

Lying police 2016

Tuesday, 26 April 2016

16 years ago my learned (and expensive) QC told me that to suggest or even imply that police had assisted witness statements would be condemned and disallowed by the judge.

For example, a man who had not seen my house in 20 years knew my front door was painted blue when it had only been blue for 18 months - how?

A man who produced a photo he claimed I had given him on the only occasion he met me (I never met him) might have been provided with it by the same police who seized several copies from my house - ooh no.

A man who admitted under cross examination that the officer had discussed compensation with him (when the officer, later, who had not been allowed in court before, swore in the box she had never done so) must be mistaken???

Police would never behave that way in the Judge or Jury's mind.

Well, after today's Hillsborough verdict and the mounting quantity of similar examples (credible and true), surely in 2016 both judge and jury must accept such behaviour is not only possible but likely?