

Damian Warburton

Fri 25 Sept • 19:31

rma90@tutamail.com

Fri 25 Sept • 19:36

Damian Warburton

Fri 25 Sept • 19:48

rma90@tutamail.com

Fri 25 Sept • 20:53

Damian Warburton

Sat 26 Sept • 08:20

rma90@tutamail.com

Sat 26 Sept • 20:28

Damian Warburton

Sat 26 Sept • 20:59

rma90@tutamail.com

Sat 26 Sept • 21:19

Damian Warburton

Damian Warburton <damian.warburton@square17chambers.com>
to: rma90@tutamail.com

Sun, 27 Sept 2026 • 07:49

Re: your enquiry APOLOGIES IN ADVANCE I USED SPEECH TO TEXT

Dear Mr Alberone

I am prepared to split the £3,600 fee, including VAT: £2,000 payable now and £1,600 payable no later than a fortnight before the substantive hearing.

That covers my representation at the 23 October mention hearing by CVP, one redraft of your written submissions, and representation at the substantive hearing on a date to be fixed, subject to receipt of the second payment. It also includes face-to-face advice on the day of the substantive hearing, before we go into court.

The prosecution is likely to respond to the redrafted submissions. I anticipate dealing with that response orally at the substantive hearing, without further charge. However, I need to allow for unexpected complexity. Should further written work be necessary, I will explain why and agree any additional fee with you before undertaking it.

I will respond to reasonable questions by email, but I cannot maintain a daily conversation about the minutiae of the case. Your instructions will be for the written work, advocacy and advice described above, rather than an ongoing email discussion of each disputed point.

Please confirm whether you wish to proceed on that basis.

If you do, there is a document I need to issue you with that sets out my terms and your rights and I need you to sign that before making any payment.

best wishes
Damian

 SQUARE 17 CHAMBERS	Damian Warburton Barrister Square 17 Chambers, 7 Bell Yard, London WC2A 2JR ✉ Email: damian.warburton@square17chambers.com 🔒 Secure: damian.warburton@square17.CJSM.net 👤 Clerk: Kelly Saavedra 07988 187020 kelly@square17chambers.com
	Regulated by the Bar Standards Board
CONFIDENTIALITY The information contained in this communication from the sender is confidential, and may be legally privileged. It is intended solely for use by the person(s) it was addressed to. If you are not in that category, you are hereby notified that any disclosure, copying, onward distribution, or otherwise acting on the contents of this email is unlawful, and may be criminal.	

From: rma90@tutamail.com <rma90@tutamail.com>
Date: Saturday, 26 September 2026 at 21:19
To: Damian Warburton <damian.warburton@square17chambers.com>
Subject: Re: your enquiry APOLOGIES IN ADVANCE I USED SPEECH TO TEXT

Uh, yeah, if it's not in the sentencing transcript, which I don't believe it is, like there wasn't a specific reason, um, then essentially I don't think there is one. It just says it was felt necessary, but not stated as to why. Um, it did not involve physical contact. Yep, fair enough. If your earlier email was based on an initial skim, and you've clarified what you meant by contacts, essentially what I said. Concerning the 2024 alert, my devices, the absence of further charges, the evidence relied upon, and the new proposed conditions. Yep, fair enough. Email tennis. What's wrong with badminton? Right, now, same applies to my skeleton argument and proposed questions. There's some kind of indication on to whether or not I... I don't know, man, just... I'm not, I'm genuinely not trying to get anything, like, free here, or... but some indication on whether or any of it's any good, like, would be nice. Other than the fact it's words on paper. so... Sorry, I'm just sort of nervously laughing. Um, right, now to explain this, because this is where it gets a bit sort of complicated and nuanced or whatever. You know that I've relied on AI, you don't understand the need, but it's really reliable for sophisticated legal work. Um, Essentially, through both my formative years and throughout this order, I have tried to, like, what, I've basically been isolated by the system and everything. Now, for years, I was diagnosed with several personality disorders, which, if you know anything about, is paradoxical. Um, now, regardless of whether I explain it or not, if I explain purely based on logic, the context... or what I actually mean by a statement or a behaviour or whatever, it then gets put onto me as I'm justifying and I'm minimising, despite the fact I actually am not. Um, broadly speaking, although I can't yet prove it, my opinion on their mentality is, he started as a personality disorder, Which means he must be doing something of some kind, or he's done something of some kind, we just can't find it. The guy's a sneaky little bastard. Please excuse my language. Despite the fact that genuinely he has nothing to find. Now, like I said, I've got the recording of the October thing, now as best as I've been able to figure out. Um, I wasn't verbally aggressive at all. I wasn't even threatening. Now, like, long story short, mate, because I've done several subject access record re uh, requests, a fair portion of which I've got, just not the

one from the police. Because of my isolation and diagnosis and being passed around constantly from care home to care home, I don't have friends, I don't have family, I don't have a support network. I have, if you look at the Alberoni things, I think the URM ones, Now, I'm not expecting you to come back to me in, with an opinion or whatever, because right now you're not being paid. Fair enough. Um, but if you bother to look at that, because my words get twisted, the one of them is mostly GP records, I believe, basically from several professionals and services where they've refused... Uh, so, personality disorder specialist says my forensic history precludes me from joining their group, not to mention there's no treatment in the county for it, um, which is kind of ironic on the face of it itself, because the type of behaviour and manner and everything that PD causes then makes you ineligible for the group. That just makes no sense to me, but okay. Um, basically, I've consistently asked for help, time and time again, and it's consistently been denied. I've done self-referrals, I've gone to my GP, the PD specialist consultant guy himself, Mark Morris, uh, VB, whatever, I don't know, highly qualified, MBA, whatever, I ain't got a clue, with access to my records, wasn't even of the opinion I had personality disorder. He referred me to class. Now, without further information by how I was as a child, which I could have just signed a consent form and they could have got the same, like records, which I, st I stated to them, they wouldn't even give me an in-depth assessment. Um, eventually got, with the right to choose service, got assessed and diagnosed with ADHD February 2025. In other words, where she states in her statement has not taken steps to address things or seek professional help, I have. That professional help has consistently been refused. I am quite literally not entirely to any fault of my own other than, I suppose, if you want to be pedantic about it, is why I did. Like, my understanding of it, my insight into it and everything... As long-winded and as messy as it is, I couldn't have gone into any further explanation and detail as I did in my initial email application from February 9th. Um, I'm not stating I'm not a risk. I'm stating that despite I'm well aware that isolation is normally a risk factor and... Essentially, regardless of various risk assessments and so on, stating medium, high, whatever, there's no evidence for it. Like, I mean, the, I'm not sure if I sent it yet, the pre-sentence report from the Prohibited Weapon in Public Place of 2023. Essentially, it states, okay, I'm a medium risk of offending within the next two years, but I'm a high risk that should I re-offend, it will be a serious offence. Well, here we are, more than two years later, without a single fucking offence, full stop. Now, on one hand, you say I haven't tried. Like, she's saying, yeah, I have, here's the proof. On the other hand, oh, you're isolated, there's no support network or whatever. My argument is, I didn't build it reliant on anything else. I built it on myself. I looked inward and did everything I could myself. Essentially, because I had a little choice. But when there's no further sexual offending in over 11 years, and it was about 15 months, I was on bail before I was sentenced. So I suppose technically you could include that as well. Because I was on quite strict bail conditions. A fair amount, I had to sign on twice a day at a police station. Now, I didn't breach those bail conditions either. That you will have to ask for, because I don't have any proof. Um, but, so yeah, you either state it was wrong to attribute the risk in the first place, or the risk is sufficiently self-managed that it has not produced or been evidenced or whatever in over a decade. Because isn't the whole point of this... Well, based on the balance of probabilities, what are the chances I'm going to sexually re-offend in future? Well, given that I haven't done it in the last 11 years, I'd say the chances are very slim. Whether I've got the interest or not, I don't, for the record. But it doesn't really make any that all that much difference. Um... But yeah, AI, because just to try and sort of... It takes me absolutely ages to send an email. Like, I'm talking hours, a day or two. Because I have to make sure it can't be twisted. It's not double-barreled. It can't be taken any other way. Because I've had a lifetime of my shit being twisted. I mean, it literally states so in a statement. Like, I would believe to be uh, trying to befuddle officers. Um, goes off on tangents and it's hard to define what it was he said trying to befuddle them. In other words, he paints that as me intentionally trying to manipulate the conversation. No, it's ADHD. I go off on a tangent. My brain makes weird or more complex connections. Eventually, it does come full circle. It takes a long, long time, though. It's not manipulation. I mean, even the ARMS 2022 risk assessment does not believe his behavior is manipulative or whatever. Um... Also, broadly speaking, if it actually matters, look at the dates on all those offences. Pretty much all of them, apart from I think two or three exceptions, uh, were done against members of care staff in care homes. Now just to clarify again, not justifying or minimising, I'm just clearly explaining. Uh, now, that's the first 18 years of my life. The 11 years or whatever that I've been in my current address is the longest address that I've ever been in my entire life. I'm 36 years old. It's also the longest period by the initial offence in 2013 and the one in 2023 where, like, in other words, if this was the first 18 years of my life, there'd be a lot more offences. I mean, at one point in 2017, it actually got to the point I made an attempt on my own life because I consistently ask and ask and ask, beg, plead, scream. Nobody wants to help. They say ring 111 option two. They paint me as an adult at risk. They do the referral for it where I'm both the victim and the perpetrator. I'm quite literally neglecting and abusing myself. Or they, they, they take me to hospital in the middle of the night, leave me there all night. During which I'm playing in traffic for a doctor or a GP to send a messenger, a nurse or someone out saying you've already got a diagnosis, go and see a GP. You ask me why I use AI because I literally have no other choice. And frankly mate, this has now become far more complex because what started as a discharge application now means I've got to defend against either a variation or the new one. I mean, they're basing it on historical shit. Well, if it's, if it's always going to be based on historical shit, then I'm never coming off it. Because you'll always throw the shit back in my face. Oh, yeah, five years ago, you did this. So, yep, no, your answer is no. Ten years ago, you did this. The answer is no. Fifteen years ago, you did this. The answer is no. So, yeah. Sorry to ramble on, mate, but... Uh, oh, the last point, actually.

Uh, you said you appreciate the position regarding the fee, but you cannot agree a payment plan or undertake the work before the fee is paid. No, what I was thinking was essentially if I pay, like how much do I get for, I don't know, two grand? Um, like can you make a

start or something on the work and like the paperwork and the mention herein? Try and, I, I genuinely don't know, but try and push the court to lock in a substantive date that won't be delayed again because if it gets delayed again I'm going to run out of funds you would have been paid for the, some, the one that didn't happen or something or got you turned up and it turned it never happened for whatever reason um and then I'm back to square one with an empty wallet that's my concern uh also whenever that substantive date is depending on what he might come up with essentially I need a long enough period to be able to pay you the remaining 1600 for you to actually attend that. That's what I meant. Because broadly speaking, that's the main bit I need you for. Because any way that I cross-examine Claire, don't matter how I word it, don't matter how I phrase it, my tone and whatever, without doubt, regardless of how I mean to, I don't come across how I mean to, basically. It's going to come across as difficult and obnoxious, which is exactly what she states in her statement. That's not my intention, and I've had a lifetime of it.

Rocky Mark Alberone

26 Sept 2026, 20:59 by damian.warburton@square17chambers.com:

>
> Thank you.
>
>
> When I questioned the justification, I was referring to the decision in 2015 to make the SOPO indefinite, not the justification for your present application to discharge it. I do not see why it was an indefinite order rather than an order for a fixed term.
>
>
> I understand your correction that the 2015 offending did not involve physical contact. My earlier email was based only on an initial skim of a substantial amount of material. When I say contact offence, that includes communication with a child, or an attempt at communication. It doesn't only mean hands-on contact. I probably wasn't clear.
>
>
> I have noted your other points, including those concerning the 2024 alert, your devices, the absence of further charges, the evidence relied upon and the proposed new conditions. Those matters require proper consideration of the papers rather than email tennis.
>
>
> The same applies to your skeleton argument and proposed questions. If instructed, I will use what is useful and revise or replace what is not. I note you have relied on AI. I can't understand the need, but it is rarely reliable for sophisticated legal work.
>
>
> I appreciate the position regarding the fee, but I cannot agree a payment plan or undertake the work before the fee is paid.
>
>
> Best wishes
>
>
>
>
>
> Damian Warburton | Barrister
>
>
> Square 17 Chambers <<https://www.square17chambers.com>>> , 7 Bell Yard, London WC2A 2JR
>
>
> Secure Mail (for CJSJ/Police/eJudiciary/.Gov users only):
>
>

> damian.warburton@square17.CJSM.net

> Clerk: Kelly Saavedra, Tel: 07988 187020

> Regulated by the > Bar Standards Board <<https://www.barstandardsboard.org.uk/>>>

> CONFIDENTIALITY

> The information contained in this communication from the sender is confidential, and may be legally privileged. It is intended solely for use by the person(s) it was addressed to. If you are not in that category, you are hereby notified that any disclosure, copying, onward distribution, or otherwise acting on the contents of this email is unlawful, and may be criminal.

> From:> rma90@tutamail.com <rma90@tutamail.com>

> > Sent:> Saturday, 26 September 2026 20:28:51

> > To:> Damian Warburton <damian.warburton@square17chambers.com>

> > Subject:> Re: your enquiry APOLOGIES IN ADVANCE I USED SPEECH TO TEXT>

> So your first email, um, stated you're an expert on the law in the area. Brilliant. If I'm a suitable candidate for discharge of the order, you will certainly identify how my case is best put. You can be available for the remote management. I'm hoping, which is what I'm trying to portray to various firms and people, and just as not fun, just everybody's not listening. Essentially, contacting the judge in the court and stating. Or requesting, is it really necessary? Because, for example, we've had the staggered dates and a substantive date four times. Now, where you said the papers I say are all prepared are a different matter. You are unlikely to be satisfied with the submissions in them, and that goes for whether I had counsel draft them or did them myself. Your experience of other people's drafting is that it's never good enough. Fair enough. Don't have an issue with that opinion. Like, everybody has their own preferences or... Like, well, if you want to go down that road with me, um, I've got a problem with a lot of shit that people do because stuff that's completely obvious and glaringly obvious to me, everybody seems completely oblivious to. But anyway, um, almost certainly the papers will need revision. Yep, I imagine they do. But I'm, um, yeah, so the real question is the degree to which they will need rewriting. Now, that's your initial email. Your last one,

> So I've sent you a lot and you've skimmed it. Probably not going to admit to me to what degree. Uh, from what you can see, I was convicted in 2008 of a contact offence. Yes, physically slept with her. A 15 year old when I was 17 myself. Convicted again. I don't know where you got another contact offence from. It was messages online and pictures. Or image offences. Never met. So there's no contact. I think. Unless you're being specific. And well, physical contact. And online contact is still contact. Uh, and then you put, which is all, potentially also problematic, there is a suggestion that you review in prohibited images. Right. There's a fair amount of nuance stuff there. So, first of all, if you bother to look at it, uh, so I didn't mean that to sound the way it did, that's... Part of the reason why I need um, someone to do the cross-examination. A lot of the statements in the MG11 and everything else really, from them, I never actually said, or I never said in those specific words, or are taken completely out of context. I.e. the relevant surrounding situation. Um, so, July the 12th, Well, technically, July the 11th, received a phone call from my officer. Am I about? No. Can I get back in 10 minutes? No. Arranged to come see me the next day. That's exactly what they did. Told me it was nothing to worry about, nothing to concern myself about. Immediately seized my devices. All they told me at the time was that there was an alert. Now, I had a theory that it was comic type stuff. Because that's the only thing... I could think of that I was looking at that could potentially have triggered it but it was never confirmed to me that was July the 12th 19, uh, 19 July the 12th 2024 um, then whilst I can't definitively prove it because I no longer have the recording I do have a contemporaneous account from my probation records from subject access request It basically says, uh, so I told my probation worker that I'd recently been made aware that the forensic report was done on my devices May of 2025. Um, then still didn't get devices back or hear anything about it until, uh, technically speaking, I got arrested for the suspected breach in August. Could have just asked a damn question, but no, they turned up in force. We believe you have other devices. Didn't find any because I don't have any. Um, then took disproportionate bladed articles in relation to one, what the law is, and two, what they left behind. Honestly, mate, it's absolutely laughable. The distinction, disparity between what they took and what they left behind when they're both in the exact same place. Person is a different matter entirely, but it's laughable. Um, then, overall, February twenty twenty, uh, February twenty fourth of twenty twenty six, I finally get my devices back. Um, so nine months after the report was actually

finished, do I get my devices back? Now, she states it was a potential prohibited image. Uh, prior to that, her, the DS at the time, I believe is the DI now, um, he states on a recorded phone call, which I've still got, it was the word teen on the website Pornhub, which by the way was a behaviour that was already addressed um, in a previous arms uh, risk assessment from 2022, which I've got, the only one I was ever given. Um, despite actually this year trying to do subject access requests, which they've gone cold on and the ICO is involved. But they've yet to allocate anyone to it. Anyway, um, but the 2022 arms risk assessment for the same behaviour rates sexual preoccupation low.

> I think you've got that as well, to be honest. Um, basically, long story short, I don't have that interest. I've stated I prefer smaller or shorter or skinnier. Basically, women, man. I don't want... Like, I honestly do not know how to politely say this. First of all, I'm not prejudiced in any way, shape or form. But if I had a choice, I would prefer someone I can wrap my arms around, figuratively speaking. Like a womanly person. Like I don't want someone that's taller than me that's going to make me feel emasculated. Someone that has a womanly figure is that I proportionately realistic. Basically, that shit is what I said. And the words in her statement is how she's twisted it. So, no, I don't have that interest. And the porn I was looking at was legal and was actors. Not to mention, I genuinely have no idea how to portray this to the court. As of April, I think it was this year, that porn is illegal now. And it's not something I even look at anymore anyway.

> Yes, I legally changed my name, Deed Paul. I find it quite uh, sort of ironically funny. Uh, what does it say in my passport? Mate, do you think I'd stay in this country if I had a passport? I'd find the money and I'd leave. Um, nothing to do with the order, it's just this country's going to shit. Please excuse my language, I'm blunt, that's how I am. I don't mean anything personal by it, it's just how I speak. I don't beat around the bush. I don't like pretty professional dressed up bullshit, basically, just get to the point. no. So yeah, uh, I'm using STT throughout all of this, by the way. Speech to text. Now, you said there is a very badly written police application for an SHPO. I thought it was dated the 25th, not the 26th. Well, that's a double check, but... The directions were technically to submit it by the 24th. The Crown has consistently been late, which has caused the damn delays in the first place. Um, now, best guess, if you can add anything to this, or I'm willing to do so. You said very badly written. Why? Because it's one, full of inconsistencies, two, written by someone that clearly doesn't understand the technology. Um... Also, basing all of it on historical records, because there's nothing recent, or throughout, um, that's substantive enough like. Also, the arguing against, well, all well, technologies become more advanced than VPNs and encryptions and shit. I really hope I don't have to, but that shit was available 11 years ago, when I was granted the order. Well, when it, the order was imposed. It's not a fucking gift, I don't know why I said granted, but okay. Um, the inconsistency, so either I can't have new accounts or whatever, uh, or I can, but I've got to let them know within three days. Not to mention, oh, uh, this the iOS thing is a, a, a condition on my current order. No, it's not. um, and also in that application, it then changes from a potential prohibitive image To an actual one. Bearing in mind, it's written by the same person. So I'm like, well, which is it? Now, for, as a result of a police complaint, I've got something that kind of in indicates, uh, it says, well, the terminology you're using and potentially reviewing, sorry, uh, possibly reviewing potential prohibited images or some shit, I don't know. And that's from a detective inspector of the same department. Now, I did try to argue conflict of interest when I made the complaint, and he was the one who was attributed to it. And they basically fobbed me off. That complaint is currently being reviewed by the OPCC. Um, I've had enough of this, man. I don't normally push things this far, but this, the, the level this has all gone to, the entire treatment, not just the order, everything, because it's all connected. Uh, I realise that makes me sound a bit like crazy crackpot, but fair amount I can prove.

> Oh, and then you've got the stuff. Um, this could be because I used encryption or computer deletion software or something. I'm like, well, if I had used anything remotely like that, you'd be able to see that something was used and I would have been breached, arrested, charged and so on. The fact that I wasn't, like, in other words, they've had my devices for 19 months. They took further stuff in August of 25, which they eventually gave back. All resulting in no charge. The singular charge was prohibited weapon in a public place, intoxicated. Give or take a month, I've not drank a drop since. Now, the end of November this year will be three years. Sober. Teetotal. On alcohol, that is. Monsters energy drinks is a different matter entirely. Honestly, they're harder to give up than the booze was.

> Right. Uh, without reading everything, it's unclear to you on what basis that it's brought. Right. So I've basically been using AI because I don't understand this shit. AI keeps losing the plot and just. Honestly, man, I'm I'm overwhelmed and lost and everything, but the three things on their new application, the specific thing with 16 conditions, apparently is for a new order or something, which is meant to go to the magistrates, I believe. Because mine was initially a SOPO from when it, and then 10 days later or something, the name changed, but it, Something about it means it can only be varied or discharged or something under certain conditions or prerequisites. So I think it's 103F off the top of my head without actually looking again. So the application applies for it, the application itself applies for a new order, whereas the Crown Skeleton Argument version 2, so V2, actually states if the judges are of a mind not to grant. my discharge would he be so kind as to make it inherently fucking worse now you said the 2015 order is until further order which means for life and less discharge yeah I'm well aware of that uh, which is difficult to see the justification for right that bit I need explaining are you saying it's difficult to see the justification as to why it was indefinite in the first place Because the reason wasn't stated in the sentence in transcript. Just said it was felt necessary. Doesn't actually state a reason. Uh, are you saying it's difficult to see the justification for their new application? Yep, probably because there, there isn't any. Um, I applied the 9th of February. There's two emails in one document, probably a few different versions of it actually. Apologies for that. Uh, very messy, very badly written. But essentially, in that, I basically made and indicated as best I was able to every single possible point and everything. Because I, I, I grew

up in care and everything, mate. Like, I've, I know what these people are likely to come up with. And sure as shit, that's exactly what they did. Um, so yeah, I'm applying for discharge. However, towards the end of the email... I also said, can, uh, should it not be discharged, can you give me clarification? Because I'm sick of the goalpost changing the interpretation of it. Because um, that in itself is a problem. Like, for example, for the first seven years, it was browsing history. Then suddenly it was WhatsApp, Facebook messages, emails, the fucking lot. Um... Apologies for swearing, I, I try my best not to, but sometimes it just comes out when I'm speaking. Um, so far I haven't done that in court, by the way. just as a clarifier.

> So yeah, I'm applying for discharge or clarification, I think, or variation. Please be applying for either a new order or variation of the current one, depending on which particular document of theirs that you read. Skeleton argument by a Crown Advocate, there's two of them. Whether or not I'm meant to pay attention to both, I'm not entirely sure. And the police application for the new one, both of which are fundamentally flawed. Yeah, the, obviously I've already gone through why I think the issues are with the thing. And it says also convicted of a qualifying offence. Now unless it's referring to the old one, the original two, either one of them, um, haven't been reconvicted of another qualifying offence. Now, the CPS at one point actually got told off by the judge to get a serious grip of this case, or otherwise it would increase the likelihood of my application being granted. And then from that, the next time I seen him, he seemed to have concerns

> So honestly, I ain't really sure what's going on. Because the 10th of August was meant to be the hearing day. Everybody was aware, uh, unaware of that, sorry. Except for me on the Friday prior. Because having one mentioned hearing cancelled or rescheduled the day before. Uh, and having to leave early in the morning before the courts open. I had the decency to email and ring up. Anyway, I'm rambling. Um, yeah, you said fundamentally flawed. I mean, the Crown is basically just... I don't know, blowing stuff out of proportion or making assumptions it doesn't really have the basis for. Because it says stuff like, well, I deleted history. Okay, well, if that's the case, why was I not arrested and breached for it? The only time I ever deleted history was when I was told I could directly after the devices had been manually fucking checked. Until Claire, where from day one, and I can't definitively prove this, that's why, one of the reasons why I did the SAR because I wanted the body cam from the visit because I distinctly remember she said no everything needs to remain on there for evidential purposes almost like she was planning to seize the device from day one um, not to mention upon the 9th of April when they reinstalled the monitoring software uh, this year by the way when I was trying to help them because the information they were going by and the video call they were on it was essentially misleading them I was trying to help them actually install the thing and activate the permissions and everything which I know because I myself updated the app after I got my devices back after so long now I'm not a damn moron I used one device to film the other one and vice versa when I did the update just in case I got accused of tampering with it I'm not stupid, mate. Um, not to mention, was I either forgot or accidentally deleted a picture of the um, the phone side of it, the tablet side between the period leading up to the seizure. I got a screenshot saying it eSafe itself only sent 244 bytes. Which, to the best of my understanding, is either a hash of an image or a word. Because it's too small amount of data. But that was only Wi-Fi. It could be actual data from the phone side of it that caused the alert. But essentially, there's like three or four different accounts as to what the alert actually was. Um, You can draft a submission that addresses both the procedural defects, yeah, the inconsistencies, the contradictions. I mean, her MG11, uh, I'm both contrite and admit to offences, and I'm insincere, deceptive, secretive, uh, as well as believed to be saying the right things. And so on. I'm not, we just pick a line and stick to it, please. I was like, yeah, nothing was found on your devices. However, you are clearly, you are clearly, clearly, without a shadow of a doubt, creating opportunities and seeking ways to review illegal material. If I wanted to review illegal material, I'd do it on a different device, something I've not done in 11 plus years. Like, honestly, just whatever you're basing it on makes no sense. Not to mention she's tried treating me with under the umbrella of essentially today's types of conditions, which I refuse to back down on. Um, that actually seems a very, very extremely reasonable cost. Problem is, I can't quite afford all of it in one go. I'm not 100% sure what to do. Now, just to clarify, so the mention here in remotely, yep. Yeah. Um, just says not before 12. I have no idea what time that's going to be. Because I kept asking, because it was always like morning or whatever. And I kept asking and asking because I quite literally have to get up at like four o'clock in the morning to be functioning by about five or five to get a half six bus to St. Ives to get to the one from there to Cambridge to be there one time. And I'm, I've got ADHD, mate. I don't sleep much at the best of times. And I've asked a few times and the judge was nice this time. But anyway, um, the written write that is necessary. Whether or not you end up completely changing it or not, I genuinely want to know whether or not, um, I don't know, my skeleton argument is actually any good whatsoever. If the questions to put to Claire are useful or structured or... Like, I'm not looking for a freebie. I just generally want an opinion whether or not it's any good. Whether or not to use it, like, I don't know, I just, I'm not looking for validation or to have my head patted or something. I just want to know, so how bad did I screw up, like, sort of thing? Or did I actually do fairly well under the circumstances? Exacerbated on my part, um, making me look better because theirs is essentially a mess. And not to mention, they contested it two weeks after the 9th of February. Now, the 10th of August, the judge mentions they indicated or applied for this new order back in April, but I was not served a copy, which I told him. Um, I said, well, are you aware of what I've actually got? He says, I don't know what you've got and what you haven't got. And I'm thinking, fuck's sake, man, like, Well, don't you think it's a good idea to ask? I never said that, obviously. Um, but anyway, he gave the Crown to till the 24th of August to indicate whether or not they did indeed intend to seek a new order. And then dated the 25th, but I didn't get it till the 28th. We have this 16 thing, condition thing that's frankly barbaric. Not to mention, it wasn't even a contact offence, so why am I being banned from children? Honestly, I'm restraining myself at the moment until I can actually prove it, but broadly

speaking, without a shadow of a doubt, Claire Cummings is overzealous. Too much indicates and points to it. The October visit, I actually have video recording of the entire thing. Not to mention the call of DS Rob Hutchins, now a DI. Another call, I can't remember the exact date, but it's the title of the thing, where she tries to, I don't know, like I'm gonna say like a gaslighting backward type thing. Um, oh, can you not speak to me in that tone? Like, I've done nothing, like, can you not patronize me? Because that's essentially my thing. Like when people sort of dress it up and, do that high-pitched tone, it drives me mad. Like, I don't mean unstable, crazy. I mean, it really, like, it's like nails on a chalkboard to me. I'm not a child. Don't speak to me like one. Speak to me on the level, we'll be just fine. Rocky Mark Alberone

>
>
>

> 26 Sept 2026, 08:20 by damian.warburton@square17chambers.com:

>

> > Right, you have sent me a lot and while I have skimmed it, I am of course not going to read everything unless I am instructed.

> >

> > From what I can see, you were convicted in 2008 of a contact offence, convicted again in 2015 of another contact offence and of image offences, and, which is potentially also problematic for you, there is the suggestion that you were viewing prohibited images (child porn cartoons, usually) in 2024 but were not charged with that. Is that right?

> >

> > What the OIC reports is your daily habit of watching porn featuring stepdaughters, schoolgirls and the like is going to be a hurdle for you. While that may be legal material, it suggests interests in younger people that will concern the court when it is assessing risk against the context of the offending in your past.

> >

> > I see the SOPO is in the name of Jason Storm. Did you change your name? Was that a legal name change or just an adoption of the new name? (ie what does it say on your passport?)

> >

> > There is a very badly written police application for a SHPO dated 26 August 2026, although without reading everything it is unclear to me on what basis that is brought because your 2015 Order is 'until further order', which means for life unless discharged, which is difficult to see the justification for.

> >

> > What is it that is happening here - are you applying for the discharge of the 2015 Order, or are the police applying for a new 2026 Order, or both?

> >

> > I can see a skeleton argument by a Crown Advocate for the CPS, and a police application,, both of which are fundamentally flawed.

> >

> > I can offer to act for you, and I can draft submission that address both the procedural defects I see in the other side's work, and the law. The amount of papers, the complexity, and the work involved is a lot.

> >

> > The fee, which will cover the mention hearing of 23 Oct 2026, the written work that is necessary, and the substantive hearing at which the application is heard will be £3000+VAT (£3600).

> >

> > I appreciate that is no small figure, but it is reduced from what would have been £5k+VAT, being £3k for the written work and £2k for the hearing, plus VAT.

> >

> >

> > best wishes

> > Damian

> >

> > <> <http://www.square17chambers.com>> >

> >

> > S Q U A R E 17

> > C H A M B E R S

> > Damian Warburton

> > Barrister

> > Square 17 Chambers, 7 Bell Yard, London WC2A 2JR

> >

> > > Email:> > damian.warburton@square17chambers.com
> > > Secure:> > damian.warburton@square17.CJSM.net
> >
> > > Clerk:> Kelly Saavedra | 07988 187020 | > kelly@square17chambers.com
> >
> >
> > Regulated by the > Bar Standards Board
> > CONFIDENTIALITY
> > The information contained in this communication from the sender is confidential, and may be legally privileged. It is intended solely for use by the person(s) it was addressed to. If you are not in that category, you are hereby notified that any disclosure, copying, onward distribution, or otherwise acting on the contents of this email is unlawful, and may be criminal.
> >
> >
> >
> > From: > rma90@tutamail.com <rma90@tutamail.com>
> > > Date: > Friday, 25 September 2026 at 20:53
> > > To: > Damian Warburton <damian.warburton@square17chambers.com>
> > > Subject: > Re: your enquiry
> >
> > > <https://we.tl/t-zgcZro5xGvFfnRzy>
> >
> > > <https://we.tl/t-h6aRaoZFxKbpfbMa>
> >
> > Can you use that Rocky Mark Alberone
> >
> >
> >
> > 25 Sept 2026, 19:48 by damian.warburton@square17chambers.com:
> >
> > > try using dropbox? (assuming not prohibited by your SOPO?)
> > >
> > >
> > >
> > > <> > <http://www.square17chambers.com>> <>> >
> > >
> > > S Q U A R E 1 7
> > > C H A M B E R S
> > > Damian Warburton
> > > Barrister
> > > Square 17 Chambers, 7 Bell Yard, London WC2A 2JR
> > >
> > > > Email:> > damian.warburton@square17chambers.com
> > > > Secure:> > damian.warburton@square17.CJSM.net
> > >
> > > > Clerk:> Kelly Saavedra | 07988 187020 | > kelly@square17chambers.com
> > >
> > >
> > > Regulated by the > Bar Standards Board
> > > CONFIDENTIALITY
> > > The information contained in this communication from the sender is confidential, and may be legally privileged. It is intended solely for use by the person(s) it was addressed to. If you are not in that category, you are hereby notified that any disclosure, copying, onward distribution, or otherwise acting on the contents of this email is unlawful, and may be criminal.
> > >
> > >
> > >

> > > From: > rma90@tutamail.com <rma90@tutamail.com>
> > > Date: > Friday, 25 September 2026 at 19:38
> > > To: > Damian Warburton <damian.warburton@square17chambers.com>
> > > Subject: > Re: your enquiry
> > >
> > > Can you call me or do you have WhatsApp or a link method you use as it will take several emails to send what I have Rocky Mark Alberone
> > >
> > >
> > >
> > > 25 Sept 2026, 19:31 by damian.warburton@square17chambers.com:
> > >
> > > Dear Mr Alberone
> > >
> > > Thank you for your enquiry.
> > >
> > > There are a few aspects to it that need comment.
> > >
> > > Yes, I can assist you; I have considerable experience both prosecuting and defending cases in which SOPOs (now called SHPOs) feature, and I am an expert on the law in this area. If you are a suitable candidate for discharge of the Order, I will certainly identify how your case is best put.
> > >
> > > I can be available for the case management hearing on 23 October if it is remote as you say - I am due to be at a court in another city, but with remote attendance I will make myself available.
> > >
> > > The papers you say are all prepared are a different matter. I am unlikely to be satisfied with the submissions in them, and that goes for whether you had counsel draft them or did them yourself. My experience of other people's drafting is that it is never good enough. Almost certainly the papers will need revision, and the only real question is the degree to which they will need rewriting.
> > >
> > > As for the fee, the rules of direct access I am afraid are that the fee needs to be paid in advance. That is a Bar Council rule, not my rule. I will be mindful of your circumstances when I quote, but I am not permitted to engage in payment plans of any kind.
> > >
> > > If you send me the papers you have now, I will assess the case and tell you whether I can help and at what fee. I will need to know the offence(s) you were convicted of that led to the imposition of the SOPO, to see a copy of the SOPO and its terms and duration. whether there have been any breaches and if so what and when and how ere they dealt with, and what your general circumstances are - married, single etc? children? other convictions before or after the index offence, and what the police say in response to your application.
> > >
> > >
> > > best wishes
> > >
> > > <> > > <http://www.square17chambers.com>> <>> <>> >
> > >
> > > S Q U A R E 1 7
> > > C H A M B E R S
> > > Damian Warburton
> > > Barrister
> > > Square 17 Chambers, 7 Bell Yard, London WC2A 2JR
> > >
> > > > Email:> > damian.warburton@square17chambers.com
> > > > Secure:> > damian.warburton@square17.CJSM.net
> > >
> > > > Clerk:> Kelly Saavedra | 07988 187020 | > kelly@square17chambers.com
> > >
> > >

> > > > Regulated by the > Bar Standards Board

> > > > CONFIDENTIALITY

> > > > The information contained in this communication from the sender is confidential, and may be legally privileged. It is intended solely for use by the person(s) it was addressed to. If you are not in that category, you are hereby notified that any disclosure, copying, onward distribution, or otherwise acting on the contents of this email is unlawful, and may be criminal.

> > > >

> > > >

> > > >

> > >

> >

>