

<p style="text-align: center;">What do the police say</p> <p style="text-align: center;">victim: Ms Txxxx</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">What do I say</p> <p style="text-align: center;">20-01-1984</p>
<p>Description: The victim was blind-folded throughout her ordeal and her only view was down at her attacker's feet. The victim gave great detail of these as one might expect. She said "Scruffy brown leather shoes tied with a couple of eyelets. The laces crisscrossed only a little bit.</p> <p>Ms Txxxx was shown a picture of the shoes Mulcahy had owned at the time being 1984/6 by police in 1999. She picked out a pair of slip on grey shoes owned by Mr Mulcahy.</p> <p>Forensic: Vaginal And Oral Sex Committed Semen found on two separate items could be a Match to Duffy. Mulcahy could not be implicated or exonerated</p> <p>A watch found near the scene belonged to Mulcahy according to Duffy.</p> <p>Nothing of evidential use was found on this exhibit.</p> <p>Nothing was found to determine the possible source of the semen found in exhibit (JA/5) trousers.</p> <p>Semen that Matched Duffy was found on the exhibits.</p>	<p>As all my clothing and footwear was subject to forensic testing, it was shown that I had never owned shoes of this type.</p> <p>Strange after giving such a detailed description of the shoes worn by the attacker in <u>5 Statements</u> she now picked out those grey slip on shoes. In court she was again shown the picture of the shoes, which she said were the ones worn by the attacker. My Solicitor then pointed out that the <u>Grey</u> shoes were in fact <u>Black</u> and only appeared <u>Grey</u> due to bad flash photography. She now said yes the attacker wore these <u>Black</u> shoes. Could it be pressure from the police to pick shoes owned by me? You decide!</p> <p>Nothing found was a match to me. <u>No Hair, No Fibres, No Semen, NOTHING!!!!</u></p> <p>I never owned such a watch! Duffy's wife gave evidence that Duffy had in fact owned this watch as he had obtained it free with a gallon of oil at his local garage.</p> <p>Although this was a <u>broken</u> free give away watch the police did not retain it for further forensic testing. <u>They sold it at auction for an undisclosed sum!</u></p> <p>It is also stated within the saved document by E Harris - Forensic Expert that Semen detected could <u>Not</u> have come from either xxx or Mulcahy.</p> <p>Further tests were unavailable as the police had again allowed the destruction of the vital exhibits.</p>

Please note: xxx is used to blank out an innocent person in this enquiry.

Alleged Accomplice:

Duffy claimed he met Mulcahy the day before the attack and went on to describe the day fully including details of where Mulcahy said we ate dinner.

Duffy said he had a very good memory of this attack because his dog fell from his balcony whilst he was away and his wife was distressed he was not at home.

He had to once again change his bogus version of events once I proved that I was in fact at work during the period he claimed we were 20 miles away eating in a Wimpy prior to the attack.

In court it was proved his dog was quite alive and well at this time. So again another provable lie.

Obviously no conclusive proof could be presented against me apart from the lying alleged co-defendant that I had any part in this terrible crime