

<p><b>What do the police say</b></p> <p><b>victim: Ms Dxxxx</b></p>	<p><b>What do I say</b></p> <p><b>29-12-1985</b></p>
<p><b>Description:</b></p> <p>Witness not called by Prosecution to Court.</p> <p>Various witnesses gave evidence as to having seen this victim on the S2 bus, but police believe the victim arrived by train so did not use this evidence.</p> <p>The original docket the controller recorded details of this request could not be found 13 years later, so the judge rules that this evidence should not go before the jury. The only fact allowed was that the female called for a cab at 7.30pm</p>	<p>A lady saw two men walking with a women along Berkshire Road (see map) they seemed to be holding her. This was at a period of time in question and fitted with the version of events presented by police at Duffy's original 1988 trial.</p> <p>I have no idea how she arrived so having nothing to add.</p> <p>The controller at Express cars took a call from a lady who gave her name as Ms Dxxxx at 7.13pm on the day in question. She asked for a cab from Hackney Wick underground over ground she seemed distressed but no cab were available so she hung up. This controller contacted Police 5 Crime Stoppers shortly after the incident was featured and gave detailed statements of the phone conversation. The controller was also willing to attend court at my trial to confirm these facts. This evidence would have been very damaging to the prosecution case had he been allowed to talk as Duffy now claimed the victim was abducted as soon as she got off the train so the victim never left the station. To use the phone she would have had to not only leave the station but walk around the corner to the phone box. To me it seems wrong that an alleged judge would withhold this vital information from the jury when the facts were well documented by police at the time, and his word and evidence were good enough for police and court in 1988.</p> <p>What do you think?</p> <p>Did you know the Police/Prosecution picked the Judge for trial? Not totally fair then is it?</p>

**Forensic: Vaginal Sex Committed**

Semen test conducted in 1986 confirmed Duffy as the attacker.

Tests conducted by E Harris (forensic scientist) in 1999 states

- 1) Semen was from an individual whose blood groups were masked by Ms Dxxxx's blood group, in which case the semen could not be from Mulcahy.
- 2) That the semen failed to give any reaction so it could be from any male

Soil found in victims pocket placed the scene of the attack at the garages under the Highworth Point club it matched garage no 158. Now not accepted by police as this does not match the account given by Duffy.

In my opinion there is no scientific evidence to support or refute the assertion that the semen on Ms Dxxxx's vaginal swabs PV/10 and PV/12 came from Mulcahy  
E Harris 30-05-2000

**Alleged Accomplice:**

Duffy called for Mulcahy they dropped 2 children off at the mother-in-laws house and drove to Hackney Wick visiting various stations on route, they grabbed the victim Duffy raped her then Mulcahy raped her twice. Mulcahy then strangled her and they both threw her body in the canal, Duffy then fled the way he had come meeting Mulcahy at the van parked in flats at Trowbridge Road.

The judge told the jury "that possible reason no semen from the defendant (me) was found was due to it being washed away (body found in canal) only leaving Duffy's" ..... All I can say is it must have been very clever water to identify one semen to remove and leave the other.

All the exhibits from this case were securely stored in the central property store from 1986 up to 1995 when after the police spoke to Duffy they were removed and sent to Hackney police station where they were destroyed. No paperwork or reason could be given for the removal and destruction of these vital exhibits, and in the end the only answer was it was a "MISTAKE"

I don't know about you but I can find no logical reason why the police would remove these exhibits from their secure storage only days after they spoke at length with Duffy, and then allowed these exhibits to be destroyed against all police rules in force thus my defence team could not conduct forensic tests to prove I was not the person involved in this terrible crime.  
Ask yourselves what did they have to hide?

I was off sick with severe breathing problems looking after my 3 children while my wife was away in India, my mother-in-law made a statement to confirm I at no time dropped the children off at her house.

If the route followed by Duffy is looked at it is not a route you would drive, it follows stations as they appear on the train map and make no sense for road route.

Ms Dxxxx attended the same gym as Duffy.

A witness saw a person she said was Duffy on a bus heading towards Hackney Wick days before the attack, she picked him out of an ID parade and it is believed police used her evidence to show Duffy was checking the area prior to the attack (we can not prove this as all court papers, notes, indeed everything to do with the court case in 1988 were lost). Duffy denied this and said I was the one who knew the area and chose it; it is also note worthy that the North London Line the line all the visited stations are on was the line Duffy worked on as a carpenter for British Rail.

Soil/dirt found in Ms Dxxxx's clothes matched that of garage 158, blocks also found at the scene matched those used to weigh down her coat (thrown in canal) this site would be reached by Berkshire Road which would have passed the witness discounted by police. Duffy also used this version and Ms Dxxxx arriving by bus before he got to see all the statements supplied by police, then the entire route changed and so did the attack method.

Again strange change of details once he has been supplied with police and victim statements.

Could this be the reason she was killed?  
Did she recognize him?  
He denied he ever saw her.

*No fingerprint only evidence is Duffy.*