serve as unique codes or symbols used by law enforcement agencies for identification purposes. Further details are necessary to fully understand their role and implications.

3. **ABOUT THE ARRESTS AND INTERRUPTIONS MADE BY POLICE:**
   A. **About Arrests and Interruptions Made by Police:**

   - The reason for addressing the arrests and interruptions made by the police in this document is to provide a comprehensive account of events and their impact. By doing so, the Claimant aims to ensure that all pertinent information is presented accurately to the relevant authorities and that any necessary actions are taken.

IDENTIFICATION MARKERS
1 OF 1

POLICE MARKERS: -

Claim-Sheet

WHAT HAS HAPPENED
&
OUR REQUESTS

POLICE MARKERS: -- (National Computer Nominal Report Nominal Details)

CASE (A1)

- **We are writing this formally request for the removal of the details below & that of its other affiliated documentation** –

Nub 1	Classification	Input Details
1)	**Criminal Record Office Number**	49823/97M
2)	**Police National Computer ID**	97/99378V
3)	**First Name(s)**	Simon Paul
4)	**Last Name**	Cordell
5)	**Date of Birth**	26/01/81
6)	**Place of Birth**	Enfield
7)	**Nationality:**	United Kingdom

- **If There Is Any Other Acceptable Information, Please Provide It Below: --**

1. **Introduction to Amended ACRO Report Requests**
   - This document represents an amended version of the original ACRO report, addressing disputed sections and integrating updated evidential findings. It serves to clarify and fortify the request for the removal of specific entries from the Police National Computer (PNC) Nominal Report and related documentation, ensuring compliance with current legal standards and promoting accurate data representation. This initiative aligns with the principles of fairness, rehabilitation, and reintegration for reformed individuals. ++++++

2. **Key Legal Frameworks and Eligibility**
   - As established under the Rehabilitation of Offenders Act 1974 (updated 28 October 2023), the removal of spent convictions depends on defined criteria. Only the originating police force or judicial authority may authorize Court Conviction deletions. Other forms of recorded data, including non-conviction details, may be eligible for deletion under the Record Deletion Process (RDP), provided specific grounds are met. These include:

     a. **Penalty Notices for Disorder (PND):** Eligible for deletion if deemed appropriate.

     b. **Cautions (Adult and Juvenile):** Includes Adult Cautions, Youth Cautions, and Conditional Cautions.

     c. **Warnings and Reprimands:** Final warnings and reprimands issued to juveniles can be reviewed.

d. **Biometric Data:** DNA, fingerprints, or other biometric details unlawfully retained or obtained under mistaken identity.

e. **Non-conviction Qualifying Offences:** Specific retention approvals by the Biometrics Commissioner or District Judge for certain non-convictions may qualify.

3. **Claimant's Unique Case Context**
   - The Claimant's case demonstrates a multifaceted combination of factors, including:

     a. **Spent Convictions:** eligible under the ROA framework.

     b. **Non-Convictions:** such as cases marked "No Further Action" (NFA) or resulting in "Not Guilty" verdicts.

     c. **Errors, Discrepancies, And Outdated Records:** within the documentation that impose undue prejudice on rehabilitation and progress.

     d. **Plea Dates:** recorded incorrectly or inconsistently, further adding to the inaccuracies in the Claimant's records.

     e. **Offence Dates:** recorded incorrectly or inconsistently, further adding to the inaccuracies in the Claimant's records.

     f. **Outdated Addresses And Other Police Markers**: retained in official documentation, contributing to administrative errors and confusion in the handling of the Claimant's case.

     g. **Files Unrelated To Any Arrest Or Conviction:** yet included and maintained in the Claimant's records without clear justification or relevance.

     h. **DNA Evidence:** stated as destroyed but later discovered to have been retained unlawfully or obtained under cases the Claimant has successfully contested and won.

     i. **Data Labeled As "Disposable":** with specific references to key entries, including the deletion of an Anti-Social Behaviour Order (ASBO) marked as disposable. This deletion obscured vital evidence that had the potential to prove the Claimant's innocence in certain disputed matters.

4. **Rights Under GDPR and Data Protection Act**
   - The General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) and the Data Protection Act provide individuals with robust rights to request the erasure of personal data that is obsolete or processed unlawfully. Leveraging these provisions, the Claimant is seeking not only the removal of redundant records but also the correction of inaccuracies to foster personal advancement without the stigma of outdated entries.

5. **Purpose and Impact of This Request**
   - This request underscores the critical importance of upholding accurate and lawful data processing, respecting legal pathways, and supporting the principles of rehabilitation. ++++++ By ensuring data accuracy and addressing errors, the Claimant's goal is to secure a transparent and fair resolution. The removal of specific entries will empower the Claimant to advance in life, free from the burdens of irrelevant or misleading records that obstruct personal and professional opportunities.

- **Re:** Our Request is for:
  1. The Removal of **"The Police National Computer Nominal Report Nominal Details & that of its other affiliated documentation."**

2. **Legal Grounds for Removal:**
   a. **The ROA Provides a Framework**:
      - For the removal of spent convictions, and the Now Claimants Case's falls within the eligibility criteria.

   b. **Cases Marked As "NFA"**:
      - (No Further Action) or "Not Guilty" should typically be removed from the ACRO report.

   c. **The Data Protection Act and General Data Protection Regulation "GDPR" Grant Individuals:**
      - The Legal Rights to request the erasure of their personal data in certain situations, including the removal of old or irrelevant criminal records. +++++

3. **Schedule 18 Offences:**

   - To provide clarity, The Now Claimant confirms that his conviction's do not fall under the category of Schedule 18 offences, as specified in the **Sentencing Act 2020.**

4. **Request for Erasure Under GDPR**:

   - Under the General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR), The Now Claimant is exercising his Legal Rights to request the deletion or removal of personal data where there is no compelling reason for its continued processing. I believe the inclusion of the "**Nominal Report Nominal Details"** on my PNC Record no longer serves a lawful purpose and may cause unwarranted prejudice.

5. **Request Process: --**
   a. We formally recognizing this request for erasure.
   b. We kindly request a response with your decisions made within: -- **"One Month,"** as stipulated by **"GDPR".**
   c. If any compensation requests are attached within the claim sheets, we request decisions within: -- **"One Month"** after your initial response.
   d. We understand that the Legal Right to erasure is not absolute and only applies in certain circumstances. However, the Now Claimants Case meets the criteria for removal as outlined in the **GDPR.**
   e. Upon approval, we expect the prompt execution of the erasure and appropriate communication to any third parties with whom the data may have been shared with.
   f. We appreciate your attention to this matter and request that you conduct a thorough review of this case in accordance with the applicable laws and regulations. We believe the removal of the specified details will contribute to the principles of rehabilitation and allow the Now Claimant the legal Right to move forward in his life & without the burden of an outdated and irrelevant record.
   g. If you require any additional information or documentation to facilitate this process, please do not hesitate to contact us. We are committed to providing any necessary details other than what we have already provided below to support the expeditious resolution of this matter.
   h. Thank you for your prompt attention to this request and we look forward to a positive outcome.

Nub 1	**ITEMS**				
8)	**Police National Computer Nominal Report Nominal Details**	**Yes** ☐ **No** ☐	**Yes** ☐ **No** ☐	**Yes** ☐ **No** ☐	**Yes** ☐ **No** ☐

9)	+++++++	
10)		
11)		
12)		
13)		
14)		
15)		
END		

Claim-Sheet

WHAT HAS HAPPENED
&
OUR REQUESTS

POLICE MARKERS: -- (Personal Description)

CASE (B2)

Nub 2	**ITEMS**				
1)	**Personal Description**	**Yes** ☐ **No** ☐	**Yes** ☐ **No** ☐	**Yes** ☐ **No** ☐	**Yes** ☐ **No** ☐

- **If There Is Any Other Acceptable Information, Please Provide It Below!**

A. Personal Description Erasure Request

1. Upon Our thorough examination of the data compiled within the Acro Report, initially created by police members, and subsequently archived for intelligence purposes on him and that is also related to this current case involving Mr. Simon Paul Cordell, certain significant aspects have emerged such as: --
   a. The Acro Report exhibits a distinct category labelled as **"Personal Description,"** highlighting information that falls under this classification.
   b. This section explicitly pertains to The Claimant's Legal Right to Erasure Under the General Data Protection Regulation **"GDPR"**.
   c. The Now Claimant fervently seeks the opportunity to review and ultimately have granted the requested erasure, contingent on its acceptance and agreement.
2. Supporting this request, we include the following compelling reasons as presented, and substantiated with evidential artifacts where applicable:

B. The Claimants Grounds for Erasure:

1. **Fairness and Unproven Suspicion:**
   - The claimant insists that it is inequitable for the police to utilize personal descriptions solely acquired on the **"Basis of Suspicion Alone."** This includes instances of arrests that did not culminate in criminal charges.

2. **Unsubstantiated Court Cases:**

- Any instance where the police have brought a case to court against the claimant without establishing guilt raises concerns. This is exacerbated by situations where **"No Conclusive Evidence Was Presented."**

3. **Unfair PNC Record:**
   - The existing Police National Computer (PNC) record unduly Casts **"A Negative Shadow"** on the claimant's reputation, unjustly branding him with offenses for which the police lacked substantial evidence.

4. **Professional and Personal Consequences:**
   - These **"Unwarranted Arrests"** have inflicted significant professional and personal setbacks on the claimant. His time has been consumed by proving innocence during police confrontations, and his reputation tarnished, eroding client prospects and future potential.

5. **Psychological and Family Impact:**
   - The claimant's life has been **"Perpetually Marred by Unwarranted Police Attention,"** resulting in strained family relationships, emotional trauma, and estrangement.

6. **Breach of Company Policy:**
   - The police have exhibited a pattern of retaining information **"Beyond Standard Operational Procedures,"** contrary to company policies. The claimant's request aligns with these policies for data removal.

C. Specific Erasure and Correction Requests:

1. **The Now Claimant Requests the Removal Of:**
   - Such data pertaining to personal descriptions.

2. **The Now Claimant Requests the Correction Of:**
   - Any **"Inaccuracies Present"** in the mentioned data.

D. Privacy Concerns:

- In light of growing privacy concerns and data protection regulations, erasing personal descriptions contributes to safeguarding individual privacy and preventing potential misuse of personal information.

E. Identity Theft Prevention:

- By eliminating personal descriptions, the risk of identity theft and impersonation is mitigated, ensuring the claimant's security.

F. Legal Accuracy:

- Ensuring data accuracy and relevance is paramount for maintaining the legal integrity of information.

G. Immigration and Visa Applications:

- The absence of unnecessary personal descriptions prevents any inadvertent complications in immigration and visa-related processes.

H. Employment Background Checks:

- Stripping out personal descriptions prevents irrelevant data from influencing employment background checks, fostering fair hiring practices.

I. Credit and Financial Matters:

- Data precision is crucial for financial dealings and credit assessments, underscoring the need for accurate, pertinent information.

J. Government Benefits and Services:

- Accurate data without extraneous personal descriptions ensures seamless access to government benefits and services without unnecessary hindrances.

K. For these compelling reasons, the following Retained DATA is put forth for deletion:

a. The Claimant Requests the Deletion of The Following:

➢ **Personal Description =**

- **Height:** F511 (M180)
- **Build:** Proportionate
- **Shoe Size:** B9.5(E44)
- **Eye Color:** Brown
- **Glasses:** No Glasses
- **Handed:** Right
- **Hair:** Collar Length/Black/Plaited
- **Accent:** London
- **Facial Hair:** Beard/Black

L. In Conclusion

- In conclusion to, the request for erasure of personal descriptions is substantiated by a series of valid concerns encompassing fairness, security, legal integrity, and various practical implications. This appeal aligns not only with the claimant's rights but also with broader principles of data protection and privacy.

Claim-Sheet

WHAT HAS HAPPENED
&
OUR REQUESTS

POLICE MARKERS: -- (Driver Details)

CASE (C3)

Nub 3	**ITEMS**				
1)	**Driver Details**	**Yes** ☐ **No** ☐	**Yes** ☐ **No** ☐	**Yes** ☐ **No** ☐	**Yes** ☐ **No** ☐

- **If There Is Any Other Acceptable Information, Please Provide It Below!**

A. The Claimant requests that of the "**DRIVER DETAILS**" Contained in the attached file to his name that is known as an ACRO Report when reviewed by Official persons of relevance to class this listed as the same "**Grossly-Term-Refs**" as the requests prior made in part "**Nub 1**" of this "**Official Document**" but with the additional Requests or due to Reasons if any as follows: --

B. Reason One: --

- "ACRO Reports" from the (Association of Chief Police Officers Criminal Records Office.) **"Do Not Contain Driver Details,"** such as driver's license information or records of traffic violations. These reports primarily focus on an individual's criminal history, including details of arrests, convictions, and related legal matters. Driver details are typically maintained by separate government agencies responsible for motor vehicle records and traffic violations.

Claim-Sheet

WHAT HAS HAPPENED
&
OUR REQUESTS

POLICE MARKERS: -- (Aliases Alias 1)

CASE (D4)

Nub 4	**ITEMS**				
1)	**Aliases Alias 1**	**Yes** ☐ **No** ☐	**Yes** ☐ **No** ☐	**Yes** ☐ **No** ☐	**Yes** ☐ **No** ☐

- **If There Is Any Other Acceptable Information, Please Provide It Below!**

A. The Now Claimant Requests a Comprehensive Review of the **"ALIASES ALIAS 1"** section contained within this attached file associated with the ACRO Report that the police hold in the Now Claimants Name.

B. When the **"ACRO Report"** is Subjected to Assessment by any Relevant Official Persons, our request is for the categorization of this "**ALIASES ALIAS 1**" to mirror the same as the information under the same as **"Grossly-Term-Refs"** that We articulated in the earlier outlined **"Nub 1"** section of this **"Official Document."**

C. We acknowledge that the police include known aliases in individual **"ACRO Report,"** but still substantial grounds compel us to seek the removal of such **"DATA"** out of any Police National System or that of their archives that is associated within the Now Claimant's Name / ID.

D. Furthermore, any additional requests or reasons, as to why our request has been brought forth, are elaborated as follows: --

1) **Reason One:** The foundation of this request is expounded by simple facts of fundamental truths: --
   a. **Incorrect Information:**
      - Inaccurate aliases listed within the **"ACRO Report"** leads to confusion and potential legal or identity complications. Rectification or removal of such errors is imperative to ensure accuracy and integrity.

2) **Reason Two:** The basis for this appeal is underpinned by the following rationale: --
   a. **Legal, Identity, and Privacy Concerns:**
      - The Metropolitan Police Authority **"MPA"** is bound by duty to maintain precision across all ACRO Reports under their purview. Discrepancies become evident when examining the copy requested by the Claimant directly from the **"MPA."** This situation undermines the mandatory data procedures that the police must rigorously adhere to. Ensuring accuracy serves both the

police's responsibility for public peace and the foundational structure of the **"MPA"** for legal and administrative efficacy.

3) **Reason Three:** This plea finds its grounding in the following factual basis: --
   a. **Safeguarding Reputation and Fair Treatment:**
      - Retaining aliases that are not substantially linked to the Claimant potentially harm his reputation and unfairly prejudice any future interactions, be they professional or personal. Upholding fairness and unbiased representation are fundamental to a just society and accurate law enforcement practices.
      - On account of these compelling justifications, we formally submit the following case numbers for deletion:

E. The Claimant Requests the Removal of the Following Aliases Under Alias 1:

➢ **Aliases Alias 1 =**
- **Alias:** Benjamin, Simon
- **Owner:** 01 (Metropolitan Police)
- **Last Updated:** 04/03/97

==

a. **Note: "Not in Work Out Code,"** - Unable to locate information supporting the arrest date, accused offense, or outcome.
b. Also, the only reference point available is the last updated date regarding the alias and its associated cases. This lack of comprehensive information leads to confusion and makes it insufficient to maintain these records in the ACRO report due to mutable updates occurring on the same dates and cases that have been linked together, at courts.

➢ **Alias 2**
- **Alias:** Benjamin, Simon Paul
- **Owner:** 01 (Metropolitan Police)
- **Last Updated:** 04/11/97

==

a. **Note: "Not in Work Out Code,"** - Unable to locate information supporting the arrest date, accused offense, or outcome, as the only reference point available is the last updated date regarding the alias and its associated cases. This lack of comprehensive information leads to confusion and makes it insufficient to maintain these records in the ACRO report due to mutable updates occurring on the same dates and cases that have been linked together, at courts.
b. **Info:** "**Address** "63." 15/09/97 Acro 2021
c. **Note: "Not in Work Out Code"** Can't Find Information Supporting the Arrest Date or Accused Offence or Outcome.

➢ **Alias 3**
- **Alias:** Cardell, Simon Paul
- **Owner:** 01 (Metropolitan Police)
- **Last Updated:** 21/08/97

==

a. **Note: "Not in Work Out Code,"** - Unable to locate information supporting the arrest date, accused offense, or outcome as the only reference point available is the last updated date regarding the alias and its associated cases. This lack of comprehensive information leads to confusion and makes it insufficient to maintain these records in the ACRO report due to mutable updates occurring on the same dates and cases that have been linked together, at courts.

b. **Info:** "Address "66." 20/08/97 Acro 2021
c. **Arrest/Summons Ref:** 97/0000/00/736197h.
d. **Charge:** Using Threatening, Abusive, Insulting Words or Behavior W/I (With Intent) To Cause Fear or Provocation of Violence.
e. **Outcome: "Cautioned"** On 21/08/97 At 01 (Metropolitan Police) Fs/Ref: 01 (Metropolitan Police)

- **Alias 4**
  - **Alias:** Codell, Simon Paul
  - **Owner:** 01 (Metropolitan Police)
  - **Last Updated:** 27/06/13

    ==

    a. **Note: "Not in Work Out Code,"** - Unable to locate information supporting the arrest date, accused offense, or outcome, as the only reference point available is the last updated date regarding the alias and its associated cases. This lack of comprehensive information leads to confusion and makes it insufficient to maintain these records in the ACRO report due to mutable updates occurring on the same dates and cases that have been linked together, at courts.
    b. **Date Taken:** 25/06/13.
    c. **Last Updated:** 27/06/13 Acro 2021
    d. **Arrest/Summons Ref:** 13/0000/00/625125u.
    e. **Outcome:** "Won."

- **Alias 5**
  - **Alias:** Cordell, Simon
  - **Owner:** 01 (Metropolitan Police)
  - **Last Updated:** 01/06/18 Acro 2021

    ==

    a. **Note: "Not in Work Out Code,"** - Unable to locate information supporting the arrest date, accused offense, or outcome.
    b. Also, the only reference point available is the last updated date regarding the alias and its associated cases. This lack of comprehensive information leads to confusion and makes it insufficient to maintain these records in the ACRO report due to mutable updates occurring on the same dates and cases that have been linked together, at courts.
    c. 18/01YD/01/4274X
    d. **Outcome:** "Won."

- **Alias 6**
  - **Alias:** Cordell, Simon Benjamin
  - **Owner:** 01 (Metropolitan Police)
  - **Last Updated:** 22/09/97 Acro 2021

    ==

    a. **Note: "Not in Work Out Code,"** - Unable to locate information supporting the arrest date, accused offense, or outcome as the only reference point available is the last updated date regarding the alias and its associated cases. This lack of comprehensive information leads to confusion and makes it insufficient to maintain these records in the ACRO report due to mutable updates occurring on the same dates and cases that have been linked together, at courts.
    b. **Case Numb:** 97/0000/00/823525e = Process Stage: REPORTED ON 21/09/97 - 18:40 = ON 21/09/97 (PLEA:GUILTY)
    c. **Adjudication:** Guilty Using Threatening, Abusive, Or Insulting Words or Behavior Likely to Cause Distress.

F. Alias Review Table

Alias Name	Last Updated	Issues Identified	Outcome/Request
Alias 1 (Benjamin, Simon)	04/03/97	**No supporting arrest date, offense, or outcome**. Inconsistent updates lead to confusion.	Request removal due to insufficient data.
Alias 2 (Benjamin, Simon Paul)	04/11/97	**Missing arrest, offense, and outcome details.** References outdated address ("63").	Request removal for clarity and lack of evidence.
Alias 3 (Cardell, Simon Paul)	21/08/97	Linked to address "66" and caution dated 21/08/97. Insufficient details on arrest ref. 97/0000/00/736197h. **Outcome: "Cautioned"**	Recommend removal due to incomplete data.
Alias 4 (Codell, Simon Paul)	27/06/13	Missing case details associated with ref. 13/0000/00/625125u. **Case Marked "Won**," due to NFA.	Request removal for outdated and inconsistent information.
Alias 5 (Cordell, Simon)	01/06/18	Case ref. 18/01YD/01/4274X **Marked "Won." Due To NFA.**	Recommend removal for accuracy and redundancy.
Alias 6 (Cordell, Simon Benjamin)	22/09/97	Case ref. 97/0000/00/823525e shows adjudication as "Guilty." Data remains unclear and incomplete.	Request removal for clarity and fairness in representation.

Claim-Sheet

WHAT HAS HAPPENED
&
OUR REQUESTS

POLICE MARKERS: -- (Alias Dates of Birth)

CASE (E5)

Nub 5	**ITEMS**				
1)	**Alias Dates of Birth - Address**	**Yes** ☐ **No** ☐	**Yes** ☐ **No** ☐	**Yes** ☐ **No** ☐	**Yes** ☐ **No** ☐

- **If There Is Any Other Acceptable Information, Please Provide It Below!**

A. Subject: Request for Removal of Alias Dates of Birth and Address.

B. Introduction: I, the Claimant, formally request the removal of the **"ALIAS DATES OF BIRTH"** contained in the attached file. These alias dates of birth are listed in the ACRO Report and have been associated with my name. This request aligns with the previous requests made in **"Part Nub 1"** of this Official Document and is substantiated by compelling reasons detailed below.

C. Reasons for Removal:

1. **Identity Confusion:**
   - The presence of inaccurate alias addresses can lead to identity confusion, potentially affecting innocent individuals.

2. **Privacy Violation:**
   - The retention of unnecessary alias addresses by the police infringes upon my right to privacy and data protection.

3. **Prejudice and Bias:**
   - The police's retention of irrelevant aliases and addresses has led to unfair profiling, reflecting bias on their part. This unjustified information could result in discriminatory labelling and unwarranted investigations. Moreover, these investigations have proven to be maliciously fraudulent and unproven, with no wrongdoing attributed to me, thereby serving no public interest.

4. **Legal Implications:**
   - Incorrect alias addresses can lead to legal complications and unjust suspicion, causing unnecessary stress and damage to one's reputation.

5. **Misuse of Information:**
   - Unrelated alias addresses may be misused for false accusations, leading to cases of harassment.

6. **Data Security:**
   - The unnecessary retention of such data increases the risk of data breaches or leaks, potentially exposing sensitive information.

7. **Resource Allocation:**
   - Law enforcement resources might be misallocated by pursuing leads based on irrelevant alias addresses, leading to a waste of valuable resources.

8. **Civil Liberties:**
   - Unjustified retention of alias addresses could infringe on civil liberties.

9. **Fair Due Process:**
   - Maintaining incorrect alias addresses compromises fair due process and can result in unjust interventions.

10. **Transparency and Human Rights:**
    - Retaining irrelevant alias addresses lacks transparency in law enforcement practices and may violate human rights.

D. Specific Data for Deletion:

- I hereby request the removal of the following specific alias dates of birth and addresses from the ACRO Report:

E. Alias Dates of Birth:

- Alias Date of Birth 1: 21/01/81 (METROPOLITAN POLICE)

F. Addresses 2021 Acro Report:

1) **Address 1:** Home 109 Burncroft Avenue Enfield Middlesex En3 7jq
   - (Won) - Date At: 25/10/18, Status: "**Won.**"

2) **Address 2:** Home 109 Burncroft Avenue Enfield En3 7jq
   - (Won) - Date At: 01/06/18, Status: "**Won.**"

3) **Address 3:** Home 109 Burncroft Avenue Enfield En3 7jq
   - (Won) - Date At: 16/03/18, Status: "**Won.**"

4) **Address 4:** Home 109 Burncroft Avenue Enfield En3 7jq
   - (Won) - Date At: 10/01/18, Status: "**Won.**"

5) **Address 5:** Home 109 Burncroft Avenue Enfield Middlesex En3 7jq
   - (Won) - Date At: 22/03/17, Status: "**Won.**"

6) **Address 6:** Home 109 Burncroft Avenue Enfield En3 7jq
   - (Won) - Date At: 05/10/16, Status: "**Won.**"

7) **Address 7:** Bail Address 23 Byron Terrace London N9 7dg
   - (Won) - Date At: 05/10/16, Status: "**Won.**"

8) **Address 8:** Home 109 Burncroft Avenue Enfield Middlesex En3 7jq
   - (Won) - Date At: 16/08/16, Status: "**Won.**"

9) **Address 9:** Bail Address 109 Burncroft Avenue Enfield Middlesex En3 7jq
   - (Won) - Date At: 9/09/13, Status: **""** - No Information Available Supporting the Arrest Date, Accused Offense, Or Final Outcome. 13/0000/00/625125U
   - **NFA (NO FURTHER ACTION)** 12. Disposal (NFA)

10) **Address 10:** Home 109 Burncroft Avenue Enfield Middlesex En3 7jq
    - (Won) - - Date At: 07/04/13, Status: "**Won.**"

11) **Address 11:** Home 109 Burncroft Avenue Enfield Middlesex En3 7jq
    - (Won) - Date At: 25/01/13, Status: "**Won.**"

12) **Address 12:** Home 109 Burncroft Avenue Enfield Middlesex En3 7jq
    - (Won) - Date At: 08/11/12, Status: **"Not in Work Out Code"** - No Information Available Supporting the Arrest Date, Accused Offense, Or Final Outcome.

13) **Address 13:** Home 109 Burncroft Avenue Enfield Middlesex En3 7jq
    - (Won) - Date At: 15/10/12, Status: "**Won.**"

14) Address 14: Home 23 Byron Terrace Ed Monton London Greater London N9

- (Won) - Date At: 14/08/12 Status: "**Won.**"

15) Address 15: Home 23 Byron Terr Ace Ed Monton London Greater London N9 7dg
(Won) - Date At: 01/04/12, Status: **"Won."**

16) Address 16: Home 23 Byron Terrace Ed Monton London Greater London N9 7dg

- (Won) - Date At: 05/09/11, Status: **""** - No Information Available Supporting the Arrest Date, Accused Offense, Or Final Outcome. 11/01YE/01/5200L
- **NOT GUILTY 20.** Disposal (Court).

17) Address 17: Home 109 Burncroft Avenue Enfield Middlesex En3 7jq

- (Won) - Date At: 05/12/10, Status: "**Won.**"

18) Address 18: Home 23 Byron Terrace Ed Monton London Greater London N9 7dg

- (Won) - Date At: 02/05/10, Status: "**Won.**"

---

19) Address 19: Home Flat 109, Burncroft Avenue Enfield Middlesex En3 7jq

- (Won) - (Lost) - Date At: 14/10/09, Status: **"The Same as Address 20" "Lost X1" & "Wonx2."**

20) Address 20: Home Flat 109, Burncroft Avenue Enfield Middlesex En3 7jq

- (Won) - (Lost) - Date At: **14/10/09** Status: **"Lost X1" & "Wonx2," 09/0000/00/929328d.**

21) Address 21: Home Flat 109, Burncroft Avenue Enfield Middlesex En3 7jq

- (Won) - (Lost) - Date At: 14/10/09 Status: **"The Same as Address 20" "Lost X1" & "Wonx2."**

22) Address 22: Home 23 Byron Terr Ace London Greater London N9 7dg

- (Won) - (Lost) - Date At: 14/10/09 Status: **"The Same as Address 20" "Lost X1" & "Wonx2."**

23) Address 23: Home Flat 109, Burncroft Avenue Enfield Middlesex En3 7jq

- (Won) - (Lost) - Date At: 14/10/09 Status: **"The Same as Address 20" "Lost X1" & "Wonx2."**

24) Address 24: Home 23 Byron Terrace Ed Monton London Greater London N9 7dg

- (Won) - (Lost) - Date At: 14/10/09 Status: **"The Same as Address 20" "Lost X1" & "Wonx2."**

---

25) Address 25: Home Flat 109, Burncroft Avenue Enfield Middlesex En3 7jq

- (Won) - Date At: 09/08/09, Status: **"Not in Work Out Code"** - No Information Available Supporting the Arrest Date, Accused Offense, Or Final Outcome.

26) Address 26: Home Flat 109, Burncroft Avenue Enfield Middlesex En3 7jq

- (Won) - Date At: 08/08/09, Status: **"Won."**

27) Address 27: Home Flat 109, Burncroft Avenue Enfield Middlesex En3 7jq

- (Won) - Date At: 26/07/09, Status: “” - No Information Available Supporting the Arrest Date, Accused Offense, Or Final Outcome. 09/23N3/01/1708M
- 20. Arrest, 30. Disposal (NFA) NFA (NO FURTHER ACTION)

28) Address 28: Home 23 Byron Terrace Ed Monton London Greater London N9 7dg
- (Lost) - Date At: **19/02/09**, Status: **“Lost X1” 09/0000/00/174108m**

29) Address 29: Home 23 Byron Terrace Ed Monton London Greater London N9 7dg
- (Won) - Date At: 05/02/09, Status: **"Won."**

30) Address 30: Home 23 Byron Terrace Ed Monton London Greater London N9 7dg
- (Won) - Date At: 02/01/09, Status: **"Won."**

31) Address 31: Home 23 Byron Terrace Ed Monton London Greater London N9 7dg
- (Lost) - Date At: **15/11/08,** Status: **“Lost X1” 08/01yt/01/4253k**

32) Address 32: Home Flat 109, Burncroft Avenue Enfield Middlesex En3 7jq
- (Lost) - Date At: 28/07/08, Status: “” - No Information Available Supporting the Arrest Date, Accused Offense, Or Final Outcome. 08/01YE/01/4408D
- 27. Arrest. 38. Disposal (Court) GUILTY THEFT
- PNC Printout 2012 Conviction 28 (Plea: Guilty} 25/07/08.

33) Address 33: Home 23 Byron Terrace Ed Monton London Greater London N9 7dg
- (Won) - Date At: 18/03/08 Status: **"Won."**

34) Address 34: Home Flat 109, Burncroft Avenue Enfield Middlesex En3 7jq
- (Won) - Date At: 22/12/07, Status: **"Won."**

35) Address 35: Home 23 Byron Terrace Ed Monton London Greater London N9 7dg
- (Won) - Date At: 02/12/07, Status: **"Won."**

36) Address 36: Home 23 Byron Terrace Ed Monton London Greater London N9 7dg
- (Won) - Date At: 24/11/07, Status: **"Won."**

37) Address 37: Home 23 Byron Terrace Ed Monton London Greater London N9 7dg
- (Won) - Date At: 03/09/07, Status: **"Won."**

38) Address 38: Home 23 Byron Terrace Ed Monton London Greater London N9 7dg
- (Won) - Date At: 17/03/07, Status: **"Won."**

39) Address 39: Home 23 Byron Terrace Ed Monton London Greater London N9 7dg
- (Won) - Date At: 01/06/06, Status: **“Not in Work Out Code”** - No Information Available Supporting the Arrest Date, Accused Offense, Or Final Outcome.

40) Address 40: Home 4 Crompton Place Enfield London En3 6xs
- (Won) - Date At: 05/05/06, Status: **"Won."**

41) Address 41: Home 23 Byron Terrace Ed Monton London Greater London N9 7dg
- (Won) - Date At: 06/04/06 Status: **“Not in Work Out Code”** - No Information Available Supporting the Arrest Date, Accused Offense, Or Final Outcome.

- 06/04/06

42) **Address 42:** Alternative Address 4 Crompton Pl Ace Enfield Middlesex En3 6xs
- (Won) - Date At: 25/03/06 Status: **"Won."**

43) **Address 43:** Home 23 Byron Terrace Ed Monton London Greater London N9 7dg
- (Won) - Date At: 25/03/06 Status: **"Won."**

44) **Address 44:** Not Known - Date At: 21/03/06,
- (Won) - Status: **"Not in Work Out Code"** - No Information Available Supporting the Arrest Date, Accused Offense, Or Final Outcome.

45) **Address 45:** Home 23 Byron Terrace Ed Monton London Greater London N9 7dg
- (Won) - Date At: 01/02/06, Status: **"Not in Work Out Code"** - No Information Available Supporting the Arrest Date, Accused Offense, Or Final Outcome.

46) **Address 46:** Home 23 Byron Terrace Ed Monton London Greater London N9 7dg
- (Lost) - Date At: **23/01/06,** Status: **"Lost X1"** **06/0000/00/113215c**

47) **Address 47:** Home 4 Crompton Place Enfield Middlesex
- (Won) - Date At: 31/12/04, **Status**: **"Not in Work Out Code"** - No Information Available Supporting the Arrest Date, Accused Offense, Or Final Outcome.

---

48) **Address 48:** Home 4 Crompton Place Enfield Middlesex
- (Lost) - Date At: **02/04/03**, Status: **"Lost X1"** **04/0000/00/1054471J**

49) **Address 49:** Home 23 Byron Terrace Ed Monton London Greater London N9 7dg
(Lost) - Date At: **02/04/03** Status: **"The Same as Address 48" "Lost X1" 04/0000/00/1054471J = "LOST" 21/08/03. Address 48** Was updated 10 days before or when this was update!

---

50) **Address 50:** Home 23 Byron Terrace Ed Monton London Greater London N9 7dg
- (Won) - Date At: 08/05/02, Status: **"Not in Work Out Code"** - No Information Available Supporting the Arrest Date, Accused Offense, Or Final Outcome.

51) **Address 51:** Bail Address the Old Barn Goffs Lane Goffs Oak Cheshunt
- (Won) - Date At: 18/08/00, Status: **"Not in Work Out Code"** - No Information Available Supporting the Arrest Date, Accused Offense, Or Final Outcome.

52) **Address 52:** Home 4 Crompton Place Enfield Middlesex
- (Won) - Date At: 01/06/99, Status: **"Not in Work Out Code"** - No Information Available Supporting the Arrest Date, Accused Offense, Or Final Outcome.

53) **Address 53:** Home 23 Byron Terrace Ed Monton London Greater London N9 7dg
- (Won) - Date At: 19/05/99, Status: **"Not in Work Out Code"** - No Information Available Supporting the Arrest Date, Accused Offense, Or Final Outcome.

54) **Address 54:** Home 23 Byron Terrace Ed Monton London Greater London N9 7dg

- (Won) - Date At: 29/01/99, Status: **"Not in Work Out Code"** - No Information Available Supporting the Arrest Date, Accused Offense, Or Final Outcome.
- The Acro Report 2012 states that on the **29/01/99** that I was released from prison on this date and was put on police supervision Supervisory
- Period Start Date: 29/01/99
- Supervisory Period End Date: 29/04/99

---

55) Address 55: Home 23 Byron Terrace Ed Monton London Greater London N9 7dg
- (Lost) - Date At: **19/11/98** Status: **"Lost X1" 98/0000/00/989685m.**

56) Address 56: Home 23 Byron Terrace Ed Monton London Greater London N9 7dg
- (Lost) - Date At: **13/11/98** Status: **"The Same as Address 55" "Lost X1" 98/0000/00/989685M**

57) Address 57: Home 23 Byron Terrace Ed Monton London Greater London N9 7dg
- (Lost) - Date At: **12/11/98** Status: **"The Same as Address 55" "Lost X1" 98/0000/00/989685M**
- Acro Report 2021 54. Arrest CHARGED ON 12/11/98 18:42 71. Disposal (Court)
- PNC 18/11/98 Enfield Juvenile, Imprisonment 5 MTh's, Conviction 9, Driving Whilst Disqualified.

---

58) Address 58: Home Fairfax House 641 Green Lanes N8
- (Lost) - Date At: **09/04/98** Status: **"Lost X1" Fairfax Children's Home. 98/0000/00/388582P**

59) Address 59: Home 641 Green Lanes Hornsey London N8
- (Lost)- Date At: **09/03/98,** Status: **"Lost X1" 98/0000/00/227669j**

60) Address 60: Home Fairfax House 641 Green Lanes N8
- (Won) - Date At: 28/02/98, Status: **"Not in Work Out Code"** - No Information Available Supporting the Arrest Date, Accused Offense, Or Final Outcome.

61) Address 61: Home 23 Byron Terrace Ed Monton N9 7dg
- (Lost) - Date At: **03/11/97**, Status: **"Lost X1" 97/0000/00/964137u**

62) Address 62: Home 23 Byron Terrace Ed Monton N9 7dg
- (Won) - Date At: 15/09/97, Status: **"Not in Work Out Code"** - No Information Available Supporting the Arrest Date, Accused Offense, Or Final Outcome.

63) Address 63: Home 23 Byron Terrace Ed Monton N9 7dg
- (Won) - Date At: 29/05/97, Status: **"Not in Work Out Code"** - No Information Available Supporting the Arrest Date, Accused Offense, Or Final Outcome.

64) Address 64: Home 23 Byron Terrace Ed Monton N9 7dg
(Won) - Date At: 14/01/97, Status: **"Not in Work Out Code"** - No Information Available Supporting the Arrest Date, Accused Offense, Or Final Outcome.

65) Address 65: Home 23 Byron Terrace Ed Monton N9 7dg
- (Won) - Date At: 01/01/94, Status: **"Not in Work Out Code"** - No Information Available Supporting the Arrest Date, Accused Offense, Or Final Outcome.

66) Address 66: Home 23 Byron Terrace Ed Monton N9 7dg

- (Won) - Date At: 01/01/86, Status: **"Not in Work Out Code"** - No Information Available Supporting the Arrest Date, Accused Offense, Or Final Outcome.
- Not even for 01/01/16 or 01/01/96.

G. Lost Cases

	Address		
1.	**Address** 28 **Summons** **09/0000/00/174108m**	**Possess A Controlled Drug – Class B – Cannabis resin.** **Offence Date(s):** 19/02/09 **Location:** ELSINGE Road En3 (01ye) **Disposal:** 06/03/09 **At:** Enfield Magistrates Court **Ref:** 09/2757/41947f **1** Fine £65.00 - Cn0900610376 **2** Forfeiture and Destruction of Cannabis Resin **3** Costs £40.00	
2.	**Address** 31 **Summons** 08/01YT/01/4253K	**Driving A Motor Vehicle with Excess Alcohol**	
3.	**Address** 46 **Summons** 06/0000/00/113215c	**The Bail Conditions Were!** **Condition 1:** **** **Condition 2:** **** **Prosecuting Agent:** None **Disposal:** Penalty Notice Issued On 23/01/06 At 42 (Essex Police) Fs/ **Ref:** 42 (Essex Police) **Location:** Market Square, Harlow, Essex (42dz) **Adjudication:**Non-Conviction **Plea Description:** No Plea Taken **NOT IN THE 2012 PNC COPY**	
4.	**Address** 49 **Summons** 04/0000/00/1054471J	**1** Use Disorderly Behaviour or Threatening/ Abusive/ Insulting **2** Words Likely to Cause Harassment Alarm or Distress **The Bail Conditions Were!** **Condition 1:** **** **Condition 2:** **** **Disposal:** 21/08/03 **At:** Enfield Magistrates Court **Ref:** 04/2757/136593v **1** Conditional Discharge 24 MThs (Months) **IN THE 2012 PNC COPY**	

5.	**Address** 55 **Summons** 98/0000/00/989685m **Address** 56 **Summons** **Address** 57 **Summons**	1) Driving Whilst Disqualified 2) Dangerous Driving 3) No Insurance **The Bail Conditions Were!** **Condition 1:** **** **Condition 2:** **** **18/11/98** **At:** Enfield Juvenile Court **Ref:** 98/2757/508187l **1** Imprisonment 5 MThs (Months) **IN THE 2012 PNC COPY**	
6.	**Address** 58 **Summons** 98/0000/00/388582P	**57+Arrest / 2021 Acro =** **98/0000/00/388582P** Arrest/Summons Ref: 98/0000/00/388582P Name Charged: CORDELL, SIMON Date of Birth: 26/01/81 Fingerprint Status: CONFIRMED 66 (NIS - NATIONAL IDENTIFICATION SERVICE) 07/05/98 Process Stage: CHARGED ON 09/04/98 16:13 Arresting Officer: SCOTT/PC/196160/YR Report Owner: 01 (METROPOLITAN POLICE) Prosecuting Agent: CROWN PROSECUTION SERVICE (CPS) Last Updated: 22/10/98 **Remand** Description: REMANDED ON BAIL ON 09/04/98 At: AT 01YR To Appear at: NEXT APPEARING ON 07/05/98 At: AT HARINGEY JUVENILE Owner: 01 (METROPOLITAN POLICE) Last Updated: 11/05/98 Condition 1: TO LIVE AT FAIRFAX HOUSE, 641 GREEN LANES, LONDON N8	

75+Disposal (Court) / 2021 Acro = 98/0000/00/388582P = Arrest 51

Adjudication Date:	18/06/98
Court Name:	HARINGEY JU VENILE
Name:	CORDELL, SIMON PAUL
Offence Count:	1
Taken into Consideration:	0
Owner:	01 (METROPOLITAN POLICE)
Last Updated:	25/10/01

Offence

Arrest/Summons Ref:	98/0000/00/388582P
Crime Reference:	01YD/CN9155/98
Offence Number:	1
Court/Caution/Force Reference:	98/6742/200774F
Court Offence Number:	1
Adjudication:	GUILTY
Plea Description:	NOT KNOWN
Originator:	01 (METROPOLITAN POLICE)
Offence Description:	BURGLARY AND THEFT - NON-DWELLING
Offence Date(s):	28/01/98
Disposal:	18/06/98 AT HARINGEY JUVENILE COURT REF: 98/6742/200774F 1 YOUNG OFFENDERS INSTITUTION 2 MTHS (MONTHS)

PNC

11.	18/06/98 Haringey Juvenile	

1.	1. Burglary and Theft - Non-Dwelling On 28/01/98 (Plea Not Known) • Theft Act 1968 S.9(L)(B) ** Offence Committed on Bail **	Young Offenders Institution 2 MTh's

When I was a teenager, I lived in Fairfax House, a children's home located at **641 Green Lanes, N8**.

Fairfax House was more than just a residence; it was intended to be a home. There were only five children living there at any one time, which helped to create a close-knit and supportive environment. I had my own bedroom, and my key worker, Unize, was lovely and I treated her like a second mother, she guided and support me as I grow though my adolescence. Every week, I received pocket money from my legal guardians, which provided a small but meaningful sense of independence.

Like many teenagers, I found my own ways to explore life. I had a girlfriend, and, on some nights, I would sneak out of the house using the drainpipe to meet her. I would climb down the pipe to leave and climb back up when I returned. One evening, after I came back late, my guardians decided to punish me for doing such a thing and they punished me by refusing to give me my pocket money the following day. Feeling upset and misunderstood, I used the drainpipe to access the office, where I took only the pocket money that had always been meant for me.

When I returned home, however, I was greeted by the police. I was arrested, and what followed felt deeply unfair. Despite Fairfax House being my home, I was charged with burglary and theft. I was young, vulnerable, and lacked the support of my legal guardians during this process. I felt abandoned by the people who were supposed to advocate for me. Instead of being given the

chance to explain my actions or have my situation understood, I was processed through the system like a statistic.

The legal system treated me not as a teenager struggling with emotions but as a criminal. I was found guilty of both charges and sent to juvenile prison. Losing Fairfax House meant losing the only place that had felt like a home, and I was left without the support system that every adolescent deserves. This conviction has remained on my record, marking me for an incident that I believe was handled unjustly. I don't believe I could have burglarized my own home, and I feel the system failed to account for my circumstances and my vulnerability at the time.

Now, I want this conviction reviewed and deleted. I seek recognition of the unjust way in which the charges were applied and the impact it has had on my life.

Should I Have Been Charged with Burglary?

From a legal standpoint, **burglary** typically involves unlawfully entering a building with the intent to commit theft or another crime. In my case, since Fairfax House was my home, it's highly debatable whether my actions should have met the threshold for burglary. The concept of **"Unlawfully Entering"** your own residence is complex, and legal arguments should have been raised against that charge.

It seems the system did not fairly account for the nuances of my situation, including my lack of legal support or advocacy at the time of being an adolescent.

However, the **"Theft Charge"** would have been based on the act of taking money from the office. Even though the money was intended for me, this situation could have been more compassionately handled, recognising the emotional distress I was under as an adolescent.

Can This Conviction Be Reviewed and Deleted?

Yes, there may be avenues for you to pursue a review and request the removal of this conviction. Here are the potential steps you can take:

1. **Review Under the Rehabilitation of Offenders Act 1974 (ROA)**:
   - Depending on the details, your conviction may now be considered "spent" under the ROA, meaning it should no longer affect most aspects of your life.
   - Although spent convictions generally remain on your Police National Computer (PNC) record, they are excluded from most disclosure requests, such as employment background checks, unless you're working in exempted fields.

2. **Record Deletion Process (RDP)**:
   - If you believe the conviction was unjust or based on factors such as **misapplication of charges** or lack of proper legal support, you may apply to ACRO for the Record Deletion Process.
   - Grounds for requesting deletion could include:
     a. **Mistaken Identity:** (arguing you did not "burgle" your own home).
     b. **No Crime:** (highlighting the unique circumstances and lack of intent to commit burglary).
     c. **Proven Alibi/Insufficient Evidence:** (if you have supporting evidence to challenge the conviction's fairness).
3. **Judicial Review**:
   - If you believe this conviction has infringed upon your rights, particularly given the vulnerability of your circumstances as a minor without sufficient guardianship support, you may explore a **"Judicial Review."**

4. **Human Rights or Miscarriage of Justice**:
   - If you feel your treatment by the legal system violated your rights or resulted in a miscarriage of justice, you could consult a legal advocate specializing in such cases to seek redress.

5. **Legal Advocacy**:
   - Contacting a solicitor who specializes in criminal appeals, youth justice, or rehabilitation law could help you present your case comprehensively.

6. **Removal from ACRO Report**:
   - Even if the record cannot be fully expunged from the PNC, you may request its removal from an **ACRO report** to minimize its disclosure.

7. **Address** 59
Summons
98/0000/00/227669j

59. Arrest
98/0000/00/227669J
CHARGED ON 09/03/98 23:59
76. Disposal (Court)
COMMON ASSAULT
10/01/98 17:45 to 10/01/98 17:50
10/06/98 AT ENFIELD JUVENILE COURT
REF: 98/6757/118791R
1 FINE £50.00
2 COMPENSATION £50.00

★
Page 25 OF 31
Page 5 Of 11
PNC

10.	10/06/98 Enfield Juvenile	
1.	1. Common Assault On 10/01/98 (Plea: Not Known) Criminal Justice Act 1988 S.39	Fine 50.00 Compensation 50.00

★

8. **Address** 61
Summons
97/0000/00/964137u

62. Arrest
97/0000/00/964137U

		Fingerprint Status: CONFIRMED 66 (NIS - NATIONAL IDENTIFICATION CHARGED ON 01/09/97 21:18 79. Disposal (Court) DRIVING WHILST DISQUALIFIED GUILTY Offence Date(s): 20/05/98 AT ENFIELD JUVENILE COURT REF: 97/6757/566952F 1 DISQUALIFICATION FROM DRIVING 3 YRS (YEARS)	

Not in Work Out Code Cases

Address Number's: 12. 25, 39, 41, 44, 45, 47, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 60, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66.

Total: 18

#	Home Address	Date	Status	Notes
1.	**Address**: 12 **Home**: Home 109 Burncroft Avenue Enfield Middlesex En3 7jq	08/11/12	Not in Work Out Code	No information available supporting the arrest date, accused offense, or final outcome.
2.	**Address**: 25 **Home:** Flat 109, Burncroft Avenue, Enfield, Middlesex, EN3 7JQ	09/08/09	Not in Work Out Code	No information available supporting the arrest date, accused offense, or final outcome.
3.	**Address**: 39 **Home:** 23 Byron Terrace, Edmonton, London, N9 7DG	14/08/12	Not in Work Out Code	No information available supporting the arrest date, accused offense, or final outcome.
4.	**Address**: 41 **Home:** Flat 109, Burncroft Avenue, Enfield, Middlesex, EN3 7JQ	05/09/11	Not in Work Out Code	No information available supporting the arrest date, accused offense, or final outcome.
5.	**Address: 44** **Home:** 23 Byron Terrace, Edmonton, London, N9 7DG	26/07/09	Not in Work Out Code	No information available supporting the arrest date, accused offense, or final outcome.

6.	**Address: 45** **Home:** 23 Byron Terrace, Edmonton, London, N9 7DG	28/07/08	Not in Work Out Code	No information available supporting the arrest date, accused offense, or final outcome.
7.	**Address: 47** **Home:** 109 Burncroft Avenue, Enfield, Middlesex, EN3 7JQ	16/08/16	Not in Work Out Code	No information available supporting the arrest date, accused offense, or final outcome.
8.	**Address: 50** **Home:** 109 Burncroft Avenue, Enfield, Middlesex, EN3 7JQ	07/04/13	Not in Work Out Code	No information available supporting the arrest date, accused offense, or final outcome.
9.	**Address: 51** **Home:** 109 Burncroft Avenue, Enfield, Middlesex, EN3 7JQ	09/09/13	Not in Work Out Code	No information available supporting the arrest date, accused offense, or final outcome.
10.	**Address**: 52 **Home:** 23 Byron Terrace, Edmonton, London, N9 7DG	14/10/09	Not in Work Out Code	No information available supporting the arrest date, accused offense, or final outcome.
11.	**Address: 53** **Home:** 109 Burncroft Avenue, Enfield, Middlesex, EN3 7JQ	22/03/17	Not in Work Out Code	No information available supporting the arrest date, accused offense, or final outcome.
12.	**Address: 54** **Home:** 109 Burncroft Avenue, Enfield, Middlesex, EN3 7JQ	28/07/08	Not in Work Out Code	No information available supporting the arrest date, accused offense, or final outcome.
13.	**Address**: 60 **Home:** 109 Burncroft Avenue, Enfield, Middlesex, EN3 7JQ	05/10/16	Not in Work Out Code	No information available supporting the arrest date, accused offense, or final outcome.
14.	**Address**: 62 **Home:**	09/08/09	Not in Work Out Code	No information available

	109 Burncroft Avenue, Enfield, Middlesex, EN3 7JQ			supporting the arrest date, accused offense, or final outcome.
15.	**Address**: 63 **Home:** 109 Burncroft Avenue, Enfield, Middlesex, EN3 7JQ	08/08/09	Not in Work Out Code	No information available supporting the arrest date, accused offense, or final outcome.
16.	**Address**: 64 **Home:** 109 Burncroft Avenue, Enfield, Middlesex, EN3 7JQ	26/07/09	Not in Work Out Code	No information available supporting the arrest date, accused offense, or final outcome.
17.	**Address**: 65 **Home:** 109 Burncroft Avenue, Enfield, Middlesex, EN3 7JQ	05/02/09	Not in Work Out Code	No information available supporting the arrest date, accused offense, or final outcome.
18.	**Address**: 66 **Home:** 23 Byron Terrace, Edmonton, London, N9 7DG	02/01/09	Not in Work Out Code	No information available supporting the arrest date, accused offense, or final outcome.

- In the **"2017 ACRO Report,"** there are **"77 Addresses"** associated with my name. However, I have been arrested far more times than the number of records suggests. **"When Totalled, My Arrests Exceed 100 Incidents,"** and I have successfully won every case except for the ones explicitly listed.
- The existence of this extensive criminal record has subjected me to persistent and unwarranted police attention, creating an environment of harassment. This ongoing scrutiny often escalates to situations where I feel compelled to act in self-defence against the police due to the undue stress and injustice caused by this record. As a result, I am frequently arrested on unfair grounds, which leads to verbal altercations. These verbal exchanges are then used as the sole basis for charges against me.
- Given these circumstances, I formally request the deletion of all offences related to breach of the peace or charges stemming from threatening words and behaviour. These charges not only stem from the undue harassment I experience but also fail to reflect the systemic issues that have contributed to my treatment by the authorities.

- **Won Cases**
  a. **Address Number's**: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 26, 27, 29, 30, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 40, 42, 43.
  b. **Total**: 35
  +
  c. **Total**: 18 + 35 = 48.
  +

d. Out of 8 Conviction there is non-convictions involved as well as mis minor juvenile offences and driving offences and/or breach of the peace.

Number	Address Home		Date	Status	Notes
1	Address: 1	109 Burncroft Avenue, Enfield, Middlesex, EN3 7JQ	25/10/18	Won	No further information available to support the outcome.
2	Address: 2	109 Burncroft Avenue, Enfield, Middlesex, EN3 7JQ	01/06/18	Won	No further information available to support the outcome.
3	Address: 3	109 Burncroft Avenue, Enfield, Middlesex, EN3 7JQ	16/03/18	Won	No further information available to support the outcome.
4	Address: 4	109 Burncroft Avenue, Enfield, Middlesex, EN3 7JQ	10/01/18	Won	No further information available to support the outcome.
5	Address: 5	109 Burncroft Avenue, Enfield, Middlesex, EN3 7JQ	22/03/17	Won	No further information available to support the outcome.
6	Address: 6	109 Burncroft Avenue, Enfield, Middlesex, EN3 7JQ	05/10/16	Won	No further information available to support the outcome.
7	Address: 7	23 Byron Terrace, London, N9 7DG	05/10/16	Won	No further information available to support the outcome.
8	Address: 8	109 Burncroft Avenue, Enfield, Middlesex, EN3 7JQ	16/08/16	Won	No further information available to support the outcome.
9	Address: 9	109 Burncroft Avenue, Enfield, Middlesex, EN3 7JQ	07/04/13	Won	No further information available to support the outcome.
10	Address: 10	109 Burncroft Avenue, Enfield, Middlesex, EN3 7JQ	25/01/13	Won	No further information available to support the outcome.
11	Address: 11	109 Burncroft Avenue, Enfield, Middlesex, EN3 7JQ	15/10/12	Won	No further information available to support the outcome.
13	Address: 13	23 Byron Terrace, Edmonton, London, N9 7DG	14/08/12	Won	No further information available to support the outcome.
14	Address: 14	23 Byron Terrace, Edmonton, London, N9 7DG	01/04/12	Won	No further information available to support the outcome.
15	Address: 15	23 Byron Terrace, Edmonton, London, N9 7DG	05/12/10	Won	No further information available to support the outcome.
16	Address: 16	23 Byron Terrace, Edmonton, London, N9 7DG	02/05/10	Won	No further information available to support the outcome.
17	Address: 17	109 Burncroft Avenue, Enfield, Middlesex, EN3 7JQ	14/10/09	Won	No further information available to support the outcome.

18	Address: 18	23 Byron Terrace, Edmonton, London, N9 7DG	08/08/09	Won	No further information available to support the outcome.
19	Address: 19	109 Burncroft Avenue, Enfield, Middlesex, EN3 7JQ	05/08/09	Won	No further information available to support the outcome.
20	Address: 20	23 Byron Terrace, Edmonton, London, N9 7DG	26/07/09	Won	No further information available to support the outcome.
21	Address: 21	23 Byron Terrace, Edmonton, London, N9 7DG	25/06/09	Won	No further information available to support the outcome.
22	Address: 22	23 Byron Terrace, Edmonton, London, N9 7DG	09/04/09	Won	No further information available to support the outcome.
23	Address: 23	23 Byron Terrace, Edmonton, London, N9 7DG	01/02/09	Won	No further information available to support the outcome.
24	Address: 24	109 Burncroft Avenue, Enfield, Middlesex, EN3 7JQ	28/07/08	Won	No further information available to support the outcome.
26	Address: 26	109 Burncroft Avenue, Enfield, Middlesex, EN3 7JQ	14/08/07	Won	No further information available to support the outcome.
27	Address: 27	109 Burncroft Avenue, Enfield, Middlesex, EN3 7JQ	01/01/07	Won	No further information available to support the outcome.
29	Address: 29	23 Byron Terrace, Edmonton, London, N9 7DG	16/11/06	Won	No further information available to support the outcome.
30	Address: 30	109 Burncroft Avenue, Enfield, Middlesex, EN3 7JQ	10/10/06	Won	No further information available to support the outcome.
33	Address: 33	23 Byron Terrace, Edmonton, London, N9 7DG	23/08/06	Won	No further information available to support the outcome.
34	Address: 34	23 Byron Terrace, Edmonton, London, N9 7DG	11/07/06	Won	No further information available to support the outcome.
35	Address: 35	109 Burncroft Avenue, Enfield, Middlesex, EN3 7JQ	09/06/06	Won	No further information available to support the outcome.
36	Address: 36	23 Byron Terrace, Edmonton, London, N9 7DG	01/05/06	Won	No further information available to support the outcome.
37	Address: 37	23 Byron Terrace, Edmonton, London, N9 7DG	25/04/06	Won	No further information available to support the outcome.
40	Address: 40	23 Byron Terrace, Edmonton, London, N9 7DG	12/03/06	Won	No further information available to support the outcome.
42	Address: 42	109 Burncroft Avenue, Enfield, Middlesex, EN3 7JQ	05/01/06	Won	No further information available to support the outcome.

43	Address: 43	23 Byron Terrace, Edmonton, London, N9 7DG	16/12/05	Won	No further information available to support the outcome.

Claim-Sheet

WHAT HAS HAPPENED
&
OUR REQUESTS

POLICE MARKERS: -- (Warning Signals)

CASE (F6)

Nub 6	**ITEMS**				
1)	**Warning Signals**	**Yes** ☐ **No** ☐	**Yes** ☐ **No** ☐	**Yes** ☐ **No** ☐	**Yes** ☐ **No** ☐

- **If There Is Any Other Acceptable Information, Please Provide It Below!**

A. The Claimant respectfully requests a comprehensive review of the **"WARNING SIGNALS"** documented in the attached ACRO Report under his name. These warning signals should be evaluated with the same diligence as outlined in part **"Nub 1"** of this **"Official Document."** Additionally, the Claimant provides substantial reasons for the consideration of these warning signals:

B. **Reason One:** For the removal of the specified "WARNING SIGNALS" from the ACRO Report based on the following compelling grounds:

1. **Warning Signal 1**
   - **Warning:** Ailment
   - **Warning Date:** 03/11/09
   - **Text:** Crohn's Disease
   - **Owner:** 44 (Hampshire Constabulary)
   - **Last Updated:** 23/11/14
     - Relevant Case Details:
     - 03/11/09 At South-East Hampshire Magistrates Court
     - **Ref:** 09/1782/-155908t1
     - Conditional Discharge 6 Months (Months)
     - 2 Costs £85.00
     - **"Won"** - 03/11/09 At Southeast Hampshire Magistrates Court
     - **Ref:** 09/1782/155908t1 Withdrawn Final

2. **Warning Signal 2**
   - **Warning:** Suicidal

- **Warning Date:** 09/05/98
- **Text:** Attempts Self Harm
- **Owner:** 01 (Metropolitan Police)
- **Last Updated:** 25/05/20
  - While No Supporting Arrest Date or Accused Offence Available, It Is Vital to Consider the Passage of Time and Rehabilitation as Factors for Removal.

3. **Warning Signal 3**
   - **Warning:** Self-Harm
   - **Warning Date:** 03/11/09
   - **Text:** Banging Head Against Cell Wall and Floor
   - **Owner:** 44 (Hampshire Constabulary)
   - **Last Updated:** 23/11/14
     - Relevant Case Details:
     - 03/11/09 At South-East Hampshire Magistrates Court
     - **Ref:** 09/1782/-155908t1
     - Conditional Discharge 6 Months (Months)
     - 2 Costs £85.00
     - **"Won"** - 03/11/09 At Southeast Hampshire Magistrates Court
     - **Ref**: 09/1782/155908t1 Withdrawn Final

4. **Warning Signal 4**
   - **Warning:** Drugs
   - **Warning Date:** 06/03/**09** ***"This Date Is After the Arrest & Offence Dates!"***
   - **Text:** Possession of Cannabis
   - **Owner:** 01 (Metropolitan Police)
   - **Last Updated:** 09/04/**12**

C. Relevant Case Details:
- **Date and Court:** 06/03/09, Enfield Magistrates Court
- **Ref:** 09/2757/41947f
- **Details:**
  1. Fine: £65.00 (Ref: CN0900610376)
  2. Forfeiture and Destruction of Cannabis Resin
  3. Court Costs: £40.00
  4. +++++

D. Arrest Record Linked to Warning: Arrest / 2017 Acro = 09/0000/00/174108M = Remand x0
- **DNA Status**: NOT TAKEN
- **Process Stage**: ARRESTED ON **19/02/09 - 17:00**

==
- **Disposal (Court):** Ref 09/0000/00/174108M
- **Last Updated**: 13/03/09
- **Arrest/Summons Ref**: 09/0000/00/174108M
- **Adjudication**: GUILTY
- **Plea Description**: GUILTY
- **Offence Description**: POSSESS A CONTROLLED DRUG - CLASS B - CANNABIS RESIN
- **Offence Date(s):** 19/02/09
- **Details:**

1. Fine and costs imposed on **06/03/09** at Enfield Magistrates Court. ***"I was in the court on this date, according to the record! This warning is incorrect as to its date!"***

Conviction PNC Police Printout!

29. 06/03/09 ENFIELD MAGISTRATES	
1. POSSESS A CONTROLLED DRUG – CLASS B – CANNABIS RESIN ON 19/02/09 (PLEA:GUILTY) MISUSE OF DRUGS ACT 1971 s.5(2)+sch.4	FINE 65.00 - CN0900610376 FORFEITURE AND DESTRUCTION OF CANNABIS RESIN COSTS 40.00

E. Circumstances of the Case:

- On **19/02/09**, I was stopped by police on my housing estate, during which the officer claimed I had swallowed something suspicious and proceeded to arrest me. However, no physical evidence or substance was retrieved to support their allegation. The police accused me of concealing a Class A drug, such as heroin, and stated they had the authority to prosecute for a more serious offence if I did not cooperate.
- Under pressure and feeling forced, I stated that the substance in question was cannabis. This admission led to my being charged at the police station and subsequently found guilty in court. The court imposed a fine, costs, and an order for forfeiture and destruction of cannabis resin. However, **"No Cannabis Resin Was Ever Retrieved Or Destroyed,"** as there was no substance recovered or proven to exist.
- Also **"Warning Signal 4"** was updated in **2012,** when it should have been done in **2009** and due to what is proved in the following sections *"POLICE MARKERS: -- (Identity Numbers,)"* within this official document in regard to **"Last Updated Dates,"** I request the following:

F. Request for Removal:

- Given the context and lack of evidence in this case, I formally request the removal of Warning Signal 4 and all associated records from the Police National Computer **(PNC)** and related systems. This request is based on the following grounds:
  1. **Lack of Physical Evidence:**
     - No substance was ever retrieved or proven to exist. The warning and charges were based solely on an unsubstantiated assumption by the police.
  2. **Coercion and Pressure:**
     - I felt compelled to admit to cannabis possession to avoid a more severe charge, despite the absence of any recovered substance.
  3. **Inaccuracy in Records:**
     - The warning text and court records refer to forfeiture and destruction of cannabis resin, which did not occur, further highlighting the inaccuracy of these records.
  4. **Undue Prejudice:**
     - The existence of this warning on my record leads to ongoing undue scrutiny and harassment, negatively affecting my rehabilitation and opportunities.
  5. **Alignment with Legal Rights Under GDPR:**
     - Under the General Data Protection Regulation **(GDPR)** and the Data Protection Act, I have the right to request the removal of data that is inaccurate, irrelevant, or processed unlawfully. This warning meets these criteria, as it is based on an unproven allegation.

G. Action Requested:

1. **Deletion of Warning Signal 4 and Related Records:**
   - Remove Warning Signal 4, its associated case details, and any affiliated documentation from all national and local systems, including the PNC and local police databases.

2. **Amendment of Records:**
   - Correct inaccuracies in any retained records to reflect the lack of evidence and the factual events of the case.

3. **Confirmation of Action Taken:**
   - Provide a formal acknowledgment of this request and notify me of the actions taken, including confirmation of data deletion and corrections made.

H. Conclusion:

The presence of this warning and associated records causes undue harm and perpetuates a stigma based on an incident where no evidence was found to substantiate the claims against me. I respectfully request a thorough review and resolution in accordance with applicable data protection and justice principles the Claimant earnestly seeks the removal of these **"WARNING SIGNALS"** from the ACRO Report. These signals, while pertinent in the past, no longer accurately represent the Claimant's current circumstances and commitment to rehabilitation. Their removal would be in line with the principles of fairness, justice, and the Rehabilitation of Offenders Act. +++++

Claim-Sheet

WHAT HAS HAPPENED
&
OUR REQUESTS

POLICE MARKERS: -- (Warning Signals)

CASE (G7)

Nub 7	ITEMS				
1)	Information Markers	Yes ☐ No ☐	Yes ☐ No ☐	Yes ☐ No ☐	Yes ☐ No ☐

- **If There Is Any Other Acceptable Information, Please Provide It Below!**

A. The Claimant respectfully requests a thorough review of the **"INFORMATION MARKERS"** documented in the attached ACRO Report under his name. These markers should be evaluated with the same attention to detail as outlined in part **"Nub 1"** of this **"Official Document."** Furthermore, the Claimant provides additional details and a compelling reason for the consideration of these markers.

B. Reason One: For the removal of the specified **"INFORMATION MARKERS"** from the ACRO Report, based on the following rationale:

1. **Information Marker 1**
   - **Marker:** DNA E+W Not Required
   - **Marker Date:** 18/06/21

- **Text:** DNA Profile Held on NDNAD For E+W

2. **Information Marker 2**
   - **Marker:** Fails to Appear
   - **Marker Date:** 27/10/09
   - **Text:** Failed to Appear at Isle of Wight Mags on 27/10/09
   - **Owner:** 44 (Hampshire Constabulary)
   - **Last Updated:** 29/10/09

3. **Information Marker 3**
   - **Marker:** Breaches Bail Conditions
   - **Marker Date:** 20/11/13
   - **Text:** Namely Not to Enter the Southwark Borough
   - **Owner:** 01 (Metropolitan Police)
   - **Last Updated:** 21/11/13

C. Information Markers Findings

Marker Number	Case Description	Relevant Details
Marker 1	This case was won by the Defendant, Mr. Simon Paul Cordell.	No further information available to support the outcome. All cases listed before **2009** are won by the claimant!
Marker 2	Marker relates to failing to appear at Isle of Wight Court. The case was overturned and is marked in error.	**Arrest/Summons Ref:** 09/0000/00/528079N **15. Disposal (Court):** Does not contain a guilty conviction for this offence as required.
Marker 3	Gazebo Case	**Arrest/Summons Ref:** 13/0000/00/625125U **Disposal (Court):** Adjudication: NOT GUILTY.

I. Conclusion:

The Claimant respectfully seeks the removal of these **"INFORMATION MARKERS"** from the ACRO Report. The request is motivated by the understanding that these markers no longer accurately reflect the Claimant's circumstances and, in the interest of fairness and justice, should be reconsidered. Furthermore, the Claimant emphasizes his commitment to adhering to legal obligations and the R**ehabilitation of Offenders Act**, reinforcing the case for the removal of these markers. +++++

Claim-Sheet

WHAT HAS HAPPENED
&
OUR REQUESTS

POLICE MARKERS: -- (Marks and Scars)

CASE (H8)

Nub 8	**ITEMS**				

1)	Marks and Scars	Yes ☐ No ☐	Yes ☐ No ☐	Yes ☐ No ☐	Yes ☐ No ☐

- **If There Is Any Other Acceptable Information, Please Provide It Below!**

A. The Claimant respectfully requests that the information regarding his **"MARKS AND SCARS,"** as contained within the attached ACRO Report bearing his name, be reviewed, and considered with the same diligence as previously outlined in part **"Nub 1"** of this **"Official Document."** This request is supplemented by specific details and reasoning as follows:

B. **Reason One:** For the removal of the **"MARKS AND SCARS"** entries from the ACRO Report, taking into account the following information:

1. **Mark / Scar 1**
   - **Type:** Pierced
   - **Location:** Left
   - **Detail:** Ears
   - **Text:** Small Yel-Met Hoop

2. **Mark / Scar 2**
   - **Type:** Pierced
   - **Location:** Left
   - **Detail:** Ears

3. **Mark / Scar 3**
   - **Type:** Lacking
   - **Location:** Upper
   - **Detail:** Teeth

4. **Mark / Scar 4**
   - **Type:** Scarred
   - **Location:** Left
   - **Detail:** Hand
   - **Text:** 1 Inch Scar on Hand by Wrist
   - **Keyword(S):** Cut

5. **Mark / Scar 5**
   - **Type:** Scarred
   - **Location:** Right
   - **Detail:** Hand
   - **Text:** On First Knuckle - Right Forefinger
   - **Keyword(S):** Cut

6. **Mark / Scar 6**
   - **Type:** Mark
   - **Location:** Right
   - **Detail:** Abdomen
   - **Keyword(S):** Birth

7. **Mark / Scar 7**

- **Type:** Mark
- **Detail:** Abdomen
- **Text:** Birthmark on Stomach
- **Keyword(S):** Birth

8. **Mark / Scar 8**
   - **Type:** Mark
   - **Location:** Left
   - **Detail:** Abdomen
   - **Keyword(S):** Birth

9. **Mark / Scar 9**
   - **Type:** Scarred
   - **Location:** Left
   - **Detail:** Legs
   - **Text:** 2" Scar Above Knee
   - **Keyword(S):** Cut

10. **Mark / Scar 10**
    - **Type:** Scarred
    - **Location:** Left
    - **Detail:** Legs
    - **Text:** Scar Across Left Knee
    - **Keyword(S):** Cut

C. **Marks and Scars Findings Table:**

Mark/Scar Number	Type	Location	Detail	Reason for Removal
1	Pierced	Left	Ears - Small Yellow Metal Hoop	Entry lacks relevance and significance for identification purposes; outdated detail from prior decades.
2	Pierced	Left	Ears	Redundant and vague entry, offering no useful or distinguishing information.
3	Lacking	Upper	Teeth	Unclear or unverifiable description; adds no value to identification or records.
4	Scarred	Left Hand	1-Inch Scar on Hand by Wrist (Cut)	Minor and indistinct scar; time elapsed and scar reduced its visibility and relevance for identification.
5	Scarred	Right Hand	On First Knuckle - Right Forefinger	Small, non-distinctive marking; outdated and unnecessary for identification purposes.
6	Mark	Right Abdomen	Birthmark (Keyword: Birth)	Non-specific and unverifiable, with no current relevance for identification.
7	Mark	Abdomen	Birthmark on Stomach (Keyword: Birth)	Redundant with entry #6, making it a duplicate and irrelevant for accurate records.
8	Mark	Left Abdomen	Birthmark (Keyword: Birth)	Redundant, vague, and offers no information.

9	Scarred	Left Leg	2" Scar Above Knee (Cut)	Generic and outdated, contributing nothing unique to identification accuracy.
10	Scarred	Left Leg	Scar Across Left Knee (Cut)	Lacks specificity or distinguishing features; as time has diminished its visibility.

D. Request Summary:

a. **Basis for Removal:**

- These marks and scars are outdated, redundant, or offer no substantial value for identification purposes. Their continued inclusion causes unnecessary prejudice and is inconsistent with principles of fairness and relevance.

b. **Inability to Identify with Lost Cases:**

- None of these descriptions provide sufficient identifying characteristics to justify their retention or connection to lost cases, underscoring their irrelevance and the need for deletion.

a. **Legal Framework:**

- This request aligns with the **Rehabilitation of Offenders Act** and the Claimant's commitment to rehabilitation, ensuring records reflect only pertinent, accurate, and lawful information. ++++

E. Conclusion:

The Claimant seeks the removal of these **"MARKS AND SCARS"** entries from the ACRO Report, considering their nature and the time elapsed since these markings and scars were recorded. These removals are requested in alignment with the principles of fairness and relevance, acknowledging the Claimant's commitment to rehabilitation and the **Rehabilitation of Offenders Act.** +++++++

Claim-Sheet

WHAT HAS HAPPENED
&
OUR REQUESTS

POLICE MARKERS: -- (Photograph Locations)

CASE (I9)

Nub 9	**ITEMS**				
1)	**Photograph Locations**	**Yes ☐** **No ☐**	**Yes ☐** **No ☐**	**Yes ☐** **No ☐**	**Yes ☐** **No ☐**

- **If There Is Any Other Acceptable Information, Please Provide It Below!**

- The Claimant requests that of the **"PHOTOGRAPH LOCATIONS"** contained in the attached file to his name that is known as an ACRO Report when reviewed by Official persons of relevance to class this listed as the same **"Grossly-Term-Refs"** as the requests prior made in part **"Nub 1"** of this **"Official Document"** but with the additional Requests or due to Reasons if any as follows:

A. Reason One:

- For the removal of the following photograph locations due to the successful resolution of associated cases, in accordance with the **Rehabilitation of Offenders Act 1974** and considering the time spent: +++++

- **Photograph 1** (**Location:** 01 - Metropolitan Police):
- **Date Taken:** 25/10/18.
- **Arrest/Summons Ref.:** 18/01yd/01/8306e.
- **Owner:** 01 (Metropolitan Police)
- **Last Updated:** 25/10/18
  - **"Won."**

- **Photograph 2** (**Location:** 01 - Metropolitan Police):
- **Date Taken:** 15/03/18.
- **Arrest/Summons Ref.:** 18/01yd/01/1984h.
- **Owner:** 01 (Metropolitan Police)
- **Last Updated:** 16/03/18
  - **"Won."**

- **Photograph 3** (**Location:** 01 - Metropolitan Police):
- **Date Taken:** 05/10/16.
- **Arrest/Summons Ref.:** 16/01ye/01/3890g.
- **Owner:** 01 (Metropolitan Police)
- **Last Updated:** 05/10/16
  - **"Won."**

- **Photograph 4** (**Location:** 01 - Metropolitan Police):
- **Date Taken:** 25/06/13.
- **Arrest/Summons Ref.:** 13/0000/00/625125u.
- **Owner:** 01 (Metropolitan Police)
- **Last Updated:** 27/06/13
  - **"Won."**

- **Photograph 5** (**Location:** 01 - Metropolitan Police):
- **Date Taken:** 07/04/13.
- **Arrest/Summons Ref.:** 13/01ht/01/1537c.
- **Owner:** 01 (Metropolitan Police)
- **Last Updated:** 07/04/13
  - **"Won."**

- **Photograph 6** (**Location:** 20 - West Midlands Police):
- **Date Taken:** 15/08/12.
- **Arrest/Summons Ref.:** 12/20dc/02/3727d.
- **Owner:** 20 (West Midlands Police)
- **Last Updated:** 15/08/12
  - **"Won."**

- **Photograph 7** (**Location:** 41 - Hertfordshire Constabulary):
- **Date Taken:** 13/08/12.
- **Arrest/Summons Ref.:** 12/41hq/01/20685j.

- **Owner:** 41 (Hertfordshire Constabulary)
- **Last Updated:** 14/08/12
  - **"Won."**

- **Photograph 8** (**Location:** 01 - Metropolitan Police):
- **Date Taken:** 05/12/10.
- **Arrest/Summons Ref.:** 10/01ye/01/7294n.
- **Owner:** 01 (Metropolitan Police)
- **Last Updated:** 05/12/10
  - **"Won."**

- **Photograph 9** (**Location:** 01 - Metropolitan Police):
- **Date Taken:** 02/05/10.
- **Arrest/Summons Ref.:** 10/01gn/01/2357x.
- **Owner:** 01 (Metropolitan Police)
- **Last Updated:** 02/05/10
  - **"Won."**

- **Photograph 10** (**Location:** 44 - Hampshire Constabulary):
- **Date Taken:** 14/10/09.
- **Arrest/Summons Ref.:** 09/0000/00/929328d.
- **Owner:** 44 (Hampshire Constabulary)
- **Last Updated:** 14/10/09
  a. (Hampshire Constabulary) Theft – Shoplifting
  b. Failing To Surrender to Custody at Appointed Time
  c. Failing To Surrender to Custody as Soon as Practicable After Appointed Time
  -
  - **"Lost"** 03/11/09 At South-East Hampshire Magistrates Court Ref: 09/1782/-155908t1 Conditional Discharge 6 Months (Months) 2 Costs £85.00
  - **"Won."** 03/11/09 At Southeast Hampshire Magistrates Court Ref: 09/1782/155908t1 Withdrawn Final
  - **"Won."** 03/11/09 At Southeast Hampshire Magistrates Court Ref: 09/1782/155908t1 Withdrawn Final

31. 03/11/09 SOUTH EAST HAMPSHIRE MAGISTRATES	
1. THEFT - SHOPLIFTING ON 14/10/09 (PLEA:GUILTY) THEFT ACT 1968 s.1 ** OFFENCE COMMITTED ON BAIL **	CONDITIONAL DISCHARGE 6 MTHS COSTS 85.00

Arrest 17 / 2021 Acro = 09/0000/00/929328D	
DNA Status:	NOT TAKEN
Process Stage:	ARRESTED ON 14/10/09 15:10

Disposal 28 (Court) / 2021 Acro = 09/0000/00/929328D = Arrest 18 + Markers
Offence 1 = THEFT - SHOPLIFTING
Court Name: SOUTHEAST H AMPSHIRE MAGISTRATES
Offence Description: THEFT - SHOPLIFTING
Offence Date(s): **14/10/09** 14:30 to 14/10/09 15:10

B. Photographs and Associated Case Details:

Photograph Number	Location	Date Taken	Arrest/Summons Ref.	Owner	Last Updated	Case Outcome	Reason for Removal
1	01 - Metropolitan Police	25/10/18	18/01yd/01/8306e	01 (Metropolitan Police)	25/10/18	Won	Case successfully resolved; retention of photograph is unnecessary and inconsistent with the Rehabilitation of Offenders Act 1974.
2	01 - Metropolitan Police	15/03/18	18/01yd/01/1984h	01 (Metropolitan Police)	16/03/18	Won	Case successfully resolved; photograph no longer serves a valid purpose and should be removed.
3	01 - Metropolitan Police	05/10/16	16/01ye/01/3890g	01 (Metropolitan Police)	05/10/16	Won	Photograph retention unjustified given the successful resolution of the case and elapsed time.
4	01 - Metropolitan Police	25/06/13	13/0000/00/625125u	01 (Metropolitan Police)	27/06/13	Won	Case resolved; continued retention of this photograph

							is inconsistent with principles of fairness and relevance.
5	01 - Metropolitan Police	07/04/13	13/01ht/01/1537c	01 (Metropolitan Police)	07/04/13	Won	Photograph is no longer necessary or relevant due to the successful case outcome.
6	20 - West Midlands Police	15/08/12	12/20dc/02/3727d	20 (West Midlands Police)	15/08/12	Won	Photograph retention is outdated; case successfully resolved.
7	41 - Hertfordshire Constabulary	13/08/12	12/41hq/01/20685j	41 (Hertfordshire Constabulary)	14/08/12	Won	Case resolved; photograph retention is unnecessary and should be removed.
8	01 - Metropolitan Police	05/12/10	10/01ye/01/7294n	01 (Metropolitan Police)	05/12/10	Won	Retention of photograph is irrelevant due to the successful case outcome and time elapsed since the incident.
9	01 - Metropolitan Police	02/05/10	10/01gn/01/2357x	01 (Metropolitan Police)	02/05/10	Won	Case resolved successfully; photograph is outdated and irrelevant.
10	44 - Hampshire Constabulary	14/10/09	09/0000/00/929328d	44 (Hampshire Constabulary)	14/10/09	Mixed: 1 Lost, 2 Won	Retention of this photograph is unnecessary given that the majority of associated cases were won, and the details are outdated and irrelevant for retention.

C. <u>Request Summary</u>:

a. **Basis for Removal:**
   - All listed photographs pertain to cases that have been successfully resolved (either won or no longer relevant) and do not serve any lawful purpose for retention.
   - Continued storage of these photographs violates the principles of the **"Rehabilitation of Offenders Act 1974"** and does not align with the principles of fairness and rehabilitation. ++++++

b. **Legal Framework:**
   - The request aligns with the **"Rehabilitation of Offenders Act 1974,"** ensuring records are relevant and appropriate for the Claimant's rights to privacy and rehabilitation. +++++

D. Conclusion:
The Claimant requests the removal of these photograph locations based on the successful resolution of associated cases, taking into consideration the **Rehabilitation of Offenders Act 1974** and the time elapsed since these cases were won is requested.

Claim-Sheet

WHAT HAS HAPPENED
&
OUR REQUESTS

POLICE MARKERS: -- (Identity Numbers)

CASE (J10)

Nub 10	**ITEMS**				
1)	**Identity Numbers**	**Yes** ☐ **No** ☐	**Yes** ☐ **No** ☐	**Yes** ☐ **No** ☐	**Yes** ☐ **No** ☐

- **If There Is Any Other Acceptable Information, Please Provide It Below!**

A. The Claimant requests that of the **"IDENTITY NUMBERS"** contained in the attached file to his name that is known as an ACRO Report when reviewed by Official persons of relevance to class this listed as the same **"Grossly-Term-Refs"** as the requests prior made in part **"Nub 1"** of this "Official Document" but with the additional Requests or due to Reasons if any as follows:

B. Reason One: For the removal of the following identity numbers due to lawful reasons:

• Identity Number 1 (DNA BARCODE):
- **Type:** DNA Barcode
- **Number:** 90437213
- **Owner:** 02 (Metropolitan Police)
- **Last Updated:** 13/02/01

• Identity Number 2 (BTP Crime System Id):
- **Type:** BTP Crime System Id
- **Number:** 9123w0276x
- **Owner:** 93 (British Transport Police)
- **Last Updated:** 19/02/13

• Identity Number 3 (UK Citizen Card):

- **Type:** UK Citizen Card
- **Number:** 1221612151526473
- **Owner:** 89 (ACPO Criminal Records Office)
- **Last Updated:** 15/05/17

• Identity Number 4 (UK Passport):

- **Type:** UK Passport
- **Number:** 801695219
- **Owner:** 89 (ACPO Criminal Records Office)
- **Last Updated:** 15/05/17

E. Findings:

1. **Identity Number 1 (DNA BARCODE):**

Use the Weblinks to Check!
01-PNC 2012-and-2014-Printouts

02-ACRO-Printouts

- **Last Updated**: **"13/02/01"**

• Identity Number 1 (DNA BARCODE):

- **Type:** DNA Barcode
- **Number:** 90437213
- **Owner:** 02 (Metropolitan Police)
- **Last Updated:** 13/02/01

Identity Number 1 (DNA BARCODE): The section labelled **"Number: 90437213"** is linked to the **"Last Updated"** date of **"13/02/01."**
When the 13/02/01 is searched for in the **"ACRO Report 2021,"** the search directs us to the case recorded and listed as below:
But this turns out to be a second input by a reviewing team member and is wrongly linked too two different cases!

➢ **Extra Info Added from Acro Report.**

1) Disposal (Court) / 2021 Acro = **99/0000/00/960881C**

- Guilty
- **Offence Description** 1: Driving Whilst Disqualified
- **Plea Description:** Guilty
- Driving Licence Endorsed
- **Offence Description 2:** Theft from Vehicle
- **Plea Description:** Not Guilty but Found Guilty
- Curfew Order 3 Months (Months) At 23 Byron Terrace, Hertford Rd, London, N9 7dg. 8am-8pm, Mon-Sun (Inc)
- **Acro 2021**: 52. Arrest
- **CHARGED ON** 26/10/99 - 23:59
- **Acro 2021**: 68. Disposal (Court)

- **Offence Date(s)**: 22/10/99 - 13:25
- **PNC Printout 2012**: Conviction 18, 22/10/99 (Plea: Guilty).
- **Last Updated**: 13/02/01

18. 07/07/00 ENFIELD MAGISTRATES	
1. DRIVING WHILST DISQUALIFIED ON 22/10/99 (PLEA:GUILTY) ROAD TRAFFIC ACT 1988 s.103(1)(b)	DRIVING LICENCE ENDORSED CURFEW ORDER 3 MTHS AT 23 BYRON TERRACE, HERTFORD RD, LNDN, N9 7DG. 8AM-8PM, MON-SUN (INC)
2. THEFT FROM VEHICLE ON 24/09/99 (PLEA:NOT GUILTY) THEFT ACT 1968 s.1	COMPENSATION 50.00 CURFEW ORDER 3 MTHS AT 23 BYRON TERRACE, HERTFORD RD, LNDN, N9 7DG. 8AM-8PM,MON-SUN

This case has the same Last Update, date, indicating potentially fraudulent activity in how the files were handled and with the reason Notably, being the **"Offence Date**" in the "**Acro Report"** coincides with the **"Plea Date**," in the "**PNC Printout**" and this raising questions about the integrity of the documentation. Additionally, the **"Last Updated**" date aligns with the **"Offence Date,"** as the PNC printout indicates that the sentencing took place on **07/07/00** at the Enfield Magistrates Court and for a three-month curfew order to start as this is what the Judge is said to have issued, extending the timeline due to the curfew until **07/10/2000**. This means the case was updated five months later, which is unusually prolonged for something of such importance but could be considered part of the administrative process, bring us to the date of the **"Last Update"** date of the **"13/02/01!"**

"Identity Number 1 (DNA BARCODE)," it becomes evident that the **"DNA Sample"** was taken in connection with a accused case to do with theft from a car and with the **(Arrest/Summons Ref: 99/0000/00/960881c),** as indicated by **"Entry Dates,"** and its correspondence**.** However, this sample was not formally included in the "**Theft from A Car"** arrest or disposable, Acro case files and only appears in the **"DNA Section"** of the **"ACRO Report."** which is what we can see.
Were this DNA Sample starts to take a turn to being illegally used and to create my Acro Record in Fraud is proved by the **"Last Update"** dates of entry and is demonstrated in the following section.

- **"DNA Report Summary," Acro Report 2021 states DNA Sample Number:** 90437213 was entered on the

13/02/01 and this number is attached to the below following case file contained in the **"Acro Report 2021!"**

Acro DNA Report 2
Arrest/Summons Ref: **97/0000/00/193878F**
Sample Barcode: 90437213
Date of Sample: 28/02/**97**
--
77. Disposal (Court)
Adjudication: GUILTY
Offence Date(s): **17/01/97** - 21:30
Offence Description: ROBBERY **"Pizza"**
--
Last Updated: 13/02/**01**

- This is supposed to be the first ever offence recorded in the Mr. Simon Cordell's Name by the police and Co. in the PNC Printout and the Acro Reports.
- The " **Offence Date** " date predates the first reprimand warning of the **21/08/97,** creating concerns about the integrity and validity of the record handling. This suggests procedural errors and fraudulent activity.
- This offence is totally fabricated and never happened.
- It states a pizza was stolen.
  a. **DNA Number:** 90437213 from above has a **Last Updated: date of the** 13/02/01 IT A DNA SAMPLE UPDATED IN **2001** and Must Never Be Backdated to **1997** a s this is **4 years** later and a total of 1,447 days.

To calculate the number of days from 28/02/1997 to 13/02/2001, including both dates:

1. From **28/02/1997** to **28/02/1998**: 1 year (non-leap year) = **365 days**.
2. From **28/02/1998** to **28/02/1999**: 1 year (1998 is not a leap year) = **365 days**.
3. From **28/02/1999** to **28/02/2000**: 1 year (2000 is a leap year) = **366 days**.
4. From **28/02/2000** to **13/02/2001**: This includes the remainder of 2000 and the start of 2001:
   - **From 28/02/2000 to 31/12/2000** = **307 days**.
   - **From 01/01/2001 to 13/02/2001** = **44 days**.

Total Days: 365 + 365 + 366 + 307 + 44 = **1,447 days** (including both start and end dates).

All police case that are convicted as guilty at court are bound as sealed after Conviction and initial upload. The memorandum of convictions and cases are sealed by law and must not be edited or amended.

Sealing of Police Cases and Convictions:

All police cases resulting in guilty convictions at court are legally bound as sealed once uploaded to the relevant system. These records must not be edited or amended under any circumstances. The sealing of such cases and convictions is governed by the following legal principles and frameworks:

1. **Rehabilitation of Offenders Act 1974 (UK):**
   - This act outlines the conditions under which criminal convictions may become "spent" after a certain period and prohibits the disclosure of such convictions in most contexts. Sealed records are protected under this act to prevent undue prejudice or misuse.

2. **General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) 2018:**
   - Under GDPR, the accuracy, security, and proper handling of personal data are mandatory. Criminal conviction records are classified as sensitive data, requiring strict adherence to storage and processing rules, ensuring they remain sealed and unaltered after being uploaded.

3. **Police and Criminal Evidence Act 1984 (PACE):**
   - This act provides the legal framework for the handling of evidence and records, including provisions to secure and seal case files once uploaded, ensuring their integrity and preventing unauthorized access or modification.

4. **Criminal Records (Rehabilitation and Disposal) Regulations:**
   - These regulations govern the proper handling, sealing, and disposal of criminal records, including rules on limiting access to authorized parties and safeguarding the records from alteration post-upload.

Purpose of Sealed Memorandum:

The memorandum of convictions and cases is legally sealed to:

- **Ensure Integrity:** Protect the accuracy and finality of court decisions.
- **Prevent tampering:** Safeguard records from unauthorized edits or amendments.
- **Uphold Rehabilitation Rights:** Support the reintegration of individuals by preventing the misuse of sealed records.
- **Comply With Legal Obligations:** Fulfill statutory requirements under the above-mentioned laws and regulations.

Sealed records serve as definitive proof of judicial outcomes while ensuring the rights and privacy of individuals under these frameworks.

b. The case **Number:** 90437213 should not be linked to this file and that is obvious and proves fraud.

Acro 2021: 68. Arrest
Acro 2021: 77. Disposal (Court)

2. **Identity Number 2 (BTP Crime System Id):**
   - "Not in Workout Codes!"

3. **Identity Number 3 (Uk Citizen Card):**
   - Used As Id While on Bail for A Case "Won."

4. **Identity Number 4 (Uk Passport):**
   - Used As Id While on Bail for A Case "Won."

F. Conclusion:

The Claimant seeks the removal of these identity numbers from the ACRO Report for lawful reasons, including instances where these identity documents were used while on bail for cases that were subsequently won, rendering their inclusion unnecessary.

Claim-Sheet

WHAT HAS HAPPENED

&

OUR REQUESTS

POLICE MARKERS: -- (Passports)

CASE (K11)

Nub 11	ITEMS				
1)	Passports	Yes ☐	Yes ☐	Yes ☐	Yes ☐

		No ☐	No ☐	No ☐	No ☐

- **If There Is Any Other Acceptable Information, Please Provide It Below!**

A. The Claimant requests that of the **"PASSPORTS"** contained in the attached file to his name that is known as an ACRO Report when reviewed by Official persons of relevance to class this listed as the same **"Grossly-Term-Refs"** as the requests prior made in part **"Nub 1"** of this **"Official Document"** but with the additional Requests or due to Reasons if any as follows:

B. Reason One:

- The information the police hold that contains the Now Claimant's **"PASSPORT"** was only required by the police due to bail conditions that they wrongly imposed against him as a result of a case they brought against him and subsequently lost at Court.
- **I did not lose any cases in 2017,** which is reflected in the Last Updated date of this case: **May 15, 2017.** This confirms that I proved my innocence and **"Won."**

➢ **Passport 1:**

- **Passport Number:** 801695219
- **Issue Date:** 27/04/11.
- **Issuing Office:** Ips
- **Country:** United Kingdom
- **Expiry Date:** 27/04/21
- **Owner:** 89 (ACPO Criminal Records Office)
- **Last Updated:** 15/05/17

C. The Claimant seeks the removal of this passport record from the ACRO Report due to its association with bail conditions that were wrongly imposed and subsequently dropped after the police lost the related court case. This information is no longer relevant and should not be part of the Claimant's record.

Claim-Sheet

WHAT HAS HAPPENED

&

OUR REQUESTS

POLICE MARKERS: -- (Occupations)

CASE (L12)

Nub 12	ITEMS				
1)	Occupations	Yes ☐ No ☐	Yes ☐ No ☐	Yes ☐ No ☐	Yes ☐ No ☐

- **If There Is Any Other Acceptable Information, Please Provide It Below!**

A. The Claimant requests that of the **"OCCUPATIONS"** contained in the attached file to his name that is known as an ACRO Report when reviewed by Official persons of relevance to class this listed as the same

"Grossly-Term-Refs" as the requests prior made in part **"Nub 1"** of this **"Official Document"** but with the additional Requests or due to Reasons if any as follows:

a. **Reason One:** For the requested **"Occupations"** data, the Claimant has provided the following occupations, each with unique dates and owners:

1) **Occupation 1:**
   - **Occupation:** Entertainer
   - **Date:** 25/10/18
   - **Owner:** 01 (Metropolitan Police)
   - **Last Updated:** 25/10/18
     - **Additional Note:**
       a) 2. Arrest
       b) **Arrest/Summons Ref**: 18/01YD/01/8306E
       c) 5. Disposal (NFA) & 6. Disposal (NFA).

2) **Occupation 2:**
   - **Occupation:** Self Employed
   - **Date:** 09/01/18
   - **Owner:** 01 (Metropolitan Police)
   - **Last Updated:** 10/01/18
     - **Additional Note:**
       a) a

3) **Occupation 3:**
   - **Occupation:** Unemployed
   - **Date:** 04/10/16
   - **Owner:** 01 (Metropolitan Police)
   - **Last Updated:** 05/10/16
     - **Additional Note:**
       a) a

4) **Occupation 4:**
   - **Occupation:** Entertainer
   - **Date:** 14/08/16
   - **Owner:** 01 (Metropolitan Police)
   - **Last Updated:** 16/08/16
     - **Additional Note:**
       a) a

5) **Occupation 5:**
   - **Occupation:** Voluntary Worker
   - **Date:** 07/04/13
   - **Owner:** 01 (Metropolitan Police)
   - **Last Updated:** 07/04/13
     - **Additional Note:**
       a) a

6) **Occupation 6:**
   - **Occupation:** Entertainer

- **Date:** 25/01/13
- **Owner:** 01 (Metropolitan Police)
- **Last Updated:** 25/01/13
  - **Additional Note:**
    a) a

7) **Occupation 7:**
- **Occupation:** Voluntary Worker
- Description: Western, Typical UK.
- **Owner:** 01 (Metropolitan Police)
  - **Additional Note:**
    a) a

8) **Occupation 8:**
- **Occupation:** Director
- **Date:** 14/08/12
- **Owner:** 20 (West Midlands Police)
- **Last Updated:** 15/08/12
  - **Additional Note:**
    a) 13. Arrest
    b) 12/20DC/02/3727D
    c) 20. Disposal (Court)
    d) NOT GUILTY

9) **Occupation 9:**
- **Occupation:** Entertainer
- **Date:** 01/01/12
- **Owner:** 01 (Metropolitan Police)
- **Last Updated:** 25/01/13
  - **Additional Note:**
    a) "Not in Work Out Code." No Supporting Information Regarding the Arrest Date, Accused Offence, Or Final Outcome.

10) **Occupation 10:**
- **Occupation:** Manager
- **Date:** 04/09/11
- **Owner:** 01 (Metropolitan Police)
- **Last Updated:** 05/09/11
  - **Additional Note:**
    a) 15. Arrest
    b) 11/01YE/01/5200L
    c) 20. Disposal (Court)
    d) NOT GUILTY

11) **Occupation 11:**
- **Occupation:** Self Employed
- **Date:** 02/05/10
- **Owner:** 01 (Metropolitan Police)
- **Last Updated:** 02/05/10

- **Additional Note:**
  a) 17. Arrest
  b) 09/0000/00/929328D
  c) 27. Disposal (Court)
  d) GUILTY
  e) THEFT - SHOPLIFTING

12) Occupation 12:

- **Occupation:** Catering Manager
- **Date:** 07/08/09
- **Owner:** 22 (West Mercia Constabulary)
- **Last Updated:** 08/08/09
  - **Additional Note:**
    a) 19. Arrest
    b) 09/22EA/01/155U
    c) 31. Disposal (NFA)
    d) NFA (NO FURTHER ACTION)

13) Occupation 13:

- **Occupation:** Catering Wholesaler
- **Date:** 26/07/09
- **Owner:** 23 (Warwickshire Constabulary)
- **Last Updated:** 26/07/09
  - **Additional Note:**
    a) "Not in Work Out Code." No Supporting Information Regarding the Arrest Date, Accused Offence, Or Final Outcome.
    b) 20. Arrest
    c) 09/23N3/01/1708M
    d) 30. Disposal (NFA)
    e) NFA (NO FURTHER ACTION)

14) Occupation 14:

- **Occupation:** Fast Food Employee
- **Date:** 12/06/09
- **Owner:** 44 (Hampshire Constabulary)
- **Last Updated:** 16/11/09
  - **Additional Note:**
    a) 21. Arrest
    b) 09/0000/00/528079N
    c) 25. Disposal (Court)
    d) POSSESS KETAMINE

15) Occupation 15:

- **Occupation:** Fast Food Employee
- **Date:** 12/06/09
- **Owner:** 44 (Hampshire Constabulary)
- **Last Updated:** 22/10/09
  - **Additional Note:**
    a) 21. Arrest
    b) 09/0000/00/530252A

c) 26. Disposal (NFA)
d) NFA (NO FURTHER ACTION)

- Above Goes with Next, Date: 12/06/09

16) Occupation 16:

- **Occupation:** Fast Food Employee
- **Date:** 12/06/09
- **Owner:** 44 (Hampshire Constabulary)
- **Last Updated:** 21/10/09

- Above Goes with Next, Date: 12/06/09

17) Occupation 17:

- **Occupation:** Unemployed
- **Date:** 12/06/09
- **Owner:** 44 (Hampshire Constabulary)
- **Last Updated:** 16/06/09

18) Occupation 18:

- **Occupation:** Unemployed
- **Date:** 19/02/09
- **Owner:** 01 (Metropolitan Police)
- **Last Updated:** 20/02/09
  - **Accused Offence:** Possess A Controlled Drug – Class B – Cannabis Resin
  - **Final Outcome: "Lost"** On 06/03/09 At Enfield Magistrates Court.
  - **Additional Note:**
    a) **Penalty:** 1 Fine £65.00 (Cn0900610376)
    b) 2 Forfeiture and Destruction of Cannabis Resin
    c) Costs £40.00
    d) 36. Disposal (Court)
    e) 09/0000/00/174108M
    f) POSSESS A CONTROLLED DRUG - CLASS B - CANNABIS RESIN
    g) Offence Date(s): 19/02/09
    h) PNC Printout 2012
    i) On 19/02/09 (Plea: Guilty)

19) Occupation 19:

- **Occupation:** Car Salesman
- **Date:** 05/02/09
- **Owner:** 01 (Metropolitan Police)
- **Last Updated:** 05/02/09
  - **Additional Note:**
    a) 24. Arrest
    b) 09/01YF/01/152B
    c) 29. Disposal (Court)
    d) NOT GUILTY

20) Occupation 20:

- **Occupation:** Self Employed
- **Date:** 05/05/06
- **Owner:** 41 (Hertfordshire Constabulary)
- **Last Updated:** 06/05/06
  - **Additional Note:**

a) 38. Arrest
b) 06/41HQ/01/15207L
c) 57. Disposal (NFA)
d) NFA (NO FURTHER ACTION)

21) Occupation 21:

- **Occupation:** Unemployed
- **Date:** 25/03/06
- **Owner:** 42 (Essex Police)
- **Last Updated:** 28/03/06
  - **Additional Note:**
    a) 39. Arrest
    b) 06/0000/00/397207P
    c) 55. Disposal (NFA)
    d) NFA (NO FURTHER ACTION)

22) Occupation 22:

- **Occupation:** Mechanic
- **Date:** 23/01/06
- **Owner:** 42 (Essex Police)
- **Last Updated:** 23/01/06
  - **Additional Note:**
    a) **Accused Offence:** Use Disorderly Behaviour or Threatening/Abusive/Insulting Words Likely to Cause Harassment Alarm or Distress
    b) **Final Outcome: "Lost"** Penalty Notice Issued On 23/01/06 At 42 (Essex Police) Fs/Ref: 42 (Essex Police)
    c) 40. Arrest
    d) REPORTED ON 23/01/06
    e) 06/0000/00/113215C
    f) PENALTY NOTICE

23) Occupation 23:

- **Occupation:** Road Worker
- **Date:** 02/04/03
- **Owner:** 01 (Metropolitan Police)
- **Last Updated:** 25/10/04
  - **Additional Note:**
    a) **Accused Offence:** Use Disorderly Behaviour or Threatening/Abusive/Insulting Words Likely to Cause Harassment Alarm or Distress
    b) **Final Outcome: "Lost"** On 21/08/03 At Enfield Magistrates Court. Conditional Discharge 24 Months (Months) Eq-03005905m
    c) 45. Arrest
    d) CHARGED ON 02/04/03
    e) 04/0000/00/1054471J
    f) 62. Disposal (Court)
    g) GUILTY

24) Occupation 24:

- **Occupation:** Unemployed
- **Date:** 08/05/02
- **Owner:** 01 (Metropolitan Police)

- **Last Updated:** 10/05/02
  - **Additional Note:**
    a) **"Not in Work Out Code."** No Supporting Information Regarding the Arrest Date, Accused Offence, Or Final Outcome.

25) **Occupation 25:**
- **Occupation:** Unemployed
- **Date:** 18/03/97
- **Owner:** 35 (Cambridgeshire Constabulary)
- **Last Updated:** 25/03/97
  - **Additional Note:**
    a) **"Not in Work Out Code."** No Supporting Information Regarding the Arrest Date, Accused Offence, Or Final Outcome.

26) **Occupation 26:**
- **Occupation:** Schoolboy
- **Date:** 14/01/97
- **Owner:** 01 (Metropolitan Police)
- **Last Updated:** 21/04/97
  - **Additional Note:**
    a) **"Not in Work Out Code."** No Supporting Information Regarding the Arrest Date, Accused Offence, Or Final Outcome.

Findings Table: Occupation Records Summary and Removal Request

Occupation	Date	Owner	Status / Outcome	Request for Removal	Case Outcome
1. Entertainer	25/10/18	01 (Metropolitan Police)	5. Disposal (NFA)	Removal requested due to irrelevance and lack of further action.	Won
2. Self Employed	09/01/18	01 (Metropolitan Police)	No Action	Removal requested due to lack of significant details.	N/A
3. Unemployed	04/10/16	01 (Metropolitan Police)	No Action	Removal requested due to irrelevance and lack of further action.	N/A
4. Entertainer	14/08/16	01 (Metropolitan Police)	No Action	Removal requested due to irrelevance and lack of significant details.	N/A
5. Voluntary Worker	07/04/13	01 (Metropolitan Police)	No Action	Removal requested due to irrelevance and lack of supporting information.	N/A
6. Entertainer	25/01/13	01 (Metropolitan Police)	No Action	Removal requested due to irrelevance and lack of further action.	N/A
7. Voluntary Worker	N/A	01 (Metropolitan Police)	No Action	Removal requested due to vague description and lack of supporting information.	N/A

8. Director	14/08/12	20 (West Midlands Police)	20. Disposal (Court): Not Guilty	Removal requested due to successful case outcome.	Won
9. Entertainer	01/01/12	01 (Metropolitan Police)	"Not in Work Out Code."	Removal requested due to irrelevance and lack of supporting information.	N/A
10. Manager	04/09/11	01 (Metropolitan Police)	20. Disposal (Court): Not Guilty	Removal requested due to successful case outcome.	Won
11. Self Employed	02/05/10	01 (Metropolitan Police)	27. Disposal (Court): Guilty (Theft - Shoplifting)	▪ **Additional Note:** a) 17. Arrest b) 09/0000/00/929328D c) 27. Disposal (Court) d) GUILTY e) THEFT - SHOPLIFTING	Lost
12. Catering Manager	07/08/09	22 (West Mercia Constabulary)	31. Disposal (NFA)	Removal requested due to irrelevance and lack of significant details.	N/A
13. Catering Wholesaler	26/07/09	23 (Warwickshire Constabulary)	"Not in Work Out Code."	Removal requested due to irrelevance and lack of supporting information.	N/A
14. Fast Food Employee	12/06/09	44 (Hampshire Constabulary)	25. Disposal (Court): Possess Ketamine	▪ **Additional Note:** a) 21. Arrest b) 09/0000/00/528079N c) 25. Disposal (Court) d) POSSESS KETAMINE	Lost
15-16. Fast Food Employee	12/06/09	44 (Hampshire Constabulary)	26. Disposal (NFA)	Removal requested due to irrelevance and lack of supporting information.	N/A
17. Unemployed	12/06/09	44 (Hampshire Constabulary)	No Action	Removal requested due to irrelevance and lack of significant details.	N/A
18. Unemployed	19/02/09	01 (Metropolitan Police)	"Lost" At Court: Guilty (Possess Cannabis Resin)	▪ **Accused Offence:** Possess A Controlled Drug – Class B – Cannabis Resin ▪ **Final Outcome: "Lost"** On 06/03/09 At Enfield Magistrates Court. ▪ **Additional Note:** a. **Penalty:** 1 Fine £65.00 (Cn0900610376) b. Forfeiture and Destruction of Cannabis Resin c. Costs £40.00 d. 36. Disposal (Court) e. 09/0000/00/174108M	Lost

				f. POSSESS A CONTROLLED DRUG - CLASS B - CANNABIS RESIN g. Offence Date(s): 19/02/09 h. PNC Printout 2012 i. On 19/02/09 (Plea: Guilty)	
19. Car Salesman	05/02/09	01 (Metropolitan Police)	29. Disposal (Court): Not Guilty	Removal requested due to successful case outcome.	Won
20. Self Employed	05/05/06	41 (Hertfordshire Constabulary)	57. Disposal (NFA)	Removal requested due to irrelevance and lack of significant details.	N/A
21. Unemployed	25/03/06	42 (Essex Police)	55. Disposal (NFA)	Removal requested due to irrelevance and lack of significant details.	N/A
22. Mechanic	23/01/06	42 (Essex Police)	"Lost" Outcome: Penalty Notice	Penalty Notice	Lost
23. Road Worker	02/04/03	01 (Metropolitan Police)	62. Disposal (Court): Guilty	a) **Accused Offence:** Use Disorderly Behaviour or Threatening/Abusive/Insulting Words Likely to Cause Harassment Alarm or Distress b) **Final Outcome: "Lost"** On 21/08/03 At Enfield Magistrates Court. Conditional Discharge 24 Months (Months) Eq-03005905m c) 45. Arrest d) CHARGED ON 02/04/03 e) 04/0000/00/1054471J f) 62. Disposal (Court) g) GUILTY	Lost
24-26. Multiple (Unemployed/Schoolboy)	08/05/02 – 14/01/97	Multiple (Metropolitan Police, Cambridgeshire Constabulary)	"Not in Work Out Code"	Removal requested due to irrelevance and lack of supporting information.	N/A

Conclusion:

The Claimant seeks the removal of the aforementioned occupation records from the ACRO Report on the following grounds:

1. **Inaccuracy and Lack of Supporting Information:**

- Numerous records are incomplete or marked as **"Not in Work Out Code,"** with no information provided regarding the arrest date, accused offence, or final outcome. These entries do not accurately reflect the circumstances or outcomes.

2. **Irrelevance to Rehabilitation:**
   - Several records pertain to cases where the outcome was **"No Further Action"** or a **"Not Guilty"** verdict, which are not relevant to the Claimant's rehabilitation or ongoing legal standing.

3. **Principles of Fairness and Data Integrity:**
   - Retention of outdated, inaccurate, or unnecessary records undermines the accuracy and fairness of the **"ACRO Report,"** impacting the Claimant's rights under the **"Rehabilitation of Offenders Act 1974"** and **"Data Protection Act 2018."**

Removing these records will ensure the ACRO Report reflects accurate, relevant, and fair information, supporting the Claimant's right to rehabilitation and data accuracy.

Claim-Sheet

WHAT HAS HAPPENED

&

OUR REQUESTS

POLICE MARKERS: -- (Habitual Dress)

CASE (M13)

Nub 13	**ITEMS**				
1)	**Habitual Dress**	**Yes** ☐ **No** ☐	**Yes** ☐ **No** ☐	**Yes** ☐ **No** ☐	**Yes** ☐ **No** ☐

- **If There Is Any Other Acceptable Information, Please Provide It Below!**

A. The Claimant requests that of the **" HABITUAL DRESS "** contained in the attached file to his name that is known as an ACRO Report when reviewed by Official persons of relevance to class this listed as the same **"Grossly-Term-Refs"** as the requests prior made in part **"Nub 1"** of this **"Official Document"** but with the additional Requests or due to Reasons if any as follows:

B. Reasons for Requesting Removal of **"HABITUAL DRESS"** Entries from ACRO Report:

1) **Inaccuracy:** The **"HABITUAL DRESS"** entries may not accurately represent your clothing preferences or habits, leading to potential misunderstandings by law enforcement or other relevant authorities.

2) **Privacy Concerns:** Personal details about your habitual dress can be considered private. You may prefer that this information is not included in official records to protect your privacy.

3) **Irrelevance:** Over time, clothing preferences and habits can change. If the entries no longer reflect your current dress style, they may be irrelevant and should be removed to ensure an accurate representation.

4) **Misidentification Risk:** Outdated information on your habitual dress can increase the risk of misidentification or confusion during interactions with law enforcement or other entities.

5) **Personal Preference:** You have a personal preference for excluding certain details about your habitual dress from your official records for privacy or other reasons.
6) **Record Clarity:** Removing outdated or unnecessary entries can enhance the clarity and focus of your ACRO Report, ensuring that it contains only relevant and up-to-date information.
7) **Data Protection Rights:** Depending on data protection regulations, you may have the right to request the removal of personal information that is no longer necessary or conflicts with privacy regulations.
8) **Accuracy and Transparency:** Requesting the removal of outdated entries promotes accuracy and transparency in your records, ensuring that they provide an accurate reflection of your current circumstances.

C. Habitual Dress =

- Habitual Dress 1
  - **Type:** Habitual Dress
  - **Description:** Jeans Jacket and Trainers
  - **Owner:** 35 (Cambridgeshire Constabulary)

- **Habitual Dress 2**
  - **Type:** Habitual Dress
  - **Description:** Jeans, Bl Ack Leather Jacket, White Trainers, With A Blue Flash
  - **Owner:** 01 (Metropolitan Police)

- **Habitual Dress 3**
  - **Type:** Habitual Dress
  - **Description:** Joggers and Sweatshirt
  - **Owner:** 01 (Metropolitan Police)

- **Habitual Dress 4**
  - **Type:** Habitual Dress
  - **Description:** Casual
  - **Owner:** 48 (City of London Police)

- **Habitual Dress 5**
  - **Type:** Habitual Dress
  - **Owner:** 01 (Metropolitan Police)

- **Habitual Dress 6**
  - **Type:** Habitual Dress
  - **Owner:** 01 (Metropolitan Police)

- **Habitual Dress 7**
  - **Type:** Habitual Dress
  - **Description:** Western, Typic Al UK.
  - **Owner:** 01 (Metropolitan Police)

- **Habitual Dress 8**
  - **Type:** Habitual Dress
  - **Description:** X
  - **Owner:** 01 (Metropolitan Police)

D. By addressing these reasons, you can tailor your request for the removal of specific **"HABITUAL DRESS"** entries from your ACRO Report to better reflect your personal preferences, protect your privacy, and maintain accurate and up-to-date records.

Claim-Sheet

WHAT HAS HAPPENED

&

OUR REQUESTS

POLICE MARKERS: -- (Jewellery)

CASE (N14)

Nub 14	**ITEMS**				
1)	**Jewellery**	**Yes** ☐ **No** ☐	**Yes** ☐ **No** ☐	**Yes** ☐ **No** ☐	**Yes** ☐ **No** ☐

- **If There Is Any Other Acceptable Information, Please Provide It Below!**

A. The Claimant requests that of the **"JEWELLERY"** contained in the attached file to his name that is known as an ACRO Report when reviewed by Official persons of relevance to class this listed as the same **"Grossly-Term-Refs"** as the requests prior made in part **"Nub 1"** of this **"Official Document"** but with the additional Requests or due to Reasons if any as follows:

B. Reasons for Requesting Removal of **"JEWELLERY"** Entries from ACRO Report:

1) **Inaccurate Information:** It has come to my attention that certain jewellery descriptions associated with my name within the report may be erroneous or incomplete, potentially leading to misunderstandings or misjudgements.
2) **Lack of Relevance:** The descriptions of these **"JEWELLERY"** items seem to bear no direct relevance to any matter under investigation. Their inclusion appears superfluous and unnecessary.
3) **Privacy and Data Protection:** I am deeply concerned about the detailed descriptions of personal **"JEWELLERY"** items being retained in a law enforcement report. This seems to be in violation of fundamental principles of privacy and data protection, especially if these details do not pertain to any ongoing criminal investigation.
4) **Risk of Bias and Stereotyping**: The inclusion of specific **"JEWELLERY"** details could inadvertently introduce bias or stereotypes into law enforcement proceedings. It is essential that law enforcement is based on objective, pertinent information.
5) **Efficient Resource Allocation:** For the efficient allocation of law enforcement resources, it is imperative to include only relevant data in the report. Entries related to **"JEWELLERY"** that hold no direct bearing on any criminal activity may divert resources away from more pressing matters.
6) **Enhanced Transparency:** Removing irrelevant **"JEWELLERY"** entries from the report enhances transparency in law enforcement practices. It ensures that only pertinent, substantive information is retained.
7) **Focus on Critical Data:** Eliminating non-essential details such as **"JEWELLERY"** descriptions allows the report to concentrate on more crucial information directly linked to any ongoing investigations.

8) **Protection from Misuse:** There is a concern that detailed **"JEWELLERY"** descriptions may be misused, potentially leading to unfounded accusations or even identity theft. Removing such entries mitigates this risk.
9) **Upholding Human Rights:** Respecting human rights and personal privacy is paramount. It is in line with these principles that I make this request for the removal of irrelevant **"JEWELLERY"** entries from the ACRO Report.

C. Jewellery =

- **Jewellery 1**
  - **Type:** Jewellery
  - **Description:** Earring / Earring Left Ear
  - **Owner:** 35 (Cambridgeshire Constabulary)

- **Jewellery 2**
  - **Type:** Jewellery
  - **Description:** Neck chain / Has Two Gold Rings on Chain
  - **Owner:** 35 (Cambridgeshire Constabulary)

- **Jewellery 3**
  - **Type:** Jewellery
  - **Description:** Earring / L/Ear
  - **Owner:** 01 (Metropolitan Police)

- **Jewellery 4**
  - **Type:** Jewellery
  - **Description:** Neck chain / A Studded Boxing Glove Pend Ant
  - **Owner:** 01 (Metropolitan Police)

- **Jewellery 5**
  - **Type:** Jewellery
  - **Description:** Neck chain / YM Chain with Boxing Glove
  - **Owner:** 42 (Essex Police)

D. There are multiple cases involving Mr. Simon Paul Cordell and both the **"Cambridgeshire Constabulary"** and the **"Metropolitan Police."** Some of these cases have been resolved, while others remain unresolved. However, due to a lack of proper identification, we are unable to link the data related to these cases effectively. As a result, the outcomes of the **"Jewellery Cases"** cannot be officially documented or recognized, rendering the information irrelevant. I sincerely hope that these reasons demonstrate the necessity of removing these specific **"Jewellery"** entries from the ACRO Report, as they establish that the inclusion of this information is not only unwarranted but also poses potential risks to privacy, fairness, and the efficient operation of law enforcement processes.

Claim-Sheet

WHAT HAS HAPPENED

&

OUR REQUESTS

POLICE MARKERS: -- (Any Other Police Archived Data)

CASE (O15)

Nub 15	**ITEMS**				
1)	**Any other Police Archived Data**	**Yes** ☐ **No** ☐	**Yes** ☐ **No** ☐	**Yes** ☐ **No** ☐	**Yes** ☐ **No** ☐

- **If There Is Any Other Acceptable Information, Please Provide It Below!**

A. The Claimant requests that of the "**OTHER DETAILS**" Contained in the attached file to his name that is known as an ACRO Report when reviewed by Official persons of relevance to class this listed as the same "**Grossly-Term-Refs**" as the requests prior made in part "**Nub 1**" of this "**Official Document**" but with the additional Requests or due to Reasons if any as follows: --

i. Reason One: --

- For

OTHER INFORMATION
ACRO 2017
ASBO
RAVES

A. General Information

1) This document provides insight into the Now Claimants criminal records for the years **2017**, **2020**, and **2021**, sourced from the police national dispatch system. Our request for this information, that is recorded in the attached file labelled as **"Other Information / Acro 2017,"** is motivated by several key factors.

B. A Brief Overview

1) One of the First of 000 primary motivations behind Our requesting of the ACRO Report stems from a government-issued ASBO "**Anti-Social Behaviour Order**" application that erroneously subjected the Now Claimant to an arduous 8-year period of imposed conditions. These unjust conditions detrimentally impacted his prospects, including the ability to run a successful company and maintain a fair standard of living.

2) Crucially, it's essential to note that the Now Claimant was never arrested for the offenses attributed to the ASBO. This absence of arrest prevented an unfair investigation from taking place.

3) Additionally, during court appearances, the Now Claimant was unjustly denied the opportunity to speak, unless spoken to.

4) The ASBO application was illicitly and inaccurately lodged against the Now Claimant by members of the Police, Council, and Neighbourhood Watch Team. A pivotal piece of evidence supporting this assertion is the ASBO application itself, which multiple issues were raised about but not accounted for.

a. One example of this is the ASBO **"Anti-Social Behaviour Order"** which incorrectly accused the Claimant, Mr. Simon Paul Cordell, of **"Organizing Illegal Raves."** Under United Kingdom law, organising illegal raves is indeed a criminal offense, specifically governed by the Raves Bill 1994, part of the Criminal Justice and Public Order Act. This offense carries serious penalties, including a maximum sentence of three months in prison or a fine of up to £2,500. However, Mr. Cordell was never arrested in connection with this accusation. Mr. Cordell, along with his legal defence team, meticulously prepared a robust defence against the claims of **"Organizing Illegal Raves"** presented in the ASBO. They demonstrated that **"No Illegal Activities Had Taken Place,"** a conclusion acknowledged by the presiding judge. Despite this, Mr. Cordell was still found guilty. Throughout the court proceedings, numerous letters and emails were sent to the judges, urging them to reconsider and

adhere to the law. Regrettably, the courts refused to take appropriate action, unjustly penalising Mr. S. P. Cordell in the process.

5) The Now Claimant, however, was unjustly prolong of the right to a fair and speedy trial for two-years and the Judge refused to run this time consecutively with the errored sentence.
6) The fact that the Now Claimant, Mr. Simon Paul Cordell, was never arrested in connection with the allegations of **"Organising Illegal Raves"** has significant implications for his legal standing. Notably, this means that the Anti-Social Behaviour Order **(ASBO)** did not register as a **"Criminal Offense"** on the polices keep **"Criminal Record,"** about him. However, it was still documented in the "**ACRO (Association of Chief Police Officers Criminal Records Office)"** Report. This inclusion was primarily a result of police awareness regarding the conditions imposed by the ASBO , but also to take the Mikey out of the cases and what they were illegally doing to him, **I.E.**

CBO Asbo or Standalone Asbo

One of the most crucial factors this caused is that the asbo can be filed as three different legal pursuits and those reasons being

1.

2.

3.

meaning that there are three different types of Asbos. The Asbo placed on Mr Simon Paul Cordell is a standalone asbo which must be a civil case alone. But due to the Asbo being filed as the "**Organizing Illegal Raves.**" It brought a criminal element to the proceedings. As the offence is one of a criminal conduct, hence the criminal raves bill being passed in parliament. And CBO Asbo being prevalent.

A. **Important Details:**
   - **1+** The Now Claimant did not organize any of the events cited in the Asbo.
   - **2+** The Asbo was a standalone Asbo, labelled as a CBO in the Now Claimant's Criminal Record.
   - **3+** The Asbo falsely accused the Now Claimant of organizing illegal raves, despite no arrest for such activities.
   - **4+** The Asbo contained a curfew, an incompatible punishment with a standalone Asbo.
   - **5+** The maximum sentence for criminal conviction, with sufficient evidence (which wasn't present), is 3 months with 1.5 months of prison time and the possibility of early release with an electronic monitoring tag and/or a £2,500 fine under the Raves Bill 1994.
   - **6+** The Asbo was created by Police Officer 206372, Steve Elsmore, as part of the Anti-Social Behaviour Team at the Enfield Civic Centre.
   - **7+** Every page of the Asbo was created with Steven Elsmore's computer login, using resources from The Metropolitan Police Force, The Enfield Council, and Other Supplement Companies.
   - **8+** The Asbo contains 10 different incidents, with one of the incidents being ("Progress Way / which the police and council forged official documentation from Crown Rd.") to effectively set up the Now Claimant.
   - **9+** There were no victims of Anti-Social Behaviour to be questioned in court when requested.

1) **The Dates of The on Goings in The Antisocial Behaviour Order (ASBO) Proceedings Are Below: -**

Timeline with Relevant Details

Date	Details
13/03/2014	The Anti-Social Behaviour, Crime, and Policing Act 2014 received Royal Assent on 13th March 2014, officially replacing Anti-Social Behaviour Orders (ASBOs) with Criminal Behaviour Orders (CBOs). This legislation introduced CBOs as a tool to address antisocial behavior more effectively, allowing courts to impose both restrictive conditions and positive requirements on individuals

	convicted of criminal offenses. However, in my case, the transition from ASBOs to CBOs has been fraught with misapplication and procedural errors, further compounding the injustices I have faced. These errors not only misrepresented the intent of the law but also caused severe personal and social restrictions for me.
12/09/2014	Officer PC Sophie Theodoulou, along with two other police officers, falsely claimed to have served the ASBO folder to me. I completely dispute this assertion, as I was never served with the folder they claimed to have delivered. To address this falsehood, I filed a formal letter of complaint detailing the discrepancy. In that complaint, I highlighted that the bundle supposedly served should still be in the Edmonton Police Station's lost property. However, when investigated further, the police were unable to locate this bundle, which adds to my concerns about procedural failures and mishandling of evidence in this matter.

	If the council and police are required to collaborate and sign certificates to create an Anti-Social Behaviour Order (ASBO) targeting illegal raves, the **Director of Environmental Protection** and **Regulation for the Council** would definitely play a role in the application process and here is why:
	
	1. **Environmental Protection Responsibilities**:
	  - Illegal raves often involve noise pollution, waste management issues, and potential environmental damage. The **Director of Environmental Protection** would be involved in assessing and documenting these impacts, as they fall under their remit to protect public health and the environment.
	  - Under the **Environmental Protection Act 1990**, councils have a duty to address statutory nuisances, including noise and waste. This provides evidence to support that the directors of the Enfield council in charge of **Director of Environmental Protection** and **Regulation for the Council** would have played a role in the ASBO application.
	2. **Regulatory Oversight**:
	  - The **Regulation for the Council** role typically involves ensuring compliance with local laws and regulations. This includes overseeing the legal framework for public safety, land use, and event management.
	  - Illegal raves breach licensing laws or land-use regulations, such as those outlined in the **Licensing Act 2003** or the **Town and Country Planning Act 1990**. The regulatory team would help compile evidence of these breaches.
	3. **Partnership with Police**:
	  - The **Anti-Social Behaviour, Crime and Policing Act 2014** emphasises partnership working between councils and police to tackle anti-social behaviour. The Director of Environmental Protection and Regulation would contribute expertise and evidence related to their specific domains, ensuring a robust case for the ASBO.
	4. **Evidence Collection and Certification**:
	  - Both roles would be involved in gathering and certifying evidence, such as noise monitoring reports, environmental impact assessments, or records of public complaints and with the reason being that these sorts of evidence would strengthen the ASBO application by demonstrating the harm caused by illegal raves.
	
	In summary, the **Director of Environmental Protection** and **Regulation for the Council** are likely have a role in the ASBO application process due to their responsibilities for addressing environmental and regulatory issues. Their involvement ensures that the application is comprehensive and supported by relevant laws and evidence.
	
	Ian Davis served as Enfield Council's **Assistant Director of Environmental Protection and Regulation** before becoming its Chief Executive in April 2017. Perry Scott took over as **Executive Director of Environment and Communities** in January 2024
	
	<u>The Known Individuals Who Have Held Relevant Roles At Enfield Council:</u>

	<table><tr><th>Year</th><th>Role</th><th>Person in Charge</th></tr><tr><td>2012-2017</td><td>Assistant Director of Environmental Protection and Regulation</td><td>Ian Davis</td></tr><tr><td>2017-2024</td><td>Chief Executive (formerly Assistant Director)</td><td>Ian Davis</td></tr><tr><td>2024-2025</td><td>Executive Director of Environment and Communities</td><td>Perry Scott</td></tr></table>
06/10/2014	Interim hearing postponed due to lack of Legal Aid. Legal Aid later granted, but insufficient preparation time caused delay. The Judge put the hearing off until the 22/10/2014.
22/10/2014	Interim hearing further delayed due to barrister availability. Rescheduled to 05/11/2014. **22/10/2014** Interim hearing could not go ahead due to Andy Locke Acting Barrister had a flood at his home address. CPS and Police were not happy about this and wanted it to go ahead. Judge told them it is not down to the Appellant he has attended court and rightfully he should have a barrister. Interim The Judge put the hearing off until the **05/11/2014.**
05/11/2014	The Highbury Magistrates Court wrongly issued to the Now Claimant a guilty Verdict in relation to a standalone Asbo Order on the **05th of November 2014.** Total Time Served for the Asbo: 7 years.
04/08/2015	ASBO conviction passed. You immediately disagreed and began the appeal process.
05/08/2015	First email to initiate the appeal process sent at 19:29:35.
05/08/2015	Exchange of emails between Lorraine Cordell and Josephine Ward regarding initiating the appeal and obtaining case papers.
13/08/2015	1) 29. Newspapers-About-ASBO-Mayors-Office • **The Text Below Is Also for The Weblink Below!** 1+ Click on the Grey Top Left Mayor of London Logo to be directed to the Mayor's Office for Policing and Crime (MOPAC) website. 2+ About the Mayor's Office for Policing and Crime (MOPAC) 3+ One of the Mayor's key responsibilities is overseeing the work of the Metropolitan Police Service (MPS) – setting the priorities for policing and community safety in London, agreeing the policing budget and holding the Met Commissioner to account for delivering a professional, efficient and effective service to Londoners. 4+ The mayor has appointed Sophie Linden as Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime (DMPC) to oversee this vital work. 5+ At the heart of our work is the Mayor's Police and Crime Plan – a statutory document that sets out the key priorities for the term ahead, how we will work to deliver them and how we will oversee delivery. **Newspaper Articles Wrongly Published**

https://horrific-corruption-files.webhop.me/Other-Claim-Files/4.%20Asbo-Files10-09-2023%20-15-10-23/TheAsboFiles/1.Asbo10-09-23%20-15-10-23/7.%20Evidence%20for%20the%20Asbo/29.%20Newspapers-About-ASBO-Mayors-Office/

Mayor Of London and Metropolitan Police Website Issue.

This was the first Published and the rest copied. Then they removed it due to complaints, but the rest of the Newspapers would not.

https://horrific-corruption-files.webhop.me/Other-Claim-Files/4.%20Asbo-Files10-09-2023%20-15-10-23/TheAsboFiles/1.Asbo10-09-23%20-15-10-23/7.%20Evidence%20for%20the%20Asbo/29.%20Newspapers-About-ASBO-Mayors-Office/1.%20The-Mayor-of-London-Accessibility-To-Metropolitan-Police-Total-Policing--News/Man%20given%20a%20five%20year%20ASBO%20-%20Metropolitan%20Police%20Service.pdf

Diary states on the **14/08/2015** Got advertised in the News Papers While I awaited my appeal!

a) Dated the **13/08/2015** is the Metropolitan police Website.

1) Between the date **04/08/2015** of the Asbo being Granted and the **13/08/2015** when the police published their intel during an ongoing Appeal Stage there was how many days
2) Between the date 04/08/2015 and the date 13/08/2015, there are **9 days.**

b) The Date of the **27/11/2015** is the printout date of our clients printing out the copied exhibit of the Metropolitan police Website.

14/08/2015	Details of the ASBO publicly advertised while appeal was pending, dated 13/08/2015 (Metropolitan Police website).
Post-14/08/2015	Original link hosting ASBO information (`http://content.met.police.uk/News/MangivenafiveyearASBO/1400033211719/1257246745756`) taken down within weeks/months after complaints were filed. The current Metropolitan Police site no longer hosts this data. Copies preserved by you offer critical evidence.

1. Introduction 1)

A. The Now Claimant is appealing against the decision made by the district Judge at Highbury Corner Magistrates' Court on **04th of August 2015** pursuant to S.1 of the Crime and Disorder Act **1998** ("The **1998** Act") to make him subject to an anti-social behaviour order (ASBO) to last for 5 years and not to run concurrent with prior preliminary lost court time .

Judge s Name: 06/10/2014	Defendant Judge Pigott? Defendant Judge Cordell? Defendant Judge Williams?
Judge s Name: 22/10/2014	
Judge s Name: 05/11/2014	District Judge Newham

Judge s Name: 10/03/2015	District Judge Williams
Judge s Name: 03/08/2015 & 04/08/2015 Mag Trial	Defendant Judge Pigott

- The Now Claimant also appealed against a decision made by the judges at Wood Green Crown Court on **26th October 2015**, pursuant to S.1 of the Crime and Disorder Act **1998**.

Judge s Name: 26/10/2015	His Honour Judge Shaun Lyons CBE
Judge s Name: 09/11/2015	
Judge s Name: 19/02/2016	HHJ Sean Morris
Judge s Name: 22/02/2016	HHJ Pawlak
Judge s Name: 04/04/2016	HHJ Pawlak
Judge s Name: 16/09/2016	HHJ Noel Lucas KC
Judge s Name: 21/09/2016 + 22/09/2016	HHJ Pawlak
Judge s Name: 26/09/2016	HHJ Pawlak
Judge s Name: 14/10/2016	HHJ Pawlak
Judge s Name: 19/10/2016	HHJ Pawlak
Judge s Name: 25/10/2016	HHJ Pawlak]
Judge s Name: 17/01/2017 + 18/01/2017 + 19/01/2017	HHJ Pawlak
Judge Justice 1:	Raja Bashhm
Judge Justice 2:	Allan Bevon

2. Legal Framework 8)

A. The Crown Prosecution Asbo Case handler a Robert Talalay implied that: - Section 4 of the **Crime and Disorder Act 1998** placed the burden on the Crown Court for an appeal against the making of the Asbo Order.

B. This provision should have given the Now Claimant the opportunity to appeal the Magistrates Court's decision fairly under Section 4 of the Crime and Disorder Act **1998**, thereby allowing an overview by the Crown Court regarding the construction and fairness of the ASBO Court Order made by the Magistrates Court.

a. However, the Crown Court failed in its obligation to the Now Claimant when reviewing the key factors related to the ASBO Court Order.

b. The Prosecuting Team consistently reminded the court and others that it was the responsibility of the Crown Court to determine if the burden of proof was met according to the legal requirements when reviewing the validity of the guilty verdict against the Now Claimant on 04/00/**2014** during the pursuit of the ASBO held at the Magistrates Court, Highbury, and Islington Corner.

c. On the following dates listed below, the Now Claimant attended Wood Green Courthouse to appeal the decision made in the lower court:

1) On the **26/10/2015** the Now Claimant attended the Wood Green Courthouse for a fair appeal hearing.

2) On the **09/11/2015**

3) On the **19/02/2016**

4) On the **22/02/2016**

5) On the **04/04/2016**

6) On the **16/09/2016**

7) On the **21/09/2016** + **22/09/2016**

8) On the **26/09/2016**

9) On the **14/10/2016**

10) On the **19/10/2016**

11) On the **25/10/2016**

	12) On the **17/01/2017** + **18/01/2017** + **19/01/2017** The Now Claimant: - "Did Not Attend," the Wood Green Courthouse: - "Due to Not Getting a Fair Appeal Hearing." **C.** And as **Section 79(3)** of the **Senior Courts Act 1981** stipulated the Now Claimant's appeal started and was to involve a re-hearing at the Crown Court. The Crown Court and the Crown Prosecution Team needed to follow the relevant test to have conducted the Asbo proceedings and that is Section 1 of the Crime and Disorder Act **1998**. However, throughout all the listed court dates, the Crown Court Judges and the Crown Prosecution Team members failed to balance the principles set out in the **Crime and Disorder Act 1998** and this included: -- **1)** On **26/10/2015** at the Crown Court, the Judges and the Crown Prosecution Team did not prevent the ASBO from continuing once The Now Claimant hand his Soliciting Team all demonstrated the corruption within the Asbo Case Proceedings as pointed out in this Official Document , which have now caused lifelong damages to the Now Claimant's life. **2)** On **09/11/2015** at the Crown Court, the Judges and the Crown Prosecution Team failed to raise concerns. **3)** On **19/02/2016** at the Crown Court, the Judges and the Crown Prosecution Team did not take appropriate action. **4)** On **22/02/2016** at the Crown Court, the Judges and the Crown Prosecution Team continued without addressing the issues. **5)** On **04/04/2016** at the Crown Court, the Judges and the Crown Prosecution Team diminished the significance of the matter. **6)** On **16/09/2016** at the Crown Court, the Judges and the Crown Prosecution Team refused to acknowledge the concerns raised.
31st January 2016	Listing; For appeal hearing, 22-24/02/2016 for Three-days LEGAL FRAMEWORK 7) Whilst the relevant provisions of the 1998 Act were repealed by the Anti-social Behaviour, Crime and Policing Act 2014, s.21 of that Act provides that these proceedings are unaffected except that, on 23rd of March 2020, the Appellant's ASBO will automatically become an Injunction under as if made under S.1 of that Act.
24/10/2016	Formal complaint filed against Enfield Council regarding handling of ASBO and related issues. **24/10/2016** The Enfield Councils History FOI Indexed Stage 4 RE: Formal Complaint dated 24/11/2016: To the Enfield Council Page Number: 2,3,4,5, **24/11/2016** **Page 2** Mr Simon Cordell 109 Burncroft Ave Enfield Middlesex EN3 7JQ 24/11/**2016** **RE: Formal Complaint dated 24/11/2016:** To Whom It May Concern: **1+** I am writing this letter on behalf on my son Simon Cordell of 109 Burncroft Ave, EN3 7JQ. **2+** Over the past few years my son has been having some issues with his neighbours this started due to what the police wrote about him in the newspapers about an ASBO that was granted by the lower courts in the newspaper the truth was not printed in the newspapers or on the Met Police website, the judge did grant the

	ASBO order but not on the grounds the police case was for we are still trying to work on how this was done to this day, this was not related to his neighbours why the police took this action it was due to lies by the police, this case is still waiting an appeal hearing at the crown court which will be held **Jan 2017.** **3+** It was after this was printed in the newspaper and on the met website my son started to have issues with neighbours banging all the time and the way they were treating him and talking about him and not letting him have any rest to sleep due to the banging all the time emails were sent to Enfield Council yet very little was done yet my son has video footage of it which the council has never wanted to see or4 take any reports, this has made his heath suffer, I feel this was due to what the police have been telling Enfield Council and Enfield Council just taking the word of the police without asking my son or myself to explain as since all this started Enfield Council has not wanted to help in any way, could this be due to the colour of my son's skin as I am lost for words that Enfield Council has done nothing to help. **4+** My son has been a tenant for many years now with no complaints about him until this all started above, and things were put in the newspapers for all to see when my son had done nothing wrong and will prove this at his appeal in Jan 2017. And more!
25/04/2017	Rob Leak, Enfield Council's chief executive, retired. Role advertised for £185,000/year. After leaving his position, the top job for Enfield Council was advertised for a whopping £185,000 per year. Rob Leak's involvement in company affairs is not explicitly documented in the information available to me. However, it's common for retired executives to maintain connections or provide occasional advice to their former organizations, especially if they had a significant impact during their tenure. It's possible that Rob Leak continued to serve as a board member after retiring as Enfield Council's chief executive in May 2017 and/or that he may have taken on other roles or remained involved in some capacity, within the Enfield Council. **Extra Exhibits Taken from Newspapers!** For Rob Leak Extracted from Newspapers! **a.** Top Enfield Council job advertised for whopping £185k per year as Rob Leak retires _ Enfield Independent.html **b.** Record of meeting with Enfield Council with Rob Leak & Ian Davis together 2015 Aug.html **c.** Rob Leak 14 years Newsletter_2017-04.pdf **d.** Rob Leak companies_house_document.pdf Mr. Leak has been in the post since 2003, after his role as deputy chief executive for London Borough of Lambeth. Applications for the role had to be submitted in before 10th of February 2017.
	• Ian Davis joined **Enfield in 2007** as **Assistant Director Environmental Protection and Regulation** before becoming **Director in 2008.** • In **April 2017** he was appointed as the **Chief Executive**.

	• Ian is focused on working with partners to address Enfield's health inequalities, further improving inward investment and delivering high quality, low cost services that **support local residents and businesses.**
04/08/2020	ASBO conditions officially ended, though limitations on social activities persisted beyond this date.
08/04/2020	ASBO sentence concluded.
2025	Evidence suggests Enfield Council restricted access to records older than five years, including 2014 data. Allegations of a cover-up and misrepresentation of CBO law dates (stating 20/10/2014 instead of 13/03/2014).

The Files in this folder have issues displaying due to the weblinks being to long and have been reallocated a new destination as linked below!

https://horrific-corruption-files.webhop.me/Other-Claim-Files/

```
12/11/2024 11:11 AM        <dir> 1.TrailerCase 3
12/11/2024 11:20 AM        <dir> 2.PoliceGazeboCase
12/11/2024 11:23 AM        <dir> 3. Driving-Ban-Cases
12/11/2024 12:10 PM        <dir> 4. Asbo-Files10-09-2023 -15-10-23
12/11/2024 12:05 PM        <dir> 5. 2014-Onwards-Exhibits
12/11/2024 12:48 PM        <dir> 7. Kay-Others
12/11/2024 12:39 PM  10158816593 7. Kay-Others.rar
12/11/2024 12:36 PM        <dir> Folders-Outputs
```

```
10/4/2023  1:05 PM     28252494 3. Robert-Talalay-the-Asbo-Prosecutor-Exhibit.rar
```

Robert-Talalay-the-Asbo-Prosecutor, stated in his response

Dated"

- An order comes into effect on the day the Judge made it.
- Will be of a CBO nature the provisions relating to the CBO are in Part 2 of the Anti-Social Behaviour, Crime and Policing Act **2014** (the "Act").
- The provisions come into force on **20th of October 2014.**

Robert and sally Gilchrist and ALONSIDE WITH Steven Elesmore and Co all in the Commissioners Name refused to
Act in accordance with the law and drop the Asbo no matter what evidence was demonstrated to them, and this includes the development of the Court order application and management stages, when addressed by us, i.e.:

The true Facebook event profile of Progress way.
Fresh-Image-Slider-4-Asbo
This demonstrates that Mr. Simon Cpordell was in his home on another police curfew what he proved his innocence in and suffered a year and a half curfew damaging his livelihood and future prospects unfairly as linked here:

2.PoliceGazeboCase

the "Fresh-Image-Slider-4-Asbo" clearly demonstrates that Mr. Cordell had nothing to do with the organising of this event and the Asbo files contents demonstrates that the police knew this as well. Police were made aware of the "event through social networking"

Time stamps

No signatures

Records of directors and neighbourhood teams who developed and managed these files on recordings stating that Mr. Simon Cordell ius dead for requesting the Asbo case be dropped and for what he could prove they all ha done.

To avoid the truth at the least.

The Enfield Council Updated in there memo meetings:

Dated

You

can you provide me with accurate and up-to-date details on meetings and interactions between the Metropolitan Police Commissioner and Enfield Council executives.

Copilot

Using the web

Certainly! Let's explore the relevant information:

1. **Crime Scrutiny Panel Meetings:**
   - The Crime Scrutiny Panel is responsible for scrutinizing and making recommendations on matters related to the Metropolitan Police Service, emergency services, the Safer Neighbourhood Board, and community safety.
   - Here are some recent meetings of the Crime Scrutiny Panel:
     - **27 Feb 2024:** Agenda
     - **6 Dec 2023:** Agenda, Minutes
     - **12 Sep 2023:** Agenda, Minutes
     - **1 Mar 2023:** Agenda, Minutes
     - And more. You can find additional meetings on the official page.[1]
2. **Full Council Meetings:**
   - The Full Council Meeting is the central political focus of Enfield Council. It coordinates all elements of the political structure.
   - The Council, comprising all 63 elected councillors, meets approximately six times a year. During these meetings:
     - Major decisions on Council policies, strategies, services, and budgets are made.
     - Debates occur on key issues affecting the Borough.[2]
3. **Community Safety Partnership:**
   - The Community Safety Partnership involves collaboration between various entities, including the Metropolitan Police, Enfield Council, the Probation Service, the Voluntary and Community Sector, the London Fire Brigade, and Victim Support.
   - Their joint efforts aim to enhance community safety and address crime-related challenges.[3]

For the most up-to-date information, I recommend visiting the Enfield Council website or directly accessing the relevant meeting documents using the provided links. 🗓️ 👮‍♂️ 🏢

RECEIVED an update on the Anti-Social Behaviour, Crime and Policing Act 2014 from Kaunchita Maudhub.

Councillor David-Sanders asked if the process for Anti-Social Behaviour Orders (ASBO) and Criminal Behaviour Order (CBO) were similar. Kaunchita confirmed that the CBO process was very similar to the post-conviction ASBOs previously used;

https://governance.enfield.gov.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=666&MId=9132&Ver=4

Taken from Meeting

1+ Criminal Behaviour Orders | The Crown Prosecution Service

2+ The provisions relating to the CBO are in Part 2 of the Anti-social Behaviour, Crime and Policing Act 2014 (the "Act"). The provisions come into force on **20 October 2014.** The CBO is an order on conviction, ... See more

To avoid the truth About the CBO Asbo and me not being arrested.

Si Extra notes added 06-04-25, when reviewing the old work I noticed the link does not work.

Addressing the Missing Files and Evidence

1. **Accessing Historical Records**
   - **Web Archives:** Use tools like the Wayback Machine to search for archived versions of the original link or related pages. This may help retrieve the missing content.
   - **National Archives:** The National Archives may hold records related to Enfield Council or the Metropolitan Police. You can search their database for relevant documents.
2. **Filing a Request**
   - **Freedom of Information (FOI) Request:** Submit an FOI request to Enfield Council or the Metropolitan Police for access to the specific files or meeting records. Be explicit about the dates and documents you need.
   - **Subject Access Request (SAR):** If the data pertains to you personally, you can file a SAR under data protection laws to access records.
3. **Exploring Meeting Records**
   - The Crime Scrutiny Panel and Full Council Meetings may have discussed relevant topics. Reviewing their agendas and minutes could provide additional context or evidence.
4. **Highlighting Discrepancies**
   - Document the inconsistencies in the dates provided by Enfield Council (e.g., stating 20/10/2014 as the CBO law's effective date instead of 13/03/2014). This strengthens your argument about potential misrepresentation.

Overview of Events and Allegations

1. **Background of the Case** On 13th March 2014, the Anti-Social Behaviour, Crime, and Policing Act 2014 received Royal Assent, introducing Criminal Behaviour Orders (CBOs) and replacing Anti-

Social Behaviour Orders (ASBOs). Despite these changes, you were issued an ASBO following a standalone conviction on 5th November 2014 at Highbury Magistrates Court. This ASBO lasted for seven years, ending officially on 8th April 2020. However, its restrictive conditions severely affected your ability to participate in social activities for years beyond its termination date.

2. **Key Discrepancies and Allegations**
    - **False Statements and Procedural Errors:** Officer PC Sophie Theodoulou falsely claimed to have served the ASBO case file bundle on 12th September 2014, an act disputed and documented in complaints. Additionally, Enfield Council allegedly misrepresented the implementation date of the CBO law as 20th October 2014, contradicting its actual enactment on 13th March 2014.
    - **Tampering and Cover-Up:** Evidence suggests that Enfield Council, under the oversight of Kaunchita Maudhub, restricted access to older records, including those from 2014, thereby preventing the retrieval of crucial files. This limitation, reduced to a five-year retrospective view, appears to be deliberate, creating barriers to uncovering the truth.
    - **Altered Records and Removed Links:** The original weblink hosting information on ASBO cases (`http://content.met.police.uk/News/MangivenafiveyearASBO/1400033211719/1257246745756`) was removed weeks or months after you and others filed complaints. The absence of this data, coupled with altered case details and inconsistencies in record-keeping, raises concerns about transparency and accountability.
    - **Involvement of Council Executives:** Interactions with Kaunchita Maudhub and other council representatives highlight their knowledge of ASBO and CBO processes. Evidence suggests that forged injunction and possession orders may have been made under their direction, undermining legal procedures.
3. **Attempts to Seek Justice**
    - **Immediate Appeal Efforts:** Upon receiving the ASBO conviction on 5th November 2014, you immediately disputed its legitimacy and began the appeal process. Emails exchanged with legal representatives, including Lorraine Cordell and Josephine Ward, document these efforts and highlight administrative delays.
    - **Preservation of Evidence:** Despite barriers, you have preserved critical files, including archived links and original documents that support your claims. These materials form the basis of your case and demonstrate systemic failures.
4. **Impact on Personal Life**
    - The ASBO conditions significantly restricted your freedoms, preventing you from attending social gatherings due to fear of further set-ups by the police and council. These restrictions had long-term consequences, impacting your mental health, reputation, and quality of life.

Supporting Evidence

- **Archived Weblinks:** Copies of the removed link (`http://content.met.police.uk/News/MangivenafiveyearASBO/1400033211719/1257246745756`) and other documents preserved through efforts like the Wayback Machine.
- **Emails and Correspondence:** Exchanges between you, council representatives, and legal advisors that document the procedural errors and administrative barriers.
- **Council Meeting Notes:** Publicly available records and meeting agendas from Enfield Council and the Metropolitan Police Crime Scrutiny Panel that reference ASBO and CBO processes.

C. Extract From the Acro Report 2017 / *"Other Information"*

- **Report 1**
- **Class:** Criminal Behaviour Order
- **Issued At:** Wood Green Crown Court
- **For:** Criminal Behaviour Order
- **Power:** Cond arrest (Conditional Arrest)
- **Fs Ref.:** 01 (Metropolitan Police)
- **Case Papers:** 01YE
- **End Date:** 03/08/20.
- **Conditions:**

a. Must Not Be Concerned in The Organization of a Rave as Defined by S.63(1) Or S63(1a) Of the Criminal Justice and Public Order Act 1994.

b. Knowingly Use or Supply Property, Personal or Otherwise, For Use in A Rave as Defined by S.63(1) Of the Criminal Justice and Public Order Act 1994.

c. Enter Or Remain in Any Disused or Abandoned Building Unless Invited to Do So in Writing by A Registered Charitable Organization or Local Authority or Owner of The Premises.

d. Provide Any Service in Respect of Any Licensable Activity in an Unlicensed Premises.

e. Enter Any Non-Residential Private Property (By Which Words Buildings and An Open Enclosed and Are Intended to Be Individual) Or an Industrial Estate Between the Hours Of 22:00 And 07:00.

f. Without Written Permission from The Owner and A Leaseholder of Such Property. If You Can Demonstrate That the Purpose of Your Entry of Such Property Is to Purchase Goods or Services.

g. From Any Shop or Garage or Fuel Supplier Which Is Open to The Public at Such Times. Then In Such Event, You May Enter but You Must Not Remain on Such Property for Longer Than 30 Minutes and You.

h. May Do So on Only One Occasion During Each Separate Nine Hour Period Between 22:00 And 07:00 Daily.

Throughout the time served pertaining to the Asbo the Police, council, Neighbourhood Teams frauded application against the Now claimant was published within the "World-Wide-Media" while he awaited his Legal Right to Appeal. The newspaper Articles printed his full details alongside with Our Information like his personal picture.

His mother wrote to Acro in 2017 and requested her son's detail and provided him with the files at their request. Mr S. P. Cordell was provided with a copy of the Acro Report. His mother contracted Acro again and the police and asked if the Asbo would be removed from the record and was provided with a response stating yes when the Asbo Conditions come to an end. I, Mr. Simon Paul Cordell had been complaining about not being arrested nor given a CBO Asbo, to everyone! I have mutable correspondence I sent that proves this and a lot more irregularities that I had found and could prove to demonstrate my innocence, when I noticed the Asbo was titled as a CBO Asbo taking the Mikey out of the complete Asos process and any fair justice occurring for myself. We all continued to complain but was refused the right to any justice, including my legal firm, in the end my legal firm got so worried for themselves, and they keep trying to leave he case, more is explained about this in my statement for the Asbo.

The Now Claimant Mother and himself requested another copy of the Acro report just before the Asbo was finished to check on it and it was lucky they did as Government officials had modded the Acro Report to cover up what he had been saying to them by deleting the CBPO aspect that they mimicked while refusing him the right to justice. this is evidenced in the 999 calls he recorded while calling the police about the Asbos errors and fraud.

In the final Acro report once the Asbo was over they deleted it without our request .

At no point of time did the Now Claimant and his **"Support Network"** request for the removal of the file and because they all were complaining about mutable issues with the ASBO Application.

7) As a consequence, law enforcement was granted the authority to monitor his activities and restrict his freedom of movement, even though he had not been convicted of a crime. This situation raises serious concerns about the impact of preventative orders like the ASBO on individuals' rights and liberties, especially when such orders are imposed without any formal criminal charges. Mr. Cordell's experience underscores the potential for misuse of these legal tools, which can result in significant repercussions for a person's personal and professional life, despite a lack of any demonstrable criminal wrongdoing.

8) Mr. Simon Paul Cordell and his support network inclusive of solicitors all attempted mutable times to address the breach of Human Rights and his legal right to a speedy and fair trial but no matter what evidence they provided the prosecuting team and that of the Courts Judges and administration as well as legal staff they all together refused to acknowledge his legal rights, and continued proceedings, until they obtained an illegal Guilty verdict.

The Asbo Files are linked here but are being claimed for separately: --

The Now Claimant started to Apply for an Appeal from the second the judge made the guilty verdict as he walked out and disagreed with the conviction. The first email was sent to start the Appeal stage at the following: --

Date: 05 August 2015 19:29:35

- **The Asbo dates**
  PC Sophie Theodoulou **12/09/2014**
  Is the Police Officer Who Lied and said that she Served me the First Asbo Folder, when that did not happen!
  Page Numbers: 57,58
  --
  Asbo Granted **04/08/2015**
  End of Asbo Court Order - 04/08/2020
  The Forged Asbo conditions placed upon me finished but I could never go out ever again to a party in case I got set up again by the police and the Council!
  End:

1+ The Day of the Asbo Conviction the Defendant walked out of the courtroom upset with the Conviction. This was a clear sign to any Judge and prosecuting team that an appeal was going to be issued.
2+ The Defendants Barrister After staying in the courtroom for a bit longer also walked out in upset and this was another sign an Appeal was going to be issued.
3+ The defendants mother stayed inside of the courtroom, and she explained that she was not happy and would be issuing an Appeal.
4+ The Defendants mother was passed an entry of conviction and there were subliminal messages wrote withinside of it dated the **04/08/2020** stating **"Attend Court and Dis Us and We Will Re Man"** this was placed in the front of the Asbo folder for any defending solicitor to see.
5+ A request to the issuing Court of the erroneous

The Folder is the Asbo Folder: Mr. Simon-Paul-Cordell's-Statment-03-10-23 (2): --

1) https://horrific-corruption-files.webhop.me/PNC66/5.%20The-Asbo-Files-10-09-2023%20-15-10-23/The-Asbo-Files-10-09-2023%20-15-10-23/6.%20Claim%20Letter%20for%20the%20Asbo/1%20Mr.%20Simon-Paul-Cordell's-Statment-16-09-23/

The Section within the Document to read is: --

1) E. District Judge Pigott Then Left the Courtroom

The Enfield Gov / Email's Issue: 02
RE Simon Cordell
/ Page Numbers: 2082,
From: JOSEPHINE WARD
To: Lorraine Cordell
Subject: RE: Simon Cordell
Date: 05 August **2015** 21:05:46
Lorraine
1+ Waiting for Andy's court note. hopefully he will send through tomorrow / Friday.
Regards
Josephine

On 5 Aug **2015** 20:01, "Lorraine Cordell" <lorraine32@blueyonder.co.uk> **wrote:**
Hi Josey
1+ Thank you that will be great, what about the appeal?
Regards
Lorraine

From: JOSEPHINE WARD
Mail To: josephinewardsolicitor@gmail.com
Sent: 05 August **2015** 19:30
To: Lorraine Cordell
Subject: RE: Simon Cordell
Lorraine
1+ Thank you for your email.

2+ I have been at police stations all day.
3+ Andy has not sent me his court notes yet.
4+ When he does, I will forward them.
5+ I will make copy of the file tomorrow afternoon / Friday morning depending on how long I am at Thames Magistrates Court in the morning.
Regards
Josephine

On 5 Aug **2015** 15:05, "Lorraine Cordell" <lorraine32@blueyonder.co.uk>
wrote:
Josey
1+ Could you please send me over all the papers to Simon's Asbo case I have been asking for so?
2083,
- long now and it has never been done.

2+ Also, can you please tell me about how I go about doing an appeal for this case.
3+ And send me the notes from Andy Locke for the trial.
4+ Could this be done as soon as possible?
Regards
Lorraine
From: Lorraine Cordell

Mail To: lorraine32@blueyonder.co.uk
Sent: 04 August **2015** 20:13
To: 'JOSEPHINE WARD'
Subject: RE: Simon Cordell
Josey
1+ Could you please send me all papers for the Asbo Case,
2+ also, not sure how we put in for an Appeal,
3+ not sure if you will have the time to deal with an appeal, but
4+ any advice would be great?
Regards
Lorraine

The Enfield Gov / Email's Issue: 02
Fwd. Cordell Back sheet
/ Page Numbers: 2084,
From: JOSEPHINE WARD
To: Lorraine Cordell; too smooth
Subject: Fwd.: Cordell Back sheet 03 and 04.08.15
Date: 11 August **2015** 12:35:23
Attachments:
1) ATT00001.txt
2) Cordell Back sheet 03 and 04.08.15.pdf

Lorraine /Simon
1+ I am on annual leave until 25th August **2015** but am forwarding the back sheet for the above hearing. I will forward all case papers on my return.
Regards
Josephine

Forwarded message

From: Andrew Locke <Andrew.Locke@nexuschambers.com>
Date: Tue, Aug 11, **2015** at 10:59 AM
Subject: Cordell Back sheet 03 and 04.08.15
To: josephinewardsolicitor@gmail.com
josephinewardsolicitor@gmail.com
Results
Results@nexuschambers.com
Dear Josie,

1+ Please see attached.

Regards,
Andy
This email is confidential. If you are not the intended recipient then you must not copy it, forward it, use it for any purpose, or disclose it to another person. Instead, please return it to the sender immediately and copy your communication to info@nexuschambers.com. Please then delete your copy from your system. Please consider the environment - do you really need to print this email?

The Enfield Gov / Email's Issue:
577. GL-HCORNERMCENQ_RE_ Simon Cordell_ (5)
/ Page Numbers: 2093,2094,
From: GLHCORNERMCENQ
glhcornermcenq@hmcts.gsi.gov.uk
Sent: 19 August **2015** 14:18
To: 'Lorraine Cordell'
Subject: RE: Simon Cordell
1+ The limit is twenty-one days to submit an appeal;
2+ The name of the justices: on **3rd & 4th: D PIGOT;**
3+ The Court does not keep transcripts of hearings.
4+ If there are any notes, they would be Legal Adviser's notes, which are simply aide's memoire and not official records.

Regards,
Customer Services Unit (8)
Highbury Corner Magistrates Court
51 Holloway Road
LONDON
N7 8JA
DX: 153700 Highbury 4
Tel: 0207506 3109
email: glhcornermcenq@hmcts.gsi.gov.uk
Gold fax: 0870 739 5768
I am neither authorised to bind the Ministry of Justice contractually, nor to make representations or other statements which may bind the Ministry of Justice in any way via electronic means.

From: Lorraine Cordell [**Mail To**:lorraine32@blueyonder.co.uk]
Sent: 14 August **2015** 11:25
To: GLHCORNERMCENQ
Subject: RE: Simon Cordell
To Whom It May Concern:
1+ I am writing this email to found out some information, I was in court on the **03/08/2015** and **04/08/2015** for case number 011402490741,
2+ I would like to find out how long I have to put my appeal in as I am not use to this type of case.

3+ Also, could I have the name of the judge who heard the case, and
4+ I would like to apply for the Court Transcripts for the appeal I will be putting in.

Regards
Simon Cordell

This email was scanned by the Government Secure Intranet antivirus service supplied by Vodafone in partnership with Symantec. (CCTM Certificate Number 2009/09/0052.) In case of problems, please call your organisations IT Helpdesk. Communications via the GSi may be automatically logged, monitored and/or recorded for legal purposes. This email (and any attachment) is intended only for the attention of the addressee(s). Its unauthorised use, disclosure, storage or copying is not permitted. If you are not the intended recipient, please destroy all copies and inform the sender by return email. Internet email
2094,
is not a secure medium. Any reply to this message could be intercepted and read by someone else. Please bear that in mind when deciding whether to send material in response to this message by email. This email (whether you are the sender or the recipient) may be monitored, recorded and retained by the Ministry of Justice. Email monitoring / blocking software may be used, and email content may be read at any time. You have a responsibility to ensure laws are not broken when composing or forwarding emails and their contents. The original of this email was scanned for viruses by the Government Secure Intranet virus scanning service supplied by Vodafone in partnership with Symantec. (CCTM Certificate Number 2009/09/0052.) This email has been certified virus free. Communications via the GSi may be automatically logged, monitored and/or recorded for legal purposes.

The original link from above before the newly implemented table is as displayed below and got taken down within a few weeks or months after the Newspapers copied the intel and I complained with others and the weblink can't be found other than in the copies I made of it.

This was the original weblink, as displayed in the copy above that I provided.
http://content.met.police.uk/News/MangivenafiveyearASBO/1400033211719/1257246745756

You can explore the **Metropolitan Police media archives** for **2014** through the following resources:

1. **Metropolitan Police Media Library (Mynewsdesk)**:
   - Visit the Metropolitan Police Media Library on Mynewsdesk. Here, you'll find various media files, including images related to police activities, CCTV footage, and more[1].
2. **The National Archives**:
   - The National Archives hold records related to the Metropolitan Police. You can search within or browse specific series to find records of interest:
     - **Photographs of Police Stations**: Series reference MEPO 14[2].
     - **Registered Files, Crime**: Series reference MEPO 15[3].
     - **Office of the Commissioner**: Series reference MEPO 16[4].
3. **Met Museums and Archives**:
   - The Metropolitan Police's Museum team curates objects, archives, books, and photographs related to the history of the Met since 1829. These collections tell the stories of officers and staff across London and beyond, as well as the crimes the Met has sought to solve[5].

Feel free to explore these resources to delve into the fascinating history and activities of the Metropolitan Police in 2014! 😊

This is the Current website is lacking the data from before!

https://news.met.police.uk/search?global_search_tab=stories&q=Man+given+a+fiveyear+ASBO

WEB ARCHIVE 2015

https://web.archive.org/web/20160131205044/http://www.london.gov.uk/about-us/mayor-london

Boris 2015 The Mayor's Office for Policing And Crime (MOPAC)

https://web.archive.org/web/20160215085943/https://www.london.gov.uk/what-we-do/mayors-office-policing-and-crime-mopac

Boris Mayors Website 2015

https://web.archive.org/web/20160206162838/http://www.london.gov.uk/search

Mayor-Commissioner Meeting

https://www.london.gov.uk/what-we-do/mayors-office-policing-and-crime-mopac/governance-and-decision-making/mayor-commissioner

The Mayor routinely meets with the Commissioner of the Metropolitan Police Service to discuss policing in London.

Notes from the meetings are available below.

2016

- **Mayor - Commissioner Meeting - 1 Feb 2016**
- **Mayor - Commissioner Meeting - 2 March 2016**
- **Mayor - Deputy Commissioner Meeting - 14 March 2016**
- **Mayor - Commissioner Meeting - 4 April 2016**

2015

- **Mayor - Commissioner Meeting - 5 Jan 2015**
- **Mayor - Commissioner Meeting - 12 Jan 2015**
- **Mayor - Commissioner Meeting - 2 Feb 2015**
- **Mayor - Commissioner Meeting - 16 Feb 2015**
- **Mayor - Commissioner Meeting - 2 Mar 2015**
- **Mayor - Commissioner Meeting - 16 Mar 2015**
- **Mayor - Commissioner Meeting - 30 Mar 2015**

- Mayor - Commissioner Meeting - 13 Apr 2015
- Mayor - Commissioner Meeting - 28 Apr 2015
- Mayor - Commissioner Meeting - 11 May 2015
- Mayor - Commissioner Meeting - 26 May 2015
- Mayor - Commissioner Meeting - 8 Jun 2015
- Mayor - Commissioner Meeting - 29 Jun 2015

- Mayor - Commissioner Meeting - 6 Jul 2015
- Mayor - Commissioner Meeting - 3 Aug 2015
- Mayor - Commissioner Meeting - 1 Sep 2015
- Mayor - Commissioner Meeting - 15 Sep 2015
- Mayor - Commissioner Meeting - 1 Oct 2015
- Mayor - Commissioner Meeting - 26 Oct 2015
- Mayor - Commissioner Meeting - 23 Nov 2015
- Mayor - Commissioner Meeting - 7 Dec 2015
- Mayor - Commissioner Meeting - 21 Dec 2015

2014

- Mayor Commissioner Meeting - 3 Feb 2014
- Mayor - Commissioner Meeting - 4 Mar 2014
- Mayor - Commissioner Meeting - 17 Mar 2014
- Mayor - Commissioner Meeting - 24 Mar 2014
- Mayor - Commissioner Meeting - 1 May 2014
- Mayor - Commissioner Meeting - 12 May 2014
- Mayor - Commissioner Meeting - 27 May 2014

- Mayor - Commissioner Meeting - 9 Jun 2014
- Mayor - Commissioner Meeting - 23 Jun 2014

- Mayor - Commissioner Meeting - 9 Jul 2014
- Mayor - Commissioner Meeting - 21 Jul 2014

- Mayor - Commissioner Meeting - 5 Aug 2014

- **Mayor - Commissioner Meeting - 1 Sep 2014**
- **Mayor - Commissioner Meeting - 15 Sep 2014**
- **Mayor - Commissioner Meeting - 16 Oct 2014**
- **Mayor - Commissioner Meeting - 27 Oct 2014**
- **Mayor - Commissioner Meeting - 10 Nov 2014**
- **Mayor - Commissioner Meeting - 24 Nov 2014**
- **Mayor - Commissioner Meeting - 8 Dec 2014**

DMPC-Commissioner Meeting

https://web.archive.org/web/20160425065411/https://www.london.gov.uk/what-we-do/mayors-office-policing-and-crime-mopac/governance-and-decision-making/dmpc-commissioner

The Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime and the Commissioner of the Metropolitan Police have monthly bi-lateral meetings to provide in depth scrutiny of the effectiveness and efficiency of the MPS and to consider issues of importance to policing and crime reduction in London.

Notes of the meetings are published below.

2016

- **DMPC - Commissioner Meeting - Feb 2016**
- **DMPC - Commissioner Meeting - April 2016**

2015

- **DMPC - Commissioner Meeting - Jan 2015**
- **DMPC - Commissioner Meeting - Feb 2015**
- **DMPC - Commissioner Meeting - Mar 2015**
- **DMPC - Commissioner Meeting - Apr 2015**
- **DMPC - Commissioner Meeting - May 2015**
- **DMPC - Commissioner Meeting - July 2015**
- **DMPC - Commissioner Meeting - Aug 2015**
- **DMPC - Commissioner Meeting - Sep 2015**
- **DMPC - Commissioner Meeting - Oct 2015**
- **DMPC - Commissioner Meeting - Dec 2015**

2014

- **DMPC - Commissioner Meeting - 3 Feb 2014**
- **DMPC - Commissioner Meeting - 17 Feb 2014**
- **DMPC - Commissioner Meeting - Mar 2014**
- **DMPC - Commissioner Meeting - Apr 2014**

- **DMPC - Commissioner Meeting - May 2014**
- **DMPC - Commissioner Meeting - Jun 2014**
- **DMPC - Commissioner Meeting - Jul 2014**
- **DMPC - Commissioner Meeting - Sep 2014**
- **DMPC - Commissioner Meeting - Oct 2014**
- **DMPC - Commissioner Meeting - Nov 2014**

2013

- **DMPC - Commissioner Meeting - Jan 2013**
- **DMPC - Commissioner Meeting - Feb 2013**
- **DMPC - Commissioner Meeting - Mar 2013**
- **DMPC - Commissioner Meeting - Apr 2013**
- **DMPC - Commissioner Meeting - May 2013**
- **DMPC - Commissioner Meeting - Jun 2013**
- **DMPC - Commissioner Meeting - Jul 2013**
- **DMPC - Commissioner Meeting - Sep 2013**
- **DMPC - Commissioner Meeting - Oct 2013**
- **DMPC - Commissioner Meeting - Nov 2013**
- **DMPC - Commissioner Meeting - Dec 2013**

2012

- **DMPC - Commissioner Meeting - Nov 2012**
- **DMPC - Commissioner Meeting - Dec 2012**

Where are the months before?

Did Sir Bernard Hogan, who was in charge of the Met Police go to these meetings?

Kaunchita Maudhub was or is Lemmy's Line Manager who tried to kill me in 2016 and onwards!

The Enfield Council Denied and still do deny being involved in the Asbo.

Si Note CBO Asbo or Standalone Asbo

A. The Highbury Magistrates Court wrongly issued to the Now Claimant a guilty Verdict in relation to a standalone Asbo Order on the **05th of November 2014**.

The Anti-Social Behavior, Crime, and Policing Act 2014, which introduced Criminal Behavior Orders (CBOs) in the United Kingdom, received Royal Assent on **March 13, 2014.** This is the date on which the bill became law.

Criminal Behavior Orders (CBOs) replaced Anti-Social Behavior Orders (ASBOs) as a measure to address anti-social behavior. CBOs provide the courts with the authority to impose restrictions and requirements on individuals convicted of criminal offenses in order to prevent further criminal behavior.

Please note that the information is accurate as of my last knowledge update in September 2021. Any updates or changes to the law that may have occurred after that date are not reflected in this response.

- **The Asbo dates**
  PC Sophie Theodoulou **12/09/2014**
  Is the Police Officer Who Lied and said that she Served me the First Asbo Folder, when that did not happen!
  Page Numbers: 57,58
  --
  Asbo Granted 04/08/2015
  End of Asbo Court Order - 04/08/2020
  The Forged Asbo conditions placed upon me finished but I could never go out ever again to a party in case I got set up again by the police and the Council!
  End:

You
when did The Anti-Social Behavior, Crime, and Policing Act 2014, which introduced Criminal Behavior Orders (CBOs) in the United Kingdom, receive Royal Assent all dates please
Copilot
Using the web
The **Anti-Social Behaviour, Crime and Policing Act 2014** received **Royal Assent** on **13 March 2014**[1]. This comprehensive legislation introduced various measures to address antisocial behavior, including **Criminal Behaviour Orders (CBOs)**. These orders aimed to tackle persistent antisocial behavior more effectively than earlier laws[2]. If you have any more questions or need further information, feel free to ask! 😊 👍
Learn more

1 gov.uk2 clok.uclan.ac.uk3

legislation.gov.uk4 legislation.gov.uk+1 more

You
does this mean it was law from this date
Copilot
Using the web
Yes, the **Anti-Social Behaviour, Crime and Policing Act 2014** became law on **13 March 2014** when it received **Royal Assent**. From that date onward, its provisions, including the introduction of **Criminal Behaviour Orders (CBOs)**, were legally enforceable. If you have any more questions or need further information, feel free to ask! 😊 👍

2) Https://Horrific-Corruption-Files.Serveblog.Net/Boris/The%20enfield%20independent%20asbo.Htm

D. Harassment / Malicious Abuse of Process

1) The documentation pertaining to the ASBO, which was included in the ACRO Report from 2014 to 2021, is presented below. It outlines the police classification and provides further insights, as elaborated upon in the attached "Other Information / Acro 2017" document.

E. Other Details =

- Other Detail 1
- **Text:** Attends Tuition School - Expelled

- **Owner:** 01 (Metropolitan Police)
- **Last Updated:** 21/04/97
  "Not in Work Out Code"
  Can't Find information supporting the Arrest date or accused offence or final outcome as the Asbo was illegally obtained and developed.

Addressing issues that are contained I this document latter that are of relevance to

Claim-Sheet

WHAT HAS HAPPENED
&
OUR REQUESTS

POLICE MARKERS: -- (DNA Report)

CASE (P16)

Nub 16	**ITEMS**				
1)	**DNA**	**Yes** ☐ **No** ☐	**Yes** ☐ **No** ☐	**Yes** ☐ **No** ☐	**Yes** ☐ **No** ☐

- **If There Is Any Other Acceptable Information, Please Provide It Below!**

A. The Claimant requests that of the "**DNA REPORT**" Contained in the attached file to his name that is known as an ACRO Report when reviewed by Official persons of relevance to class this listed as the same "**Grossly-Term-Refs**" as the requests prior made in part "**Nub 1**" of this "**Official Document**" but with the additional Requests or due to Reasons if any as follows: --

i. Reason One: --

- For

➢ **DNA Report Summary** =

DNA Report Summary / 2021 Acro =

WORK OUT CODE	**26**
DNA Report 1	
Arrest/Summons Ref.:	06/0000/00/397207P
DNA Status:	CONFIRMED
Sample Barcode:	96988294
Date of Sample:	15/05/06
Sent to Lab:	FORENSIC SCIENCE SERVICE (FSS)
Sample Type:	SWAB
DNA FS Ref.:	42 (ESSEX POLICE)
Fingerprint Status:	CONFIRMED
Test Method:	SGMPLUS (SECOND GENERATION MULTIPLEX PLUS)

The Now Claimant won this case at court and requests the files removal.

DNA Report 2

WORK OUT CODE	**55**
Arrest/Summons Ref.:	97/0000/00/193878F
DNA Status:	CONFIRMED
Sample Barcode:	90437213
Date of Sample:	28/02/97
Sent to Lab:	FORENSIC SCIENCE SERVICE (FSS)
Sample Type:	SWAB
DNA FS Ref.:	01 (METROPOLITAN POLICE)
Fingerprint Status:	CONFIRMED
Test Method:	SGM (SECOND GENERATION MULTIPLEX)

For DNA Report 2

- This DNA Report says it for the following case: -
  1. Taking Motor Vehicle Without Consent
  2. Using Vehicle While Uninsured
  3. Driving Otherwise Than in Accordance with A Licence
  4. For this case as well as others the Plea dates are not correct as they are the same as the offence dates in the Acro Reports and the PNC Printouts.
- But **"DNA Report 2"** also states it for a case in 1997 before the first reprimand warning!
- **21/05/98** not in the Court reg and it wrote it's not there. **97/0000/00/193878F** by the Courts Staff admitted in the Emails between them.

DNA Report 3

WORK OUT CODE	**18**
Arrest/Summons Ref.:	07/01YT/01/34813D
DNA Status:	DESTROYED
Sample Barcode:	98407055
Date of Sample:	23/11/07
Sample Type:	SWAB
DNA FS Ref.:	01 (METROPOLITAN POLICE)
Fingerprint Status:	CONFIRMED

DNA Report 4

WORK OUT CODE	**22**
Arrest/Summons Ref.:	06/0000/00/1629163X
DNA Status:	DESTROYED
Sample Barcode:	97658916
Date of Sample:	21/12/06
Sample Type:	SWAB
DNA FS Ref.:	01 (METROPOLITAN POLICE)
Fingerprint Status:	CONFIRMED

End Taken from ACRO Report 2021.

a) The file is an image in the "**Simulation File**."

- **Sent**: 18 September 2015 15:00
- **Attachments**: Court-List-From-Benedicta.pdf

1+ 06/08/97 not in the Court reg ***97/0000/00/236370T***

--

2+ 12/11/97 not in the Court reg ***97/0000/00/768545U***

3+ 13/11/97 not in the Court reg ***97/0000/00/768545U***

--

4+ 21/05/98 not in the Court reg and it wrote it's not there. "**97/0000/00/193878F**"

5+ 05/01/01 not in the Court reg ***00/0000/00/1139706K***

6+ 17/08/02 not in the Court reg "***Not in PNC***"

7+ 24/04/03 not in the Court reg ***02/0000/00/556175K***

These are in the PNC printout of the Asbo made by police.

MOTHERS AND THE Courts Emails.

Also, in the original copy the biro pen is made by the staff of the Court.

The cases above are definitely not in the Court Registry as they never happened.

The files are kept in fire safe boxes and no pages are allowed to be ripped out of the registry.

Court Registrars and Registers of the Magistrates' Court:

Court registrars are administrative officers in the court system who handle various administrative tasks related to court proceedings. They maintain records, process documents, and assist judges, lawyers, and the public with matters related to court cases.

Registers of the Magistrates' Court refer to the official records or documents where court proceedings, orders, judgments, and other important information are recorded. These registers are used to keep a chronological record of the court's activities and decisions.

Handling of Court Files:

Court files, which contain documents related to court cases, are generally handled with care to ensure the integrity of the legal process. Pages being ripped out of court files would likely be against established procedures due to the need to maintain an accurate record of proceedings and decisions.

The handling and safekeeping of court files are subject to specific rules and regulations to ensure transparency, fairness, and security. Unauthorized alteration, removal, or tampering with court documents can have serious legal consequences, as it can undermine the integrity of the judicial process.

In most jurisdictions, court files are considered legal records and are subject to retention schedules and archival procedures. These procedures vary from place to place but generally aim to ensure that court records are preserved for historical, legal, and administrative purposes. Court records are often accessible to the public, but certain sensitive information may be redacted or protected for privacy reasons.

It's important to emphasize that intentionally damaging or altering court documents, including ripping pages out of them, can be a violation of the law and may result in penalties or legal consequences.

SUMMARY
One

2. **SUMMARY OF FINDINGS SO FAR: --**
   A. **Our Comprehensive Assessment**

- Reveals that the entity integrity of the data held by the police in connection with the Now Claimant, as documented within their ACRO Report, is fundamentally compromised across various classed categories such as: --

1) Police National Computer Nominal Report Nominal Details / ACRO: --

- Data integrity issues arise due to cross-contamination of government-official categorized files, leading to inaccuracies in the proper structuring of relevant mandatory files associated with proven guilt.

2) Personal Description: --

- The accuracy of personal description data is called into question, potentially leading to wrongful identifications and arrests.

3) Driver Details: --

- Irrelevant and wrongful arrest or summons references may lead to misinformation and misrepresentation of the Now Claimant's identity.

4) **Aliases Alias 1:** --

- Data inaccuracies within alias details could result in improper profiling and potential misjudgements.

5) **Alias Dates of Birth:** --

- Issues in alias date of birth entries could lead to confusion and procedural errors.

6) **Warning Signals:** --

- The presence of warning signals may be compromised by inaccurate data inputs, impacting law enforcement actions.

7) **Information Markers:** --

- Data inaccuracies in information markers lead to misguided assessments and actions.

8) **Marks and Scars:** --

- Incorrect entries in marks and scars information lead to misidentifications and improper procedures.

9) **Photograph Locations:** --

- Inaccuracies in photograph location data hinder the proper documentation and identification process.

10) **Identity Numbers:** --

- Issues in identity number entries may lead to complications in proper identification and recordkeeping.

11) **Passports:** --

- The accuracy of passport data may influence travel-related judgments and decisions.

12) **Occupations:** --

- Incorrect occupation data may affect assessments and decisions related to the Now Claimant's professional activities.

13) **Habitual Dress:** --

- Inaccurate habitual dress entries could lead to mistaken identifications and actions.

14) **Jewellery:** --

- Issues in jewellery-related data may impact identifications and investigations.

15) **Other Details:** --

- Data inaccuracies within other details could lead to misconceptions and flawed judgments.

16) **DNA Report:** --

- Compromised DNA report data hinder accurate forensic assessments and conclusions.

--

B. These Discrepancies Arise due to the very reasons the police policies aim to prevent, such as: --

1) **Cross Contamination of Government-Official Categorized Files:**
   - Inadequate maintenance of correct file structures with relevant mandatory files for proven guilt-related offenses.
2) **Irrelevant and Wrongful Arrest/Summons References:**
   - Misleading references that inaccurately identify the Now Claimant, leading to wrongful actions.
3) **DNA Status, Date of Sample, Sample Type, Fingerprint Status, Date Arrested, Last Updated, Case Name:**
   - Ongoing issues persist where arresting officers are implicated in wrongful detention, illegal remand dates, and unauthorized continuation of actions against the Now Claimant.
4) **NFA Date, Offence Date(s), Harassment, Abuse of Process:**
   - The integrity of these records is undermined, potentially leading to miscarriages of justice.

C. In Light of These Findings: --

1) It Becomes Evident that corrective actions are imperative to rectify data inaccuracies and uphold fairness, accuracy, and the principles of justice.

1) **Specific Instances Of Errors Include**:
   a) **21/05/98**: Not found in court records. 97/0000/00/193878F
   b) **05/01/01**: Not found in court records.
   c) **17/08/02**: Not found in court records.
   d) **24/04/03**: Not found in court records.
   e) **25/01/08**: A failure-to-surrender charge dismissed by the judge.