

The Truth About Convicted Murderess Sally Challen

It is often claimed that in a rape trial, the victim rather than the accused is put on trial. That claim is not always entirely without merit, but by the same token, when a woman murders a man, it is likewise often the victim who is put on trial.

In August 2010, Sally Challen murdered her estranged husband Richard in cold blood. She was convicted and given the mandatory life sentence with a tariff of 22 years. She appealed, against sentence only, and lost.

Years later, she appealed against not only her sentence but her conviction, was granted leave to appeal, and, incredibly, her conviction was quashed. She has now pleaded guilty to manslaughter and has been granted bail prior to a retrial, when hopefully she will again be convicted.

The grounds of her spurious appeal are fresh evidence, so-called, in particular she is said to “suffer” from dependent personality disorder, a condition that has only recently been discovered, ie invented.

A full discussion of mental illnesses and mental disorders, so-called, would take us far afield, but briefly, a mental illness has no pathology so is not really an illness, rather it is mere description, usually of someone’s behaviour. In 1851, the American physician Samuel Cartwright described a condition called drapetomania. This was said to be the mental illness that made slaves want to escape, if you can believe that.

In 2014, the banker Rurik Jutting tortured two prostitutes to death. One of the claims made by the defence when he stood trial in Hong Kong was that he suffered from sexual sadism disorder. In other words, he enjoyed torturing and killing people. Should Rurik Jutting have been found not guilty on that account?

How has the current situation with Sally Challen come about? The short answer is that it is the result of the handiwork of two man-hating lesbians: the corrupt lawyer Harriet Wistrich and her lover, the so-called journalist Julie Bindel. As you’ve probably guessed, this is not the first time they have tried such a stunt. In 1990, these two hags set up the misnamed Justice For Women, a so-called charity specifically to campaign for women who murder men.

One of their most high profile cases was Jane Andrews who murdered her lover Thomas Cressman in September 2000 as he slept then claimed he had been killed by someone else. Her appeal was unsuccessful, but Andrews was paroled anyway in 2015. In July 2018, it was reported she had been recalled to prison for harassing a former lover.

Their star catch though was Emma Humphreys, a wilful teenage prostitute and serial false rape accuser who murdered her lover Trevor Armitage by stabbing him through

the heart as he lay drunk. They were successful this time, and Humphreys was paroled with some fanfare. Three years later she was dead by her own hand, accidentally or otherwise.

As in the Humphreys case, the so-called fresh medical evidence in the Challen case is likely to be augmented with other evidence that should not be admissible because it was not adduced at trial, and it was not adduced at trial for a very good reason: it never happened. Challen has now had years to concoct claims against her victim, clearly with the collaboration or more likely at the suggestion of Wistrich and Bindel. For example, an article published by the *Guardian* newspaper in September 2018, claimed that on one occasion Richard Challen took her upstairs and anally raped her. This claim was not made at trial because it never happened.

Part of her new defence is that her husband had exerted coercive control over her. Although like dependent personality disorder, coercive control is a relatively new concept in legal terms, it is not a fiction. Religious cults have long been said to exercise such control over their members, something that is usually referred to as brainwashing. There is no doubt that behaviour that could be described as coercive control could be said to have been exhibited in the Challens' relationship, but who was the controller and who was the victim?

The following quotes are from the judgment in her first appeal, Neutral Citation Number; [2011] EWCA Crim 2919 No. 2011/04031/A3

This was before the Lord Chief Justice, and was handed down November 24, 2011.

3. For a number of years the appellant had been suspicious about her husband's fidelity, it appears with considerable justification. In the autumn of 2009 she informed him that she was leaving him and that she had bought a property of her own nearby. She moved out with her younger son and began divorce proceedings.

4. The deceased began to socialise with new friends whom he had met through websites. The appellant found the separation difficult to cope with. She felt jealous and lonely. Convinced that her husband was having an affair, she asked a neighbour to spy on him. In 2010 she began to access his e-mails and voicemail messages and to check his Facebook page.

And

6. In the week before his death she looked at his Facebook page several times, and in particular at an entry for a woman whom he had arranged to meet on the Sunday.

7. On Saturday 14 August the appellant and her husband spent the morning clearing out the house and garage. At about 3.30pm she was asked by him to go out and buy some provisions. Whilst she was gone, he telephoned the female friend and cancelled an arrangement that they had previously made to meet the following day. When she returned she noticed that the phone had been moved, and on calling the last dialled number heard a woman's voice.

8. She then asked her husband whether she could see him the following day. He replied "Don't question me", which was how he often spoke to her. She then made them something to eat. As he ate, she took a hammer which she had taken to the house in her handbag and repeatedly hit him from behind over the head with it. She then covered his body with blankets, left a note which said "I love you, Sally", changed her clothes, and then went home where she typed a note which she took back to his house and left in the kitchen.

You don't need to be a lawyer to realise what the foregoing paragraphs indicate: an attempt to control *him* by *her*, and premeditation. How many women do you know carry hammers in their handbags?

Wistrich and Bindel are not only man-haters but liars of the first order. If their client Sally Challen is allowed to get away with this, it will give *carte blanche* to any woman to murder a husband, former husband, lover, even a neighbour on the most spurious of pretexts.

Please share this video and help stop that from happening.

There is a slight error in the video, when quoting the transcript I said "For a number of reasons". I should have said "For a number of years" - see above, also the actual transcript which can be found at this link:

<https://web.archive.org/web/20190406104617/https://www.infotextmanuscripts.org/hold707/challen-first-appeal.pdf>

See also *The Canonisation Of Emma Humphreys*:

<https://www.infotextmanuscripts.org/wikinut/wikinut-the-canonisation-of-emma-humphreys.html>

Emma Humphreys - False Rape Timeline entry

<https://www.infotextmanuscripts.org/falserape/false-rape-1116.html>

Jane Andrews - False Rape Timeline entry

<https://www.infotextmanuscripts.org/falserape/false-rape-1399.html>