

How To Murder A Man And Get Away With It

This is an address by The International False Rape Timeline.

A conference on this subject will be held shortly, although its title is [less direct](#) and far less honest.

Unsurprisingly, the event is being held on-line. As you can see, it is called *Women Who Kill: how the state criminalises women we might otherwise be burying* - in other words, women who are convicted of murder should not be. Ever? If you know anything about the women behind this perversion of the rule of law, you will realise that is a rhetorical question.

The Centre For Women's Justice is a registered charity, which according to its [mission statement](#) "aims to advance the human rights of women and girls in England and Wales by - holding the state to account for failures in the prevention of violence against women and girls and - challenging discrimination against women within the criminal justice system".

Don't be deceived by the rhetoric anymore than by the name. Strangely, for a feminist organisation, it has zero commitment to diversity; all ten of its trustees are women. Biological women. The two women behind it are the lawyer Harriet Wistrich and her lover, the journalist Julie Bindel. Wistrich's mother Enid was a formidable anti-censorship campaigner; she died last year aged 91. Sadly, the apple fell a long way from the tree; Bindel is even worse: attacking pornography and prostitution - both social evils created and perpetuated by the [mythical patriarchy](#).

Those present at this conference/meeting/launch will include the gullible Samira Ahmed, and four women who are anything but gullible: Sally Challen, Pragna Patel, Elizabeth Sheehy, and Naz Shah.

Challen was one of the women "criminalised" by the state. To see how she came to be walking the streets a mere nine years after battering her estranged husband to death, we must start with Pragna Patel. Patel is a founder member of Southall Black Sisters; although she is Asian, black means anyone who isn't white in her kind of newspeak. She and her organisation championed the case of Kiranjit Ahluwalia. Ahluwalia's husband was abusive, of that there can be no doubt because she was granted not one but two restraining orders against him. Instead of booting him out of the house, as she was legally entitled to do, *and should have done*, she threw a bucket of petrol over him as he slept, and lit it. It took a week for him to die, a truly horrible death.

Later that same year, Kiranjit Ahluwalia was rightly convicted of murder. She didn't testify at her trial. While there was no doubt she was "provoked", there are limits to the defence of provocation, one of which is that generally it is interpreted as a more or less spur of the moment loss of control. The murder was clearly a planned act, but the connivance of Patel and her gang led to this conviction being quashed. A retrial [was ordered](#), but the Crown chose not to go

through with it. In 2001, Ahluwalia was “honoured” at the first Asian Women’s Awards.

Hearing about the Ahluwalia case, Emma Humphreys contacted Bindel and Wistrich. Humphreys was a juvenile delinquent turned teenage prostitute who had [murdered her older lover](#) by stabbing him through the heart as he lay in a drunken stupor. Ordered to be detained during Her Majesty’s Pleasure, she would very likely have spent many more years behind bars, but by successfully corrupting the legal process, Wistrich was able to secure her release. Humphreys died from a drug overdose three years later, possibly accidentally.

As in the Ahluwalia case, the dead man was portrayed as the real perpetrator, but there was never any credible evidence that Trevor Armitage had abused Humphreys, certainly not to the extent Ahluwalia’s husband had abused her. Humphreys said they used to fight, and indeed, she gave as good as she got and then some. Shortly before the murder, she trashed his home and was then arrested for causing a commotion at a cheap hotel. When she appeared in court, she was discharged into the care of her soon to be victim.

In spite of the documented facts of the case showing the admittedly tragic Humphreys in a terrible light, Bindel and Wistrich launched an annual award in her name.

The gruesome twosome have championed other cases, at least two of which are still in the court system. Fariessia Martin stabbed her lover Kyle Farrell to death and blamed the murder [on a phantom intruder](#), yet she is now being paraded as a victim. Another, strikingly similar case, cannot be detailed here for legal reasons.

Sally Challen was one of their biggest successes. Again, this was yet another clear cut case of murder, more so than even the Humphreys case, because by the time it was committed, Richard and Sally Challen had been living separate lives. They were if not wealthy, then very well off; he was living in the matrimonial home with their youngest son while she was living nearby with their eldest son.

On August 14, 2010, she [battered Richard to death](#) with a hammer then made a likely fake suicide attempt. She was convicted of murder and given a 22 year tariff reduced to 18 on appeal - in practical terms meaningless. Her first appeal, which was against sentence only, set out some extremely damning findings of fact, in particular it was clear she had been spying on Richard and had hacked his social media. Yet after she was visited in prison by Julie Bindel, she too was transformed into a victim. The woman who had led a very privileged life including holidays in the United States, was a victim of domestic violence including rape, again and again.

When pressed slightly by one reporter as to why she hadn’t mentioned this at the trial, Challen said it was unbecoming to speak ill of the dead. A much more plausible explanation is that she never mentioned it at the time because it happened only in her tiny mind years later and most likely at the prompting of Julie Bindel.

Normally, the courts will not tolerate this kind of nonsense, the courts in the UK, Canada, the US, India, or anywhere the legal system is based even loosely on English law. Generally speaking, after conviction on indictment, fresh evidence will be admissible for an appeal only according to two broad but firm criteria. It must be evidence that is genuinely fresh - new forensic evidence due to advances in DNA profiling is a good example; and it must be capable of being believed, worthy of belief. The reason for this is that given enough time and resources, evidence can be manufactured to prove a guilty defendant innocent, and vice versa. This latter is why prosecutions for historical sex offences are often so dubious, people simply make stuff up years and decades later, lies that cannot be disproved due to the passage of time.

Wistrich has honed a technique of inventing fresh psychological evidence in such cases. This has not always succeeded; another case they championed was that of Jane Andrews who stabbed and battered her victim to death in September 2000 while he was asleep in bed. She was paroled in 2015 anyway but recalled to prison [three years later](#) for harassing a former lover.

The third name on the above list is Naz Shah. She is a controversial Labour MP and nasty with it, but nowhere near as nasty as the woman who gave birth to her. Here is the *Guardian's* take [on her murderous mother](#), including Naz winning the first Emma Humphreys Memorial Prize. And here is the truth:

In April 1992, kept woman Zoora Shah murdered her lover Mohammed Azam by poisoning him with arsenic - not her first such attempt. The victim was a married man, and although Shah was far from attractive, there was a classic fatal attraction between them, a literal one in his case. She stood trial later in the year and was convicted on December 21. Although she didn't testify, she implied through her counsel that Mr Azam had been poisoned by his wife.

Naz Shah began lobbying on her mother's behalf, and Pragna Patel together with her gang from Southall Black Sisters mounted an appeal which was dismissed emphatically in 1998. Court Of Appeal judgments tend to be stodgy, but this one [reads like poetry](#):

“Up to a point that is evidence which we accept, but only up to a point because this appellant, as it seems to us, is an unusual woman. Her way of life had been such that there might not have been much left of her honour to salvage, and she was certainly capable of striking out on her own when she thought it advisable to do so, even if it might be thought to bring shame on her or to expose her to the risk of retaliation. The forgery executed to obtain title, and the false allegations of rape and theft made against Bala are but two examples of that. The nature of her defence at the trial which involved an open attack on Bala and others, and a thinly veiled suggestion that the deceased's own widow might have been responsible for his death is another example.”

That phrase “an unusual woman” appears to have really rankled the sisterhood, and at least one feminist so-called legal scholar has published in broad support of her.

The fourth person on the above list is Elizabeth Sheehy, a Canadian feminist and one for whom women can do no wrong. Her *magnum opus* to date is *Defending*

Battered Women On Trial... Sheehy's scholarship has been shredded by a number of critics including Diana Davison. In the wake of the [acquittal of Jian Ghomeshi](#), Sheehy was [quoted by Andrew Russell](#) in *Global News*:

“The lessons from this trial show how these witnesses are held to an impossible standard, unlike witnesses in other cases,” she said. “Having read countless murder trial transcripts, I can say that even women accused of first degree murder are not cross-examined for days on end as many complainants in rape trials are.”

What she neglects to mention is that Ghomeshi's accusers conspired openly to falsely accuse this man and destroy his life. If Ghomeshi hadn't keep decade old e-mails and correspondence, he would still be in prison now.

This is what you can expect from the Centre For Women's Justice, a total lack of objectivity, and dishonesty bordering on delusion. Sadly, the influence of these *wimmin* is both widespread and pernicious. Please share this video and help spread the truth to those who are in a position to do something about it.