

02/08/2017

To All,

I AM SURE THAT MANY PEOPLE NOTICED THAT THERE WERE A NUMBER OF DIFFERENCES BETWEEN MY TWO TRIALS. WHAT YOU MAY NOT REALISE IS THAT MY LEGAL TEAM AND I WERE GIVEN AMBIGUOUS DISCOVERY WHICH WAS RATHER CONFUSING FOR A MONTH OR SO OVER CHRISTMAS. DELIBERATE OR NOT I CANNOT SAY. TWO WEEKS BEFORE THE TRIAL BEGAN, WE MANAGE TO COOGE SOME CLARIFICATION, OUT OF THE CROWN, AS TO WHAT THEIR CASE ACTUALLY CONTAINED. THE ACTUAL INDICTMENT (CHARGE) WASN'T EVEN FINALISED UNTIL THE FIRST DAY OF THE TRIAL. FOR THOSE WHO ARE UNAWARE, I WILL LIST SOME OF THE MAIN CHANGES:

TIME OF DEATH

- AT TRIAL ONE, THIS WAS 7:00pm 29/08/2000, LIVE OR TAKE ABOUT 15 MINUTES. THIS WAS DETERMINED BY STOMACH CONTENTS, AND THE ONLY TIME IT COULD BE MARK LUNDY.
- AT TRIAL TWO, IT WAS SOMETIME BETWEEN 10:52pm 29/08 AND 9:00am 30/08. THIS CORRESPONDS TO WHEN THE DESKTOP COMPUTER WAS TURNED OFF BY CHRISTINE AND DISCOVERY.

COMPUTER MANIPULATION

- DURING TRIAL ONE IT WAS CLAIMED THAT I WROTE SOFTWARE ENABLING ME TO MANIPULATE THE TIME CLOCK ON THE DESKTOP. THIS WAS DONE WITHOUT IT SHOWING UP ON THE 'LOG'. ALSO MY LAPTOP WAS DEFINITELY NOT CLONED, AS THE DESKTOP WAS.
- IN TRIAL TWO, IT WAS CLAIMED THAT DURING TRIAL ONE IT WAS ONLY SUGGESTED THAT THE DESKTOP MAY HAVE BEEN ALTERED. NOW THERE'S FBI EVIDENCE THAT THE DESKTOP WAS DEFINITELY NOT MANIPULATED. AS FOR THE LAPTOP, NOW THE CROWN REFUSES TO ADMIT THERE EVER WAS A LAPTOP IN THE HOUSE, JUST THE LAPTOP BAG, AS PHOTOGRAPHED. CONVENIENT.

DRIVING SPEEDS AND TIMES

- TRIAL ONE MADE ME OUT TO BE A PROFICIENT HIGH SPEED DRIVER. I SUPPOSEDLY MADE THREE HIGH SPEED TRIPS BETWEEN PALMERSTON NORTH AND THE WELLINGTON AREA. THE FIRST 150km TRIP, AT PEAK TRAFFIC TIMING, WAS

APPARENTLY IN ABOUT AN HOUR TWENTY MINUTES. THE RETURN 150km TRIP WAS SUPPOSED TO BE DONE IN ONE HOUR. THESE WERE ALLEGED TO BE IN THE EVENING OF 29/08. THE QUICK TRIP I ACTUALLY DID, ON 30/08, OF ABOUT 130km TOOK ONE HOUR TWENTY FIVE MINUTES AND IT SCARED ME AFTERWARDS.

TRIAL TWO CLAIMS A TOTALLY DIFFERENT SCENARIO. A SLOW AND ECONOMICAL RETURN TRIP IN THE EARLY HOURS OF THE MORNING (30/08). THIS WAS FOLLOWED BY MY ACTUAL ONE HOUR TWENTY FIVE MINUTE TRIP.

- EYE WITNESS

IN TRIAL ONE YOU MAY RECALL THE SELF-PROFESSED PSYCHIC. SHE STATED SEEING ME RUNNING IN A DIRECTION AWAY FROM OUR HOUSE, WEARING A BLONDE WIG, AT 1:50pm 29/08.

IN TRIAL TWO, THIS WAS CONTRARY TO THE CROWN'S NEW CASE. WHILE HER NAME STILL APPEARED ON VARIOUS WITNESS LISTS, SHE WAS NEVER CALLED.

- CELL PHONE LOCATIONS

TRIAL ONE SAW A DETAILED DISCUSSION INTO THE CELL SITES THAT MY CELLPHONE USED ON THE EVENING OF 29/08. THIS SUPPOSEDLY PROVED THAT I WAS DEFINITELY ON THE MOVE, SO TO SPEAK, SHORTLY AFTER 8:00pm

TRIAL TWO REQUIRED ABSOLUTELY NO ACTIVITY ON THE SUBJECT OF CELL PHONE LOCATION.

- PHONE CALLS HOME

DURING TRIAL ONE I WAS HARANGUED BY THE CROWN BECAUSE I DID NOT PHONE HOME THAT NIGHT. THEIR CLAIM WAS THAT I DID THIS WHENEVER I WAS AWAY. I SAID CHRISTINE AND AMBER PHONED ME, NOT THE WAY THEY ASSERTED. I SUGGESTED THEY CHECK OUR PHONE RECORDS.

TRIAL TWO CAME ALONG AND THIS ATTACK COULD NOT BE REPLICATED. THIS IS BECAUSE WE NOW HAD COPIES OF THE POLICE ANALYSIS, COMPARING PHONE RECORDS TO MY TRIPS OUT OF TOWN (VIA CREDIT CARD RECORDS). THIS ANALYSIS, DONE PRIOR TO TRIAL ONE SHOWED

THAT MY STATEMENTS WERE IN FACT CORRECT, I DID NOT PHONE WHENEVER I WAS AWAY. THIS DETAIL WAS NOT DISCLOSED TO US PRIOR TO TRIAL ONE.

FINGERPRINTS

- DURING TRIAL ONE THERE WAS NO MENTION OF ANY UNIDENTIFIED FINGERPRINTS INVOLVED IN THE CASE WHATSOEVER.
- TRIAL TWO WAS A DIFFERENT STORY. THERE WERE A LOT OF FINGERPRINTS FOUND IN THE CONSERVATORY (THE WAY IN AND OUT OF THE HOUSE) THAT TO THIS DAY HAVE NOT BEEN IDENTIFIED. NOT ONLY THAT, BUT THERE WERE SHOE PRINTS FOUND WITHIN THE HOUSE THAT WERE NEVER MATCHED TO ANY KNOWN SHOES THAT ACCESSED THE PLACE.

CONSIDERING WE HAD A VERY PROFICIENT HOUSEKEEPER CLEAN THE HOUSE ON MONDAY 28/08 THESE ARE VERY IMPORTANT DETAILS, YOU WOULD THINK. PERHAPS THAT IS WHY THESE FINDINGS OF AN UNKNOWN PRESENCE WITHIN OUR HOUSE, NATURALLY KNOWN TO POLICE BEFORE TRIAL ONE WAS NEVER DISCLOSED TO MY LEGAL TEAM AT THE TIME.

CASE FACTS

- TRIAL ONE THE CROWN SAID 'TRUST US THIS IS WHAT HAPPENED.'
- TRIAL TWO THE CROWN SAID 'TRUST US THIS IS WHAT HAPPENED. DON'T WORRY ABOUT THE CHANGES.'

WHILE THERE WERE NUMEROUS OTHER CHANGES, MOST WERE SMALL. THERE WERE ALSO OTHER CASES OF NON-DISCLOSURE THAT ALL COMBINED WOULD HAVE CHANGED TRIAL ONE ENTIRELY. I THINK THE ABOVE IS SUFFICIENT TO NOTE THAT THERE WERE MAJOR VARIATIONS.

DO YOU REMEMBER WHEN JOHN BANKS HAD HIS CONVICTION FOR FALSE ELECTORAL RETURNS, OVERTURNED ON APPEAL? WITH NEW EVIDENCE THAT THE SUPPOSED

02/03/17
4/4

FINANCIAL 'GIFT' DID NOT HAPPEN ON 09/06, THE NEW STORY WAS THAT IT ACTUALLY OCCURED ON 05/06, AT A DIFFERENT LUNCHEON. BANKS' LAWYER TOOK THIS BACK TO THE COURT OF APPEAL, ON 19/05/2015 THEY GAVE THEIR RULING AND ACQUITTED JOHN BANKS. PART OF THAT RULING READ:

"... IT IS ANALOGOUS TO R V DOUGLAS, IN WHICH THIS COURT HELD IT WOULD NOT BE RIGHT TO ALLOW THE CROWN A RETRIAL AT WHICH IT WOULD PURSUE A CONVICTION ON GROUNDS IT HAD PREVIOUSLY ABANDONED OR DISCLAIMED."

TOO BAD THIS DECISION CAME OUT 49 DAYS AFTER MY TRIAL FINISHED.

YOURS IN INNOCENCE



MARK LUNDY

