

"The only thing necessary for the triumph of evil is for good men to do nothing." (Edmund Burke)

IT IS WITH MUCH SADNESS that we announce the death of George Williamson who passed away peacefully on 13th November 2007. George was a founder member of AAFAA & UCAFFA (of which SAFARI became a part) and of Justice from Psychotherapy, and had that rare gift of being able to lead campaigns irrespective of whether they originated as 'domestic', institutional, or occupational cases. He had a very sharp mind and passionate belief in our cause. A true Scotsman in every sense he will be missed for his gentle ways, his humour and his fighting spirit. George was diagnosed with an inoperable brain tumour and died peacefully at a nearby hospice. He leaves a widow Wendy to whom we offer our condolences.

POLICE FRAME COLLEAGUE: Sultan Alam, an Asian police officer found guilty of conspiracy to handle stolen motor vehicle parts in 1996, has had his conviction quashed. In the Court of Appeal, Lord Justice Moore-Bick described it as a "very grave case", in which police had "deliberately misled the court in order to suppress evidence". Gordon Aspden, counsel for the Crown, which did not contest the appeal, told the judges the prosecution had also been "misled by the police". Sultan, who joined Cleveland police in 1984, had made a claim in 1993 alleging racial discrimination after a series of incidents culminating in finding a Ku Klux Klan poster on his desk. Sultan felt he was "deliberately targeted and wrongly implicated" by the police in order to undermine the discrimination proceedings. Sultan was sentenced to 18 months in prison and dismissed from the force. Sean Price, chief constable of Cleveland, said the force had not hesitated in handing over evidence during the investigation. "I, as Chief Constable, apologise on behalf of the force to Mr Alam for what happened," he said. "We understand it is his wish to take up his legal right to return to police duties and we will support him fully in this course of action."

GEMMA GREGORY, a 'SERIAL ACCUSER' who left a trail of devastated lives for nine years from her late teens onwards, has been given a 12-month suspended jail sentence for perjury for her latest false accusation and ordered to undergo psychiatric treatment.

Paul Haslam was one of her earliest victims when he was just 21. He had met Ms Gregory while working as a care assistant in the nursing home where a relative of hers was being looked after. Not long after they met, he was woken at 3:30 am by the Police knocking loudly at his door. They told him he was being arrested on suspicion of rape, and took him to Charles Cross police station in Plymouth, where he was questioned about what had happened the previous evening, when he had spent the night with Ms Gregory. He knew he had done nothing wrong, but he did not know how he could prove it. Later that day he was released without charge.

When his employer found out that he had been arrested, he lost his job. Paul lived on tenterhooks for three weeks before receiving a letter telling him that no further action was being taken. "If it hadn't been for two other people in the house who knew nothing untoward had happened, I could have gone to prison for a crime I didn't commit. The thought makes my blood run cold," he says. Some other men accused had to have penile swabs, and their genetic fingerprints were put on the national police database.

Gregory's latest victim had no idea that she had a history of claiming rape when he was asked to attend the same police station in September last year. The man had had a relationship with Gregory but ended it because of her heavy drinking. The couple met on a few occasions later on, and one night he stayed at her flat. The next evening, Gregory claimed to police that she had been raped. She was given a medical examination and repeated the claim in a video interview.

He was saved from a possible charge because of "intimate" text messages sent by her. Detective Constable Paul Weymouth, of Plymouth CID, said: "We have a log of 512 telephone calls from or about her. She wanted to see him in prison." The danger of Gregory's lies is that they may deter women who have been genuinely attacked from coming forward. Detective Constable Weymouth said: "It is about encouraging real victims to come forward, while reminding people who are thinking of making a false allegation to think again."

KATRINA FAIRLIE has been awarded £20,000 payout from the former Perth and Kinross Healthcare NHS Trust (now part of NHS Tayside) after claiming that hospital psychiatrist, Dr Alex Yellowlees, almost ruined her life after he extracted false memories that her father, Jim, a former deputy leader of the Scottish National Party, had sexually abused her. Dr Yellowlees had used a form of Recovered Memory Therapy (RMT) - a controversial technique since discredited by the Royal College of Physicians. Miss Fairlie, who withdrew the baseless allegations months after making them, revealed during other sessions with consultant Dr Alex Yellowlees that she witnessed her father murder a child and named him and 17 other men, including two politicians, as paedophiles. The case was due to be heard at the Court of Session in Edinburgh, but at the eleventh hour, bosses at the trust offered the substantial out-of-court settlement instead. Miss Fairlie said: "After so many traumatic years, I finally feel that I can put this nightmare behind me and start getting on with my life. However, I am still extremely angry at the hospital and the consultant involved who all but ruined my life and damaged my family. To this day, they have never apologised for what they did to me and I would much rather have got no money just for the chance of seeing them squirm in court and admit what they did to me."

Donations very much appreciated at:



Or hit the
button on the
website!

a/c name: 'SAFARI', Sort Code: 30-92-02, a/c No.: 2702360

Contact us by eMail at SAFARI_Editor@yahoo.co.uk

(We can accept no responsibility for errors in this newsletter as we only share information received)

DETAILS MIGHT MATTER, AFTER ALL: Guy Wilson of the Ministry of Justice has written to SAFARI in answer to our queries about Prosecution cases (dates, details, etc) being changed during the course of a trial. He said: "...the interpretation of legislation is a matter for the courts, not this department. Your latest letter is not so much about the technicalities of indictments as the more general question of the extent to which it is proper to amend the prosecution case during the course of a trial. The position under the law is that this can take place at any stage of a trial. As a matter of policy, the issue is: Whether the prosecution has made its amended case sufficiently clear, however that was achieved (for example, by producing evidence); and whether the defendant has had a fair trial. If the defence has had a reasonable opportunity to challenge a change to the prosecution case, it is difficult to see how that can lead to injustice. On the other hand, if the procedure followed has deprived the defence of this opportunity, injustice may arise and the conviction may be unsafe. *Therefore the answer to your question is that a conviction may be unsafe if the prosecution case changes and the defence does not have sufficient opportunity to contest the amended case.* This would apply whether or not the indictment is amended. If an indictment has not been amended in circumstances where it would have been proper for it to be amended, the defence will no doubt raise this on an appeal against conviction."

MISLEADING CLAIMS ABOUT DNA: "We have found your DNA" means we have found a DNA profile like yours. Which can match many others. Many investigating officers have no real idea of the complexities of DNA evidence, and may well believe (along with many of the public) that a so-called "DNA match" means you *must* be the perpetrator. Don't argue that it's been 'planted' (whether it has or not, that argument will only cause you problems!) – if you *know* you weren't there, say so! It might be someone else's, or it might have got there by innocent transfer. You might have sneezed as you were walking past the victim last time they wore the same jacket – or while you sat next to where they were taking their undies out of the tumble-dryer at the launderette, for instance. (As an example of what 'innocent transfer' means, around one in ten £10 notes has traces of cocaine on it, so traces can be found in many innocent people's pockets.)

'EXPERT' WITNESSES: HOW RELIABLE? The public's blind faith in 'scientific opinion' (possibly bolstered by watching too many episodes of CSI and other TV forensic 'dramas') makes them reluctant to question pronouncements by 'experts', but while the law requires even plumbers to be trained, registered and checked, there is no such requirement for witnesses who may be pronouncing on matters of life and death in court.

A study by senior barrister Penny Cooper of City University in London, who is also a governor of the Expert Witness Institute, has shown that a substantial number of 'expert witnesses' have undergone no training to understand their legal duty. She was concerned to discover during her research that not only have one in five experts undergone no training to understand this duty, but one in 10 was so arrogant they said they saw 'no need for it'. "There should be a requirement for them to be trained, and there should be rules requiring judges and lawyers to consider their credentials before accepting them as expert witnesses," she said.

Police forensic scientist Peter Ablett, who is now chief executive of the Council for the Registration of Forensic Practitioners, points out there are only three ways to prove a crime: a reliable eyewitness, a confession, or forensics. The advent of DNA technology and other advances in recent years has brought increasing reliance on forensics, yet only about 3,000 of the estimated 8,000 expert witnesses operating are members of the council and signed up to its code of practice. He said *many of those who aren't members are unaware that their duty is to give impartial evidence to the court, not to bolster the case of their paymaster.*

A review is still going on of 700 cases in which bogus forensic scientist Gene Morrison gave evidence. Morrison, 48, from Manchester, who was sentenced to five years for fraud in February, admitted he pretended to be an expert witness and bought his qualifications on the internet because it "seemed easier" than getting real ones. For many of the genuinely qualified experts, legal work is a lucrative sideline, and if they are perceived to be able to 'tailor' their evidence convincingly, the commissions keep flowing in. John Hemming MP, who is campaigning about the misuse of medical evidence, says fees for a basic written opinion, based on reading through existing files, *start at* £4,000.

"I have known experts get as much as £28,000 for one report," said Hemming, who is lobbying for experts to be required to produce the scientific publications on which their opinion is based: "Unless we start using evidence-based evidence in court, we will get nowhere."

SOTP ON LICENCE. SAFARI has received a number of letters from falsely accused people who have been released from prison on licence. One of the biggest concerns from those falsely accused and convicted for alleged sex offences is a requirement being placed on them to attend the SOTP (Sex Offenders Treatment Programme) or the SOGP (Sex Offenders Groupwork Programme), along with a threat that failing to take part will result in them being breached (i.e. being returned to prison.) There is a very simple answer to this: if your licence requires you to take part in one of these courses, do so! Just remember to tell the truth at all times. You should not be breached for answering a question such as 'Tell the group what led you to commit the crime' with 'I didn't commit the crime'. You are attending. You are taking part. You are telling the truth. It is important to remember, however, that a *refusal to attend* a course required of you on your licence *is* grounds for being breached. If any requirement is actually unlawful then you can ask your solicitor to force its removal.

SAFARI E-PETITIONS: Please get everyone you know with Internet access to sign our on-line Government ePetitions. Just visit:

<http://safari-uk.org>

..to view all our ePetitions.

Thanks to Terry McCarthy (Parole Board for England and Wales) for statistics of those granted release on Parole despite maintaining innocence.			
Figures for month of October 2007			
<i>Non-lifers:</i>			
All offences	8	of 58	13.8%
Rape	1	of 21	4.8%
Indecent Assault	0	of 10	0.0%
Other Sex	1	of 5	20.0%
Violence	1	of 3	33.3%
Property	0	of 10	0.0%
Drugs	2	of 2	100.0%
Others	3	of 7	42.9%
Total Sex	2	of 36	5.6%
Total Non Sex	6	of 22	27.3%
<i>Lifers only</i>			
	1	of 1	100.0%