

Freddie Starr and the false allegations industry

Tuesday, 06 May 2014

In days gone by, the hundreds of "released without charge" - let alone the "police failed to follow through" - victims would hide their heads. The horror of simply being accused was so awful; put it all behind me, was the feeling.

A personal example - Matthew Kelly, who was falsely accused (by co-incidence, just as my appeal was due to be heard; no proof so cannot make any accusations) and not charged of crimes that never took place.

But these days it has become so ludicrous, and people like Freddie won't accept a simple apology (he's suing his false accuser in civil court) that it cannot be too long (Rolf?) before a defendant insists on subpoena-ing Chief Constables and CPS officials to outline the most recent absurd examples of false allegations made to police (and Editors for similar media stories).

Sounds ridiculous - police and CPS being key defence witnesses - but if a defendant claims that the current climate ("You will be believed") encouraged his accusers, he or she has every right to present evidence of that climate.

A recent judge said in his summing up "pay no attention to recent acquittals" when the defendant had said a crucial part of his defence was that the current climate encouraged false allegations. I would have thought this was not a wise judicial remark but, then, I'm no legal expert.

If a judge wants to tell the jury to ignore a defendant's defence, I'm sure he's entitled to do so. After all, why bother with juries at all?

So ten key Chief Constables and ten top CPS officials get trooped into the dock to read out, say, ten recent examples each of ludicrous and abandoned claims.

"I was raped" followed by "the victim turned out to be asleep in bed at home and not in the park at all". That sort of thing.

Unless, of course, there ARE no such regular absurd cases. But these days (individual accountability), if there were, they would have to be recited. Why risk life and career by lying about such things as "they were NOT believed"?

And I'll bet many acquitted celebrities (like Starr, Tarbuck, Davidson - let alone Le Vell, Roache, Lancel, DLT) would agree to testify with delight about the ludicrous allegations made against them.

Let alone some of the barmier accusers of offences by dead stars. Their evidence in the witness box would produce more than just giggling. Belly laughs, perhaps?

It would, of course, extend the length of the trial, but such things don't appear to bother the public purse. What else could they be spending our tax monies on? Quite enough goes to health, education, benefits - doesn't it? (Innocent face).