

<p style="text-align: center;">What do the police say</p> <p style="text-align: center;">victims: Ms Kxxxx / Ms Axxxx</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">What do I say</p> <p style="text-align: center;">16-07-1984</p>
<p>Description:</p> <p>One of them was tall about (5'8") He was black, he was dressed in dark blue clothes. The other man was smaller; I think that he was also black, dark clothing. One tall and skinny about a head taller than me. I am (5'4"). Smaller man not sure if black or white; Tall man, he didn't have a beard, he had thick lips.</p> <p>Forensic: Vaginal And Oral Sex Committed</p> <p>No Semen found in saliva sample (1984) Semen was present on her internal vaginal swab (1984). Semen mixed with blood and saliva was present in the crotch area of knickers (1984). Attempts to group the stains on the knickers and swabs gave inconclusive results (1984).</p> <p>Extraneous fibers and hairs have been removed from all items of clothing and are retained here (forensics lab) for possible future reference (1984). Hairs found in victims' underwear were of Negroid Extraction.</p> <p>A portion of area 2 (JH/1) was DNA extracted once 8-10-98 and SGM, STA, DNA tested 5 times.</p> <p>According to the records the inside crotch of the trousers (KLU/3) had a patch of reddish white staining (area 1) this item not tested in original inquiry. Semen was found on PT/3 vaginal swab and pants JH/1, no results were obtained from the PGM tests carried out on this swab or from the ABO,</p>	<p>This victim was Repeatedly asked at great length to re-think her memory of the description of the attacker as being <u>Black with Big Lips!</u> <u>She had been Kissed, so knew about the big lips.</u> <u>She had seen the Colour of his skin and been forced to have oral sex.</u> So even after Constant Questioning and Attempts to get her to Change her memory of the <u>Colour of her attacker.</u> She <u>reiterated that he was Black with Big Lips. I am White and do not have big lips!</u></p> <p>All these files have been lost / destroyed by police so were not available to my defence team to prove I was not the person involved.</p> <p>These fibers / hairs were lost / destroyed by police prior to my trial so were not available to my defence team.</p> <p>It's very important to note that these hairs were of <u>Negroid – Black Origin (Black Attacker).</u></p> <p>Tested 5 times and no full profile was obtained, and then they mixed the profiles to attempt a match.</p> <p>These trousers were rejected after being examined by the forensic scientist in 1984 as having no stains or evidential value; they did not even feature on the exhibits list. Forensic Report by J Allard stated "A Preliminary Examination of these items found no semen." "Full Examination was carried out." This report was dated 03-04-2000, yet at Court was changed</p>

PGM or GLO tests carried out on the pants.
In my opinion the results of the grouping tests carried out on these items show.

- 1) That the semen was from an individual whose blood groups were masked by those of the (victim)
In which case it could not be from Duffy or Mulcahy Or
- 2) That the semen failed to give any grouping reactions and so could be from any male.

Report by E Harris in 2000

A mixed profile was obtained from a area of semen on the left hand side of Ms Kxxx's knickers

(JH/1) the major part of this profile matched that of Mulcahy, so the semen could have come from him.

A trace of DNA from a second person at a low level was also detected.

Semen was also present in the crotch area of Ms Kxxx's trousers (KLU/3) a mixed DNA profile was obtained from the area of this semen.

In my opinion there is no scientific evidence to either support or refute the assertion that the semen on Kxxx's high vaginal swab PT/3 came from Mulcahy.

E Harris report 03/05/2000

Negroid hairs found in the victims underwear have been destroyed

to "A full report was *Not* carried out.

How could you make that kind of mistake on a vital forensic report? Or did they? And how can we trust any report now?

This vaginal swab PT/3 was destroyed by police on Health and Safety grounds, yet they kept a used tampon, so my defence team could not test PT/3 to prove my innocence.

Again E Harris seems to want it all ways, nothing to connect me was found so I should have been excluded.

Lets look at these items, an independent packaging expert stated that this bag had been opened up to 6 times with no record having been made of who or where this was done, he gave evidence that the main seal had been opened and resealed again with no record and against all rules on exhibits protocol. He stated the exhibits bag was so damaged the items could easy fall out. The exhibits were taken to the lab for E Harris by the lead police officer in this case and yet again this exhibit does not follow the rules on exhibits deposit, the rules state that the exhibits must be given to the reception clerk who checks the seals and confirms all is correct.

With the exhibits prior to acceptance to the lab, but these exhibits did not go through this vital check but instead the police phoned E Harris ahead and arranged for E Harris to meet officer Murphy at the staff entrance where they ***Bypassed*** ***The Reception Check*** and handed them directly to her. E Harris in court tried to downplay this but accepted it was against protocol, E Harris also attempted to explain away some of the openings on the exhibit bag containing these exhibits by claiming to sometimes opening her own seals and not recording them.

This makes a total farce of the chain of evidence rules and should have resulted in these items being totally excluded.

It is also strange to see how E Harris obtains her results (see summary of results Ms Kxxx's), ***How***.

Do You Have NO RESULTS And Yet Still Get 1 In 1 BILLION MATCH?

So what do we have?

Well we have the only DNA in this case that the prosecution claims comes from me, we have a victim who describes her attacker as a black man with big lips, we have exhibits discounted and then re entered to supply the alleged match, we have an exhibit submission form that makes no sense unless you open the bag to log items (see the submission forms).

We have exhibits not put through the vital check at reception prior to acceptance and you have to ask why it is only on these exhibits that we find this pattern, on all other exhibits booked in through the correct procedure there are no finds that have been accredited to me, and who did the minor part of the DNA sample belong to and why did the prosecution refuse to test it?

Why did they destroy the negroid hairs when the victim clearly states her attacker as Black?

This seems to be the standard pattern for Duffy to explain the attacks, he has made several mentions to the problem the victim had doing her shoes up because the laces were knotted, if he had the time to check the translation from German to English he would have found that there had been a mistake by the translator and **victim was in fact wearing sandals so there were no laces**, he had again been supplied with all the statements and files by the police prior to making his statement, so he picked out a point that stuck out but it turned out to be a typo and not a real fact so goes to show he is using the statements to tailor his version of events and implicate me falsely.

So this case has what one could call evidence on face value, but look carefully and it doesn't stack up does it? I didn't do it so who did?

Alleged Accomplice:

"David and I were our driving we spotted 2 lone females and went after them on foot, we grabbed them and David and I raped them. I remember this one because there were two of them and also I do remember her unlacing her shoes as she had real problems with them.

After the attack we ran away to the car and left the area, David used my name in front of the girls.

I also remember the girl had problems getting her shoes on because of the laces being knotted."

Obviously no conclusive evidence could be presented except for the dubious DNA against me apart from the lying alleged co-defendant that I had any part in this terrible crime.