

The Old Bailey child rape/not rape trial...

Thursday, 13 May 2010

This extraordinary case - with two ten year old boys accused of raping an 8 year old girl who admits in court that it never happened - must surely open eyes to the state of the legal system.

For a start, you cannot have a different age of consent (16) to the age of criminal responsibility. If a small child does not understand about sex, they cannot be guilty of a sex crime.

Secondly - how on earth can police, prosecution, judges, CPS, social workers and every expert get an absurd "rape" case brought to the Old Bailey when, in the mildest cross examination, she admits it didn't happen and she lied because otherwise her Mum might not buy her sweeties?

Thirdly - I make no allegations about motives such as money or malice or revenge or compensation or sympathy or celebrity - all of which tend to influence older liars. But the sheer incompetence and desire for a "good story", personified by the use of a teddy bear called Mr Happy, illustrates how easy it is for the authorities to change a mistake or misunderstanding.

And it is for the sake of the media, isn't it?

Ten years ago this happened to me but as a 56 year old I could cope with it and continue my life. To do it to a ten year old (let alone an 8 year old) is pure, stupid, insane social child abuse.

Can this be a wake up call to our absurd legal system? I doubt it. Sally Clark, that tragic cot death mother wrongly convicted of murder, was killed by it.

And nobody cared then. Why should they care now?