

## Police Tricks 15

Wednesday, 24 October 2018

Police simply avoid doing any in depth examination of witnesses that could provide evidence for the defence.

Example - one false accuser claimed to have worked in a Five Star Hotel in the 1970s when he was 14. This was covered in detail in the national press.

But we found evidence that the hotel in question never employed waiters of that age and more than that; his time at the hotel was remembered as being very dodgy - culminating in his being fired after a couple of years.

In cross examination the man admitted having made "£500 a week" there - that's over £150,000 a year in today's money!

At 14? As a waiter?

We had to track down people who had worked there over 40 years ago to tell us more and we managed to find incredible evidence about his previous history.

Police could and should have found as much as we did - they had far greater resources. Was their incompetence deliberate? We cannot prove that but I suspect that it was.

In another case involving a man losing his virginity, police stated they had spent weeks trying to find his original girlfriend and she had totally disappeared.

Our investigator found her in 5 minutes, went and took a long, detailed statement from her proving our defence 100% and showing his claims were lies, and obtained her willingness to appear in court and give her detailed evidence for the defence.

So why did police "fail to find her"? Could it, again, have been deliberate?

Make up your own mind. And bear this in mind in case - God forbid - it happens to you or someone you know in the future.

Do not trust police to look for the truth. They only look for convictions and don't care if (as in my case 18 years ago) they are wrongful convictions.

And chase up every detail of statements to show them as wrong or lies. It takes incredible work and effort and time but it is worth it.

Just watch the jurors' faces.