

Judge Hoffman and my letter to the Mail

Tuesday, 07 April 2009

Dear Peter Wright,

The Mail has been the only paper fair enough to carry the story that my submission to the Court of Human Rights has been accepted and is being considered this summer.

If they were to decide in my favour I suspect you might agree with them, as opposed to Judge Hoffman's comments in general in your paper today.

Is it really fair that the dates on an indictment can be changed after the defendant has proved they cannot have been correct, without any opportunity being given to prepare or present an alternative defence for the new dates? And can it really be fair that a man can be convicted of crimes that never took place and then, years later, discover he has a cast iron alibi that he was on another continent during one set of the later dates? Can it be fair that a jury can be sent out to consider verdicts without hearing a single word of defence for the 4 out of 6 changed dates?

The prosecution argument is that it's not when but whether something took place that matters. Our point is that most jurors would have had grave doubts if dates were to be changed twice (always to later dates - quite possibly eventually putting the ages of the complainants over 16).

I must tell you - in sex charges, the accused is now essentially considered guilty unless he or she can prove themselves innocent; not only difficult but often impossible when it is one person's word against another's. The reversed decisions and overturned convictions in the Court of Appeal are mounting daily (and rarely seem to get media attention). But they often take forever. I promise you - I am absolutely totally 100% innocent of the convictions against me.

Thank heavens for the Court of Human Rights which sometimes examines decisions in our British courts. This is the other side of the coin; something that the Mail often seems to be alone in pointing out. So please bear in mind. There are many, many circumstances where we should give thanks for the Human Rights court. The "simple, cold clarity of the laws of England and Scotland" often get it dreadfully, dreadfully wrong.

As you well know from Sean Hodgson to Barry George to Sally Clark to Jonathan King.

Best wishes,
Jonathan King