

After Redaction - further thoughts

Tuesday, 30 August 2022

I want to stress - of course police bosses need to protect officers from cunning criminals and haters trying to avoid detection and conviction.

BALANCE. There is nothing wrong with police doing a lot of things, even criminal acts, if they can convict and lock up a killer or abuser or thief. I'm totally in favour of REDACTION if not doing so might lead to informers or sources getting killed.

But, as in many other ways, these legitimate tactics for valid reasons have been misused for the wrong reasons.

My home was searched three times - the last time they tore up floor boards, ripped up carpets. They examined every history and area of every phone, iPad, laptop, computer.

Nothing. No porn. No letters. No photos.

OK that could have been because I was bright enough to know not to keep such things. But when everything pointed to the fact that, if I'd ever done anything now considered illegal, I certainly wasn't doing it now, the case would have been dropped. NFA. No Further Action.

But that wasn't why they were doing it. Like Neil Fox; like Nigel Evans MP. They wanted a high profile scalp and to get that were prepared to break the law. To pervert the course of justice. And to encourage others to do that.

Even when they had clear evidence of this (one man's wife had foolishly texted him saying they had to adapt the dates in order to make the crime more serious), they tried to hide it or persuaded "victims" to alter statements (on such things as dates). One man refused to change the two films he'd seen before meeting me, despite that proving he'd been 16 and not 13 when he first met me. "You must have got the names both films wrong", they begged him. "NO", he said, "he was 100% certain".

Imagine the scene as they desperately wanted to tell him that proved he was lying about me as the movies had not been MADE then. But couldn't - that would have been too obvious. They must have winked and nudged and raised eyes to the sky (like, before video recording came in 2001, waving a blue tie when asking "what colour was his front door?") but NO, he kept saying. Because it was true. He hadn't met me until he was 16 (and Claridges confirmed they would never have hired a waiter who was under 16). But he stupidly didn't realise he was contradicting himself. As with many false accusers, he'd failed to work out that the truth might emerge from his own statement.