



Association of McKenzie Friends

voluntary public interest advocacy

www.mckenzie-friends.co.uk

Chairperson: Belinda McKenzie -- **Web Publisher:** Sabine K McNeill

EU Law Specialist: Deborah Mahmoudieh

Crime Report

Official Collusion & Cover-Up of a Reported Paedophile Cult?

The 'Whistleblower Kids' / 'Hampstead Scandal'

Contents

Contents	1
Executive Summary	2
Brief Description of the 'Hampstead Case'	3
The Secrecy of UK Family Courts vs Suspensions 'in good faith' of EU Directive 2011/92	4
Police Use of the Harassment Act	5
In the Public Interest: the British Public and Internet Community as 'Legally Competent Authority' ..	5
Background	5
Links to Videos and Documents	6
Grounds for suspicion and concern for the children's safety	9
Grounds for guilt and proof of innocence, for children's safety	10
Criminal/Professional negligence or conspiracy among multiple professionals and authorities to cover up serious crimes against children?	10
A Fair Trial based on General Assertions?	12
Proving Innocence or Confirming Guilt	12
Remove the Children from Care and Return them to their Russian Grandparents	13
Evidence: Probability	13
Judge Pauffley: Professionally Negligent or Criminally Complicit?	14
Evidence: Possibility & Opportunity	18
Call for Police Action via the British Public and McKenzie Friends as the 'Legally Competent' Authority	23
Children's Safety & EU Directive 2011/92	25
Motive & Intent	26
Legal Directives	28

A voluntary Initiative of Public Interest Advocates assisting Litigants in Person

83 Priory Gardens – London N6 5QU – T: 020 8348 9114 – M: 07770 927 734

b.mckenzie@btinternet.com

Executive Summary

This Crime Report is directed at British Constabularies, after Barnet (North London) Police and the Metropolitan Police failed to comply with [EU Directive 2011/92](#) on combating the sexual abuse and sexual exploitation of children and child pornography. In the spirit of the Directive, the British Public and Internet Community have become the **'legally competent authority'**, since the UK authorities have failed two child victims and witnesses who reported their own and the abuse of 18 other 'special' children. In the light of the cover-ups of historic abuse, we are urgently seeking 'Police against Child Abuse'.

The Report uses the 'Hampstead Scandal' that had become 'internet famous' before Mrs Justice Pauffley's judgment was published with the headline: Satanic 'cult' dismissed by judge. It has come to be the public's widespread opinion that Mrs Justice Pauffley has become a professionally negligent and/or criminally complicit Suspect for the following reasons:

1. According to a former Detective Constable of the Metropolitan Police who analysed the Crime Reporting Information System (CRIS) Report, Barnet Police closed the case without "planning, preparation and the consideration of investigative strategies, actions or reviews."
2. Barnet Police made use of the Harassment Act to incriminate the mother, her partner and her McKenzie Friend (lay legal advisor) so that they fled UK jurisdiction. But none of the alleged 70+ abusers have been investigated, even though the children had described detailed distinguishing marks of their private parts that are easily verifiable.
3. Instead, the ethos of secrecy of UK Family Courts was used by Barnet Council and subsequently by the High Court of the Family Division to conceal and cover-up serious crimes and to disadvantage the mother and favour the allegedly abusive father.
4. The legal team of the Metropolitan Police colluded in the failure to investigate to Professional Standards by submitting their unacceptable 'Grounds of Resistance' in response to the mother's Judicial Review to re-open the case.
5. High Court Judge Pauffley did not make any effort to dissolve all grounds for suspicion and concern for the safety of all the children involved.
6. Neither did she affirm appropriate grounds for the guilt of the supposed abuser, namely Mr Abraham Christie, or proof of innocence of any of the alleged 70+ abusers, who were named by the children, independently of each other, and with persuasive consistency across different adults who interviewed them.
7. Instead, the father, accused of being the leader of a cult involving eight schools and a church, was given more contact than the mother and pronounced innocent while none of his computers were seized or investigated. Thanks to the outrage of the British and internet public, evidence has been provided that the father may be a child pornographer: [Video 17 of Hampstead Research](#), dedicated to finding facts to substantiate the children's allegations.

Brief Description of the 'Hampstead Case'

Allegations include ritual abuse, child sexual abuse, making of child pornography, child trafficking, ritual murder and cannibalism via 70+ professionals who include parents of 20 'special' children and also teachers, the head teacher, church clergy, social workers, police, CAFCASS officers and local shopkeepers in and around Hampstead London UK.

Abuse is alleged to centre mostly around [Christ Church School](#) and its adjoining church though 7 other schools and other churches are alleged to be involved too, with abuse and murder said to be taking place also in secret rooms/cellars in private Hampstead homes and local shops namely, McDonalds and a coffee shop - also, a local swimming pool and a tennis club are also mentioned.

Mother Ella Draper and her children Q and P reported the above allegations to Barnet Police London early September 2014 after the children had disclosed abuse at the hands of their father Ricky Dearman and multiple others, to mother and her partner Mr Abraham Christie two weeks earlier, while on holiday in Morocco. Since their father had threatened to kill them, were they to 'talk', it is evident from their original allegations that a certain degree of force needed to be employed by Mr Christie to persuade the children to disclose and this occurred in the presence of and with permission of their mother.

Medical evidence confirms repeated and long-term sexual abuse of both children and who are noted also as suffering from serious Post Traumatic Stress Disorder.

The children were immediately placed under a protection order and removed from their mother's custody.

Several days after the original allegations were recorded, Barnet police paid a visit to Christ Church School and Church searching for certain items alleged to be held there but nothing was found.

By then, the case had been relegated to the Family Courts and after interviews with CAFCASS officers (who are among the alleged abusers), the children retracted their allegations and Barnet police once again interviewed the children who confirmed their retractions.

Unlike the original allegations, the retractions do not match; they are largely inconclusive, especially concerning Q who clearly has much difficulty in stating that no babies at all were killed, as at no point does he accept that NO babies were killed. P starts her police retraction interview with: "What do you want me to say?"

In light of the original, serious allegations, P's opening question in the police retraction interview is most damning and is itself, evidence of possible coercion.

The Family courts subsequently decided to send both children to Foster Carers, with the mother's contact limited to twice monthly and the father's (alleged abuser, baby killer and leader of a paedophile, Satanic Cult) contact increased to weekly.

The Court accepted the evidence of the medical reports, yet no further investigations ensued as to who had sexually abused the children. Barnet Police closed the case with 'Crime not confirmed' on 22 September 2014.

Once in care, both children are reported by foster carers to be suffering symptoms of PTSD. Both children retract their retractions while in foster care and reaffirm their original allegations. The mother, Ella Draper is informed of the renewed allegations and acts on the advice of an experienced retired police sergeant.

After months of getting nowhere via regular 'competent' authorities at local level, the case was transferred to Mrs Justice Pauffley in the Family Division of the High Court. Mrs Pauffley decided that it should remain closed, that the Judicial Review should not be pursued, while an 'intervening' Local Authority suggested that all evidence and tapes to be destroyed. Hence the mother and her McKenzie Friend acting on the combined strength of professional advice and the EU Directive (which supported their Human Rights of Free Speech), decided to alert the public as the only remaining 'competent' authority available and capable of demanding action towards investigating this case.

The Secrecy of UK Family Courts vs Suspicions 'in good faith' of [EU Directive 2011/92](#)

In the wake of the case 'going public', a [Penal Notice](#) is later issued via the Family Court against the mother and her McKenzie Friend Sabine K McNeill. It appears that in obeying EU Directives and reporting suspicions of serious child abuse and murder (see sections 26, 28 & 50 EU Child Protection Law), mother and her McKenzie Friend had broken the Family Courts' 'privacy' regulations thus potentially incurring a penalty of between 3 months to 7 years in prison.

The mother and her McKenzie Friend were forced to flee Britain while the mother's Russian parents (the children's grandparents), remain at the London family home in the hope of the children being released into the safety of their custody.

In the absence of both mother and her McKenzie Friend and Mr Christie, on 17 February 2015 a 11 day 'fact-finding' hearing was held at the High Court under the authority of Justice Pauffley. Medical and forensic evidence was submitted with forensic evidence remaining secret.

It was not evident via the recent High Court hearing exactly what evidence was presented to prove the alleged abusers innocence to the degree that Justice Pauffley was able to unequivocally state that the original allegations were false and the subsequent retractions were accurate. Her final Judgement on this case is that the mother and her partner had physically and psychologically abused the children while on a two week holiday in Morocco, in order to coach the children into reporting false allegations and with the prime motive being to discredit and incriminate the children's father Mr Ricky Dearman and thereby deny him all contact with his children.

Police Use of the Harassment Act

In addition to Barnet Council's Court action, Barnet Police used complaints by the alleged abusers to justify visiting the homes of Sabine McNeill and, with nine constables in plain clothes, of the mother. They based their action on the false accusation that the two had published the names and addresses of the alleged abusers and that Police had received complaints.

Since they came without Arrest Warrants, another Counsel in process of advising the mother sent them away and she escaped.

It has since emerged that the threat of EU Arrest Warrants had been used by the Police and an Interpol Notice to arrest Sabine McNeill at airports had been issued. This was withdrawn without reason on 22 March 2015.

Please refer to accompanying documents and recordings related to all of the above. Please note we have included internet links where we can for easier access to relevant information and to minimise paperwork-load on points of this initial report.

In the Public Interest: the British Public and Internet Community as 'Legally Competent Authority'

Section 28 of EU Directive 2011/92 says: *Member States should encourage any person who has knowledge or suspicion of the sexual abuse or sexual exploitation of a child to report to the competent services. It is the responsibility of each Member State to determine the competent authorities to which such suspicions may be reported. Those competent authorities should not be limited to child protection services or relevant social services. The requirement of suspicion 'in good faith' should be aimed at preventing the provision being invoked to authorise the denunciation of purely imaginary or untrue facts carried out with malicious intent.*

After Barnet and Metropolitan Police covered up rather than investigated, after Judge Mayer in Barnet Court and Mrs Justice Pauffley in the High Court did not act in the interests of the abused children, after internet corporations deleted videos, accounts and petitions, after the mainstream media supported the High Court judgement without questioning, it has become clear that the British public and the internet community are the only 'legally competent authority' left who are acting in the Public Interest.

Even before Mrs Justice Pauffley called us 'evil and/or foolish', some felt outraged, others insulted, and many expressed their feelings in online publications, as below:

Background

Mother's Position Statement for High Court hearing on 26 January 2015:

- <http://whistleblowerkids.uk/about/position-statement/>

Email to Home Secretary on 02 February:

- <http://tapnewswire.com/2015/02/courts-want-crime-kept-quiet-while-the-innocent-are-punished/>

The Dame Pauffley - Hollie Greig connection:

- <http://tapnewswire.com/2015/04/warning-hampstead-intel-gathering/>

Main blog:

- www.WhistleblowerKids.uk with over 120,000 views since 21 February 2015

Links to Videos and Documents

1. The Children's testimonies:

- Home recordings: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=aMplQR-5ewk>
- Police recordings Q: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=H21WDONtk78>
- Police recordings P: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=OMiYMzREseo>

2. Their Retractions:

Professional Linguistic Analysis of Q embedded in general post with valid comments:

- <https://hampsteadresearch.wordpress.com/2015/04/25/forensic-linguistic-analysis-here/>
- <https://wordsontrial.wordpress.com/2015/04/21/is-this-a-retraction/> (password sumatra)

"In conclusion, this interview is at best a partial retraction of a set of claims and leaves a number of claims that have not convincingly been retracted as well as numerous avenues that required additional probing during the interview and would benefit from further investigation. It could also be argued that presenting opportunities for retraction as a positive move disqualifies this interview from the retraction genre."

'Amateur' Analysis:

- <http://crimesofempire.com/2015/03/01/hampstead-analysis-of-the-september-17th-police-interview/>

3. Their Medical Reports:

- <https://drive.google.com/file/d/0Byzy22cCtwpdbERtNXNhQ0Y5RmM/view?usp=sharing>
- <https://drive.google.com/file/d/0Byzy22cCtwpdYy0xdVZFcGxscXM/view?usp=sharing>

4. Extracts from a former Constable's Witness Statements re Police Report and Police Interviews:

- <https://drive.google.com/file/d/0Byzy22cCtwpdUXhKQzc2M25nM0E/view?usp=sharing>

5. The mother's witness statement:

- <https://hampsteadresearch.wordpress.com/vid-8-ellas-witness-statement/>

6. The father's record of domestic violence:

- [Application for Non-Molestation Order](#) (after two previous ones)
- <https://hampsteadresearch.files.wordpress.com/2015/04/dearman-crime-reports.pdf>

a) His Police Interview:

- <https://hampsteadresearch.files.wordpress.com/2015/04/dearman-police-interview-transcript.pdf>

b) His online record of child pornography:

- <https://hampsteadresearch.wordpress.com/vid-17-dearman-child-pornographer/>

c) His interview by the BBC:

- <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=f5f9N6wmiLQ>

7. The Russian Grandparents tell their side of the story:

- <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=pF1ewVyHmVw>

8. Named Suspects and their professional status and connections:

Published by Veterans Today, alleged to have MI5 marks on the file:

- <http://www.veteranstoday.com/2015/02/22/anonymous-leaks-satanic-cult-member-names-places-phone-s/>

So far, 19 videos on Hampstead Research, including teachers, parents, churches:

- <https://hampsteadresearch.wordpress.com/>: extensive online research, regular posts and comments about the excellent videos with facts to substantiate the children's allegations.

9. Family Court decisions:

- <https://drive.google.com/folderview?id=0Byzy22cCtwpdVEdmaWFIT01XZk0&usp=sharing>

10. Judicial Review filed on 22 December 2014, supposedly being picked up by Mrs Justice Pauffley:

- <https://drive.google.com/folderview?id=0Byzy22cCtwpdfm1pcUxfVGIweIJ0VmhHLU5SZFNqNmxxnWVyS3F3Ui1BT05ZcFgxZlFCeUE&usp=sharing>

11. Mrs Justice Pauffley's Judgement:

- <http://www.bailii.org/ew/cases/EWFC/HCI/2015/26.html>

12. Witness Statements appealing Her Ladyship's Judgement:

- <http://www.meetup.com/whistleblowerkids/pages/?op=all>

13. EU Legal Directive 2011/92 on combating the sexual abuse and sexual exploitation of children and child pornography:

- <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=CELEX:32011L0093>

Infringement Notice issued by the European Commission against the UK Government on 27.01.14:

- http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/home-affairs/what-is-new/eu-law-and-monitoring/infringements_by_country_united_kingdom_en.htm

14. UN Report on Child Trafficking, Ritual Murder and Abuse of children and babies in London

Concluding observations on the report submitted by the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland under article 12, paragraph 1, of the Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Rights of the Child on the sale of children, child prostitution and child pornography:

- http://www.un.org/ga/search/view_doc.asp?symbol=CRC/C/OPSC/GBR/CO/1

The UK report to the UN Committee:

- <https://drive.google.com/file/d/0Byzy22cCtwpdbXkxUDJwakFzWTQ/view?usp=sharing>

NDTV – 20.06.14 - UN Warns Britain Over Child Voodoo Victims, Sex Tourists UN Warns Britain Over Child Voodoo Victims, Sex Tourists:

- <http://www.ndtv.com/world-news/un-warns-britain-over-child-voodoo-victims-sex-tourists-579629>

Daily Mail – 02.08.14 - How London became the child abuse capital of the world: Trafficked here by gangs, prey to pimps, paedophiles and murderers... the booming trade in 'lost' children that shames us all:

- <http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-2714200/How-London-child-abuse-capital-world-Trafficked-gangs-prey-pimps-paedophiles-murderers-booming-trade-lost-children-shames-all.html>

15. Reports of Paedophilia both Historic and Present via a multitude of UK Authorities including police, government ministers, health and child care professionals, clergy, etc.

- <http://www.yourthurrock.com/Thurrock-s-cop-Chief-Inspector-Ben-Hodder-pleads/story-26168012-detail/story.html>
- <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/politics/david-cameron/10675036/Who-is-Patrick-Rock.html>
- <http://news.sky.com/story/1440761/thatcher-turned-blind-eye-to-paedophile-mps>

- <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/uknews/crime/11391314/Rotherham-child-sex-abuse-scandal-council-not-fit-for-purpose.html>
- <http://www.chad.co.uk/news/crime/council-in-425-000-payments-to-child-abuse-victims-1-7174791>

Grounds for suspicion and concern for the children's safety

From the start, the case was negligently handled by Barnet Police in that they failed to follow EU Directives and immediately investigate the very serious allegations. According to normal procedure in case/s of reported rape, following medical forensic examination of the victim to establish if indeed the crime had taken place (affirmative in the case of the 2 'Hampstead' children), the next immediate action of the police should have been to visit the home of the chief named suspect, in this case the children's own father and seize his computer, mobile phone, etc. however this did not happen. Had the father's computer been seized much evidence of his child-pornography activity would have been found (See [video 18 of Hampstead Research](#)). It is also a fact of evidence against Barnet Police that they ignored the very real and credible risk of inside information being passed to suspect parties who subsequently, were possibly forewarned and given time to hide any evidence before their 'surprise' visit to Christ Church School 8 days after the allegations were reported.

The above possibility cannot be denied as police, social workers, family court officers etc., were all among alleged abusers and therefore, uniquely placed to be first to catch word of the allegations via other professionals/peers. There is a possibility that alleged abusers were knowingly or unwittingly informed of the allegations by fellow associates.

The Family Courts was also negligent in failing to demand further investigations into who had sexually abused the children, after they retracted their initial allegations against their father and others. According to the Family Courts and contrary to EU Law, responsibility for the medically confirmed physical and emotional evidence of abuse, incriminated only their mother only for "failing to protect" them.

Barnet Police are further negligent in that they failed again to follow EU Directives and did not continue to investigate the very serious allegations which involve multiple children and murder, in spite of the retractions. According to EU Child Protection Directives, the law is very clear: ALL allegations of child sexual abuse must be investigated, even AFTER withdrawal of allegations.

EU Directives are clear on this issue of investigation because it is understood that victims and/or witnesses are often in fear of the abusers and are subsequently coerced into silence which then means children remain at risk. EU Law determines to undermine and eradicate that risk with the burden of belief falling to witness/victims original testimony.

In this case, both children are very clearly and repeatedly recorded as saying that their father had threatened to kill them if they ever "broke their deal". Considering the children allege that they regularly witnessed their father killing babies, again, it is an important fact of evidence that this was very possibly, no IDLE threat.

The initial police interviews with Mr Dearman are frankly ridiculous set against the seriousness of the allegations and with interviewing officer DC Savage saying "...and I say 'alleged' very strongly..." Which very clearly suggests DC Savage at least, is convinced the children's allegations are false, because details of those allegations, are BARELY if at all mentioned in the interviews.

Grounds for guilt and proof of innocence, for children's safety

When it comes to serious allegations as shared above, EU Law strives to not prove the alleged abusers as guilty but to prove them innocent. It is because of the unique nature of this type of crime and the secrecy and often, collective power of abusers, that suspects are to be considered guilty until proven innocent beyond all reasonable doubt. When it comes to children's safety, there can be NO ROOM FOR DOUBT.

According to the evidence and facts presented herein, we acknowledge many points that place doubt on the retractions and which instead, support the children's original testimonies.

Criminal/Professional negligence or conspiracy among multiple professionals and authorities to cover up serious crimes against children?

As evidence in support of our allegations that we have every reason to suspect a conspiracy among alleged abusers, we refer initially to failure of authorities to abide by EU Directives. This could be due to professional negligence which, in the event of children being proven to have suffered abuse and remaining at risk directly due to that negligence, is in fact criminal negligence.

The possibility of this being a conspiracy to deliberately ignore EU Directives in the interest of protecting paedophile identities and permitting them freedom to continue in their activities of abusing, trafficking and murdering children, is not a possibility that can be reasonably dismissed.

In the light of past and present evidence as presented above, it is clear that multiple professionals in positions of British power and authority have colluded in and are conspiring to commit sexual abuse of children and/or profit from abuse of children.

It is clear according to the aforementioned UN Report that London is internationally recognised as a centre for receiving 'thousands' of trafficked children and babies from abroad every year. Of these many children 'hundreds' are tortured and killed in ritual 'sacrifice' which does sometimes include drinking blood and eating human flesh.

When we weigh up the amount of investigations and arrests against the numbers of abused children reflected in e.g. the UN Report, it is again clear that very little is being done to successfully address and eradicate this type of crime.

While we accept that because of the secrecy and collective powers of many paedophiles, allegations are rare and evidence often difficult to find, nonetheless, in light of the fear and manipulation of victims and the resulting rarity of reports it is therefore of paramount importance that all and any

allegations relating to crimes against children, as listed above, are immediately and thoroughly investigated.

It is for this sole purpose that witness/victim testimony is accorded the burden of belief and that witness/victims' having made allegations takes precedence over suspects' denials, also, that any retractions are regarded with suspicion and most especially when retractions are given while victim/witnesses are under the control of alleged abusers.

In case of the Dearman children, retractions of allegations occurred only AFTER the children were removed from the care of their mother and placed into the custody of allegedly abusive authorities.

Again, we cannot reasonably deny the fact that paedophiles within circles of CAFCASS officers and social workers and police have both potential and power to subvert the course of justice and collectively conspire to coerce the children into retracting their allegations.

It is significant that the children later retracted their retractions and alleged they were coerced to retract via CAFCASS officers, while in Foster Care homes.

Since the High Court has now ruled that mother and her partner abusively coached the children to make the original allegations, who then was responsible for the retraction of the retractions? Did the Foster Carers 'coach' them too? Who is responsible for the sexual abuse and trauma as revealed by video recordings and victim testimony, along with supporting medical evidence?

The above questions have not been answered and this is most unsatisfactory, given the extreme seriousness of original allegations. As a result, the public, a lawfully recognised competent-authority in this case according to EU Directives and directly because other 'competent authorities' had failed to act, remains deeply concerned and suspicious that many children remain at risk via all alleged abusers in this case.

According to EU Law, such a level of suspicion concerning such immense risk to so many children, is legally, unacceptable.

According to EU Law, the retractions of the original allegations are of secondary value and automatically raise doubts due to their having been issued while the victims were in the care and control of alleged abusers.

According to EU Law, retraction of the retractions while in Foster Care, doubly amplifies the original allegations in the sense that in retracting the retractions, CAFCASS officers, police and social services are once again named as alleged abusers who have since used their professional powers to silence the children. Because of this, allegations now issued against mother and her partner are again to be legally considered secondary from the legal viewpoint and as yet more possible evidence of a conspiracy among alleged abusers.

Indeed, it is the collective and repeated failure of the regular competent authorities to adequately and to promptly investigate this case which leads us to question possible other motives behind their ignorance of Legal Directives?

In case of the original allegations being correct, there is every reason to suspect that the guilty parties are continuing to participate in covering up their crimes and utilising their collective, professional powers to silence victims and witnesses and even, to persecute the mother and her adviser via threat of prosecution for crimes of which they have been found guilty via a Judgement derived from a hearing/s which these newly accused and convicted did not and could not attend.

A Fair Trial based on General Assertions?

It is of further importance to note that the hearing in question included the submission of secret evidence not made available to the mother, her partner nor her McKenzie Friends. According to a House of Lords Ruling such circumstances represent a miscarriage of Justice:

*“The control order regime enacted by the **Prevention of Terrorism Act 2005** (and still in force at the time of publication) imposes severe restrictions, including house arrest, on anyone suspected of being involved in terrorism-related activity. Under the policy, the Secretary of State makes a decision as to whether a control order should be made and the courts then consider the decision made. In many cases, control orders have been made on the basis of closed material – where the person subject to the control order has never been given the chance to see the case against them.*

*The House of Lords held in June 2009 that this breached the **right to a fair trial under Article 6**. The Law Lords held that a person subject to such a restrictive order had to be given sufficient information to know the essence of the case against him or her. It was held that there could never be a fair trial if the case against a person was based solely or to a decisive degree on closed materials and where any open material consists only of general assertions. The Court held that in conducting control order hearings judges must consider whether material needs to be disclosed to ensure the fairness of the trial.’*

*It was held that **there could never be a fair trial if the case against a person was based solely or to a decisive degree on closed materials and where any open material consists only of general assertions.**”*

<https://www.liberty-human-rights.org.uk/human-rights/what-are-human-rights/human-rights-act/article-6-right-fair-hearing>

Proving Innocence or Confirming Guilt

In the case that our suspicions are proven correct, it would follow that two abused children were removed from their mother's protection due to police negligence and the family court and placed under the control of their abusers and from there, coerced into retracting their original allegations. It would follow that 20 other ‘special children’ could have continued to be sexually abused and any number of babies murdered by multiple professionals involved in child care and who have direct access to Britain's most vulnerable children, including children of foreigners, and to babies brought into the UK from abroad.

In view of the seriousness of the alleged crimes, we consider it of utmost importance to investigate every aspect of the children's original allegations and including all suspects concerned, in order to establish innocence or confirm guilt. If the latter, such criminals pose a serious threat and risk to all children and, unless apprehended, will surely continue in their crimes and with many more children being left to suffer.

Remove the Children from Care and Return them to their Russian Grandparents

In light of all evidence presented herein, and the grandparents' testimony on [this video](#), we urge the Police to uphold the law and immediately remove aforementioned children from care of present possibly abusive authorities and into interim care with their Grandparents until all parties concerned in this case are thoroughly investigated and actual facts eradicate any further doubts.

It should also to be noted that in the case of alleged abusers being proven innocent, they too have suffered negative publicity directly due to police negligence in failing to follow EU Directives; prompt police action could have immediately proven their innocence. It is only through LACK of police action that this case has received the legally necessary publicity. International child trafficking alone is a very serious crime, just ONE of many very serious crimes against multiple children initially alleged.

Evidence: Probability

According to the original allegations, the children provide many names of their abusers along with personal details of their profession and physical descriptions including of their genitalia and other bodily features.

It is not usual for children to know so many names and professions of adults outside their direct family circle and certainly, not to describe their body parts in such detail e.g. one abuser has a wart on her genitals, the size of '5p coin' others have tattoos. See this video: <https://vid.me/rUuS> with the children's drawings and this petition: <https://www.change.org/p/hampstead-alleged-abusers-come-to-be-examined-we-demand-that-the-alleged-abusers-with-apparent-distinguishing-marks-come-forward-to-be-examined-by-independent-trusted-doctors-and-the-police> with over 1,800 signatures.

One would not normally expect children aged 8 & 9 to independently describe the process of cutting off a baby's head, but first cutting its throat in a special way so blood does not spurt out but instead, drips into a basin below.

One would not normally expect two children age 8 & 9, to know about 'special tools' needed for removing baby-skin which they allege was stuck to shoes worn for the special ceremonies where they danced with babies' skulls amidst naked adults/abusers likewise adorned with baby-skulls.

One would not normally expect two children age 8 & 9, to know about the existence of 'plastic willies' and also, how they were affixed to the human body.

Why would a mother and her partner coach children to repeat as 'fact' things that could very easily be proven false? Here we refer to the detailed descriptions of the head teacher's and other teachers' genitals.

[Witness Statement B](#): paragraphs 23-30 outline the laws of probability e.g.

27: It is interesting that Judge Pauffley cites the probability factor as grounds for arriving at her judgement against a concerned mother and her adviser whose only concern has been to be sure that children do not remain at risk. How many cases are regularly shared in the British media about mothers who bully and torture their children into repeating a story to police and other authorities about ritual abuse involving 8 schools and 20+ other children and including such details as baby killing and eating and **"dancing with skulls"**?

28: What probability exists even to suggest even, a reason for a mother and/or her partner to commit such vile abuse of two children in their care, if it was indeed, as Justice Pauffley suggested, to discredit their father and thereby deny him any contact with his children? Then it makes no sense that they would engage in abusively coaching the children to memorise and independently and accurately repeat in police custody, such a lengthy and detailed story involving not just the father but a multitude of others and even embellished with **"drinking blood"** and **"eating babies"**?

29. Unless an individual is suffering from severe, psychotic illness, it is not at all probable that a mother would go to such extremes and risk losing custody of her children, putting them through such an ordeal of police interviews and medical examinations and thereafter, out of pure malice against the father, would publish her children's 'coached testimonies' on YouTube with a cry for help - for what purpose? Because certainly if her issue was with the father, then it could all have been a very much simpler process only to focus on abuse via the father and even more certainly, allegations of sexual abuse pertaining only to the father, would have been easier to coach and more likely to be accepted and believed by others.

30. The very lack of probability as to the mother's and her partner Mr Christie's being the only abusive parties in this case constitutes another important legal point of FACT because in any crime (unless committed through severely impaired psychology), there has to be a motive with intent. What was the motive and what was the intent behind Ms Draper's and Mr Christie's alleged coaching and abuse of P and Q? Was any evidence presented to the Court of the couple's deep hatred and resentment toward Christchurch School and the Hampstead community that might provide motive? No such evidence was presented or implied.

Judge Pauffley: Professionally Negligent or Criminally Complicit?

Blogger Alan Wrightson publishes: [Anna Pauffley: ignorant or complicit?](#) *"Then why did the mother report the matter to the police?"*

Why did Belinda McKenzie, the 'McKenzie Friend' of the mother in court get stalked by secret police vans during the court hearings? Is this normal? Why did Sabine McNeill get chased off to Germany

by hordes of police? Is this normal? Why did Ella Draper get chased off to Russia by more hordes of police? Is this normal?

No. All this was part of the policy of supporting child abuse at large within the British government, so it was all done so the children would be alone in England without a family, and in the clutches of a system that want to continue their abuse.

And Anna Pauffley has made sure that has happened.

Is she ignorant of systemic child abuse? Or is she, rather, part of the system which exploits it when it finds it happening within families?

Either way she is a disgrace. On the one hand, how can she be ignorant of systemic abuse given all the high-profile instances of it recently, when the Met is investigating high-level cover-ups of it, and when Lowell Goddard is being brought in from New Zealand to investigate it?

The alternative is that she does know, and is therefore part of the system which is encouraging the abuse of children, protecting abusers of children, and covering up the abusers of children.

Which one is it, Anna: ignorance or complicity?

All of the Witness Statements provided in condemnation of Justice Pauffley's latest High Court Judgement on this case, expose the many and very serious failings in her judgement and again, considering the risk to children in light of our legally valid suspicions, those failings either reflect professional and possibly criminal negligence or else, Justice Pauffley herself, is part of the alleged paedophile conspiracy either by force or by choice. Below is an extract from [Witness Statement B](#):

14. Regardless of how strange a story may seem, child sexual abusers are *per se* very strange people and EU Law is devised to eliminate and eradicate the crime of all forms of child abuse and the adult fantasies and depravities this kind of crime is regularly committed to satisfy. For sure, not all child abuse has been or is being performed by 'unions' of adults who mutually 'enjoy' and profit from abusing, killing and even consuming children under cover of worshipping 'Satan'.

15. Though such a 'union' of abusers might call themselves 'Satanic' and act as part of a 'cult', in reality most ritualism is 'theatre' used to embellish events of abuse and murder, as well as to deflect external scrutiny. Any victim who manages to speak out is unlikely to be believed because the 'Satanic' aspects are difficult for most people to accept as a reality. The 'Satanic' aspect of the abuse could be a deliberate 'cover-story' whereby abusers feel protected given the 'incredulity' they know will be a common response to anyone reporting their crimes.

16. All the alleged abusers are intelligent, educated and professional people who have both means and intellectual sophistication to devise such a cover as a 'Satanic Cult' as camouflage for the gratification of their depraved desires and fantasies.

17. Nonetheless, Justice Pauffley goes on to say: "*I am able to state with complete conviction that none of the allegations are true. I am entirely certain that everything Ms Draper, her partner*

Abraham Christie and the children said about those matters was fabricated. The claims are baseless. Those who have sought to perpetuate them are evil and / or foolish." p16

18. Here we have yet another condemnation and judgement against a legally recognised competent authority in this case, namely the British Public who have heard and witnessed all the evidence and been longer at it than Justice Pauffley and her 11-day 'fact finding' mission. For a British High Court Judge to label members of the British Public who have chosen to stand by EU Legal Directives for the sake of ensuring children are not at risk, as "evil and/or foolish" amounts to gross disrespect.

19. That comment alone in light of the very serious negligence of British Authorities in failing to abide by EU Directives, reflects Justice Pauffley reflects a serious misunderstanding of her public and lawful duty as a High Court Judge which is; to serve and uphold the law for the sake of delivering lawful justice. She condemns the public as evil and foolish but has no such condemnation for the equally 'evil and foolish' Authorities who failed to abide by the law and immediately investigate all the verifiable facts in this case.

The Probability-Factor is an important point of evidence in all allegations of child sexual abuse;
[Witness Statement B:](#)

25. In this case, probability is heightened concerning the original allegations because of the following facts:

- A. Two child Witness/Victims report credible, separately and repeatedly given testimonies which match and are supportive and do not contradict one another.
- B. Medical evidence confirming sexual abuse and emotional trauma.
- C. Details are given in testimonies by children aged 8 & 9 who are not in probability likely to have experience of, know about or even, so accurately imagine i.e. 'special tools for removing babies skin'.
- D. A huge amount of instantly and easily, verifiable facts are given.
- E. Multiple professional people including father Ricky Dearman, are cited and named as alleged abusers:
 - Was it probable that **Jimmy Savile** was a paedophile? British authorities decided for a very long time it was not 'probable' hence his victims were until very recently, ignored.
 - Was it probable that David Cameron's Senior Policy Adviser, **Patrick Rock**, would be forced to resign from his role at number 10 Downing Street in view of his admittance to and later conviction for paedophile activity?
 - Was it probable that SENIOR Essex police officer **Ben Hodder**, would be 'facing jail after pleading guilty to making five indecent images of children'?

- Was it probable that a British Prime Minister, namely, **Margaret Thatcher** would be guilty and complicit in covering up paedophile crimes within her own cabinet and other Government Ministries as has been recently revealed to the British public?
- Was it probable that multiple Councils, Police and child care providers would all be found complicit in covering up and participating in paedophile activity of every kind?

26: Because all of the above once considered improbabilities are now proven FACTS OF CRIME and with a multitude of historical victim-survivors pressing charges for the crimes they suffered and which were SYSTEMATICALLY IGNORED as "improbable", all present allegations of sexual abuse of children which involve multiple professionals can no longer be dismissed as improbable. Indeed, it is these ever increasing revelations to the British public that have contributed to even deeper suspicions of mother, her McKenzie Friend and the lawful, public authority in this case in the sense, that P and Q's initial allegations are actually, very probable.

In her Judgement, Justice Pauffley minimises Mr Dearman's severe mental health problems, violence and aggression being symptomatic of those problems;

67. Justice Pauffley makes light of Mr Dearman's history of violence and physical abuse against the mother, Ms Draper and she implies that the relationship ended only because: *"Their relationship had disintegrated by 2006 when the father went to live in an adjacent street."* Justice Pauffley then adds, *"There were occasional referrals to the police when domestic violence was alleged. Ms Draper initiated private law proceedings in 2008."* p24

"A non molestation order was made against the father in 2010. There was some involvement on the part of the London Borough of Camden; in December 2008 a core assessment was prepared. Between May 2010 and October 2013, therapeutic sessions occurred intermittently at the Tavistock Clinic. There was a period, notably between November 2011 and November 2012, when the children did not have contact with their father." p26

68. Here again, we witness very important evidence being casually brushed aside; evidence which tells us that Mr Dearman, an alleged paedophile and baby killer was unable to make any contact with his children for a whole year, due to his need of therapy for domestic violence and all of this via *"involvement on the part of the London Borough of Camden; in December 2008 [when] a core assessment was prepared. Between May 2010 and October 2013, therapeutic sessions occurred intermittently at the Tavistock Clinic."*

69. Are the assessments of Mr Dearman's psychological health after non molestation orders were issued against him in 2010, not of any importance or significance to this case and the original allegations?

The father's tendency to violence and aggression is reflected in the children's original testimonies where both independently describe how their father would tell or force them to behave violently toward each other and/or he would behave with violence and aggression toward them and their mother. Validity of those allegations fall more on side of truth considering above evidence as presented in Justice Pauffley's summary.

Therefore, suspicions against the father as a probable/possible abuser are further increased.

It is to be noted that Barnet Police were made aware of Mr Dearman's violence and aggression at the time his alleged crimes against children were reported and yet still failed to immediately arrest Mr Dearman for questioning and further investigation.

This ignoring of solid evidence which is highly relevant and supportive of TWO children's allegations against their father and others is again, contrary to EU Directives.

Evidence: Possibility & Opportunity

It is one thing for two children to independently and repeatedly give identical allegations of such length and detail against a multitude of professional people. It is quite another thing to find that those alleged abusers had and have both possibility and opportunity to be involved in child trafficking and other crimes against children.

In the absence of proper police investigations, the 'competent authority' in this case has taken it upon itself to carry out its own investigations in terms of searching for online evidence which might either support or cast doubt on the children's allegations. These investigations began months before the allegations were made public and alarmingly, the 'coincidences' are building; Video transcript from Online Investigations:

The children allege that **Cartney's** parents bring babies back from Portugal and Spain and while **Lidia Noronha** does not share her Friends she shares with the world that she visited Portugal in 2013 along with a lots of other countries.

The children also make the extraordinary claim that this couple, **Jacqui Ramrayka** and **Warren Cowell** are bringing babies back from Guyana, China, India and America. But is this so extraordinary? Jacqui Ramrayka states that she has travelled extensively around South East Asia and the Caribbean – so that could be India and Guyana. And Warren Cowell works for Pfizer, which has offices in the Guyanas, China, India and of course all over America. Warren Cowell's specialism is HTA, or Health Technology Assessment.

What are the chances that two children could NAME particular adults as baby-traffickers and even, to name the countries they brought the babies from and then, to discover that indeed, all those people have not only visited those countries, their professions and contacts do give them both possibility and opportunity to be involved in baby-trafficking?

The couple mentioned above are not the only alleged baby traffickers and all of the accused are found to have equal opportunity and possibility to engage in such activity as baby-trafficking.

Transcript from [Video 3](#): Teachers

The children make the extraordinary claim that all the staff at Christchurch School are doing sex to them several days a week and that the worst sex day is Wednesday.

This picture came from this Facebook site. It's a page selling decorative hot water bottle covers, hence the use of the word 'Hotties', even though this word is normally used to describe someone sexually attractive. The website sends some kind of a posting out every "Wooing Wednesday" to subscribers; we're not sure what the word wooing means here but it's usually used in a romantic context.

Still, in our opinion the "[Happy Wooing Wednesday, Hotties](#)" image and text **Claire Willmer** [alleged abuser] shared is loaded with innuendo and the idea of an adult man kneeling down in short trousers to check someone or something out with a library card may bring to mind a Primary School library and we wonder why this image appealed enough to Ms Wilmer for her to share it on her Facebook page on a Wednesday?

Both children inform us via home and police recordings that Wednesdays was the "most sex day". Can we really dismiss the above in light of TWO children's testimonies, as an innocent 'coincidence' and especially, considering the *immense seriousness of the allegations*?

Transcript from [Video 4](#): Churches

The children have provided a drawing of a woman called **Vanessa Fitzpatrick**. They allege that she is abusing them, her own children and others and hosting sacrifice, blood drinking and baby flesh eating at her house.

They also allege that Vanessa Fitzpatrick brings babies back from South Africa and that she may sell paedophile pornography there. The children allege that VP's **husband, George**, is a builder who installs secret rooms and escape routes for members of the cult.

The children also allege that a **Susanne Pinkenton** is one of the wickedest abusers.

So it is with deep concern that we see both these women listed in the Hampstead parish Church Annual Report 2012 and last week when we visited the church's website we see a Vanessa Fitzpatrick listed as the church's Children's Champion. The church has now removed her name from the website but we don't know whether they have removed Vanessa from the church.

We also note that the Church contributes to an Angola, London and Mozambique Association. Angola and Mozambique are, of course, South Africa.

When we look at the church's FB page we are reminded that alleged abuser and parent **Bianca Wessell** is a Friend along with **Mark Unwin**, the husband of alleged abusing teacher **Katy Unwin**. We also see the name Willmer and wonder if this woman is related to Christ Church teacher **Claire Willmer**. We do not have any evidence to suggest that this is the case but the children tell us that this cult is intergenerational; their father Ricky Dearman was abused by his parents who also apparently, allegedly, abused the children.

As we rummage through this Church's FB page we note with interest that it is Friends with St John at Hackney. **Emily Ovenden**, the daughter of artist Graham Ovenden and her mother Annie, his estranged wife, are also closely involved with that Church.

It has been alleged that **Graham Ovenden, Annie Ovenden** artist **Peter Blake** and others were in the 1970s members of a cult that abused children. This cult, it is alleged, hid behind what was called the Brotherhood of Ruralists, founded on Spring Equinox 1975. It has also been alleged that the poppies you see in the painting are a reference to the paedophilic drugging of children using opiates. Graham Ovenden, who was found guilty of indecency and indecent assault against children in 2013 was mentored by the famous Hampstead poet **Sir John Betjeman**.

One of the bells at Christ Church Hampstead has a JB quote inscribed upon it and another of its bells was donated by the family of John Betjeman's publisher.

Our Online Investigations though not all presenting conclusive evidence, do nonetheless substantiate the children's claims and certainly, in no way deny them. Presented here, are just a small sample of the many 'coincidences' revealed via the supplied video-links. When considered in full alongside the original allegations, any fair minded individual with concerns for child safety is surely left with many uncomfortable suspicions.

It is all such suspicion that EU Law considers as being 'in good faith' - all of this suspicion is according to EU Law, 'smoke' from a possible fire and therefore, demands immediate investigation.

The children name 3 alleged abusers who work at a local tennis club.

Online Investigations [video transcript 9](#): Tennis Coaches

The children mention the Chandos tennis Club several times in their allegations. They name three coaches who, allegedly, are abusing them.

The Chandos is, obviously, one of Hampstead's tennis clubs. It happens to be the club where UK celebrity **Jonathan Ross** plays so we wonder whether Mr Ross is aware of the allegations that have been made. We also want to state that the children have not named Jonathan Ross as being an abuser and that we are not accusing the tennis club of being complicit in the alleged abuse. It may be but we don't know.

The first coach from the Chandos who the children allege has been abusing them and the other children along with the rest of the cult is a man named Ala. We note that the children are correct – there is indeed a coach named **Ala Tehrani** who is working at Hampstead's Chandos tennis club. Ala has posted on his Facebook page a photograph of himself at Hampstead School and in 2012 he wished Happy New year to the School so this substantiates the children's allegations that he visits Hampstead schools.

This is not Christ Church school, this is Hampstead school, still it is a step towards substantiating the children's allegations.

As far as we are aware the UK police have not interviewed Ala Tehrani or any other employee of the tennis club. So it is with concern that we note that Ala Tehrani, along with a **Daniella Taub** and **Richard Ellis**, have just set up a company to coach children called "Little Smashers".

And that in 2004 Ala was Head Coach of the Junior Section at Temple Fortune Club. We also note that Ala is not the only one commenting enthusiastically on the Facebook photographs on his colleague, **Gunther Darkey's** toddlers.

The second Chandos tennis coach the children allege is abusing them is a man named Benjy. According to the Chandos Newsletter April 2012, the club's Head Coach was "handing over the coaching mantle to" – **Benjamin Kasmer**. Benjy, apparently, was a student at the time. Benjy is still a student. He is studying physics at University College London. This is his Facebook page. He is Friends on Facebook with AT. The children allege that while Ala Tehrani fully abuses them, Benjy Klasmer touches them.

This is Benjy Klasmer's LinkedIn page. He confirms that he has been a coach at the Chandos club since 2009 and that along with all his coaching he has a hand in the organisation of two social events a week.

The third coach the children allege is touching them and the other children along with the other members of the cult, who are fully abusing them, is a man called Peter. The only tennis coach called Peter at the Chandos is **Peter Quek**. Worryingly, he is now works in admin and seems to have a hand in the administration of all children's tennis, from "Teddy Tennis" through "Holiday Camps" to under 16s.

We wonder why the UK police have not questioned these men and why the Chandos is still being allowed to run Teddy Tennis courses?

Suspensions are further deepened when we consider the most recent revelations of our online investigations. Here, evidence relates specifically to the father, Mr Dearman. The evidence here is conclusive in the sense there is NO DOUBT as to the IP address belonging to Mr Dearman:

Video transcript: [Dearman - Child Pornographer?](#)

The children allege that their father Ricky Dearman is a child pornographer. Dearman, they allege, sexually abuses and humiliates them and the other children, along with all the other members of the cult. Dearman and the others film this and upload it onto the internet; the children claim that their father has shown them some of this material.

Every internet user is familiar with predictive analysis. Predictive software analyses your behaviour patterns online and works out what kind of a person you are. For example, if you buy lots of shoes on ebay the software will pick up your shopping patterns, analyse them and advertise shoe shops and ebay at you. YouTube uses it to recommend videos based on the other videos you have watched and so on. Ecommerce is now such big business that online retailers have invested millions into developing increasingly accurate predictive software.

Back in March 2015 a fellow researcher – let's call him John Smith – left a message on our Hampstead Research blog. John stressed that he was not accusing anyone of being guilty but Ricky Dearman seemed to be deleting all traces of himself from the internet.

John drew our attention to one particular website that Dearman had deleted. The IP address of this website was very important, he said. Ns2.2heartsdelight.com

We were unable to verify whether 2 hearts delight belonged to Dearman so we took John's word for it. John explained that 2hearts delight's IP address is not a normal IP address, it is a step up from that: 2heartsdelight is a domain name server, or DNS. A DNS is used as a look up table to reference other websites. According to John, if you add a DNS address to your computer you can access websites that other people can't access, not unless they know the IP addresses of those websites.

So, we wondered, would a DNS give someone who knew what they were doing access to illegal sites, sites that were hidden, sites that contained, say, child pornography? Could a DNS be used to search Deep Net? Is this how paedophiles and other criminals operate online? We don't know but from what John said, it sounds as if this could be the case.

We followed John's lead and looked up *2heartsdelight* on the Wayback machine. And here we can see that 2hearts provided services and conducted tours with deep connections into the US and Russia.

We have also heard that the symbols of two hearts is sometimes used as a pedophilic reference to sex with young girls. We don't know if this is fact but if it is then the name 2heartsdelight could signal more than a straightforward dating agency.

Still following John's lead on 23 March 2015 we accessed this website, which shows us all the websites that are hosted at Ricky Dearman's IP address.

On the surface it all looks perfectly innocent – a selection of health related sites. But when we checked the predictive analysis software, which can see what's going on behind the scenes, we were directed to a list of hardcore and child pornography websites.

We decided to look into these websites for the purpose of fact checking. After all, they look and sound like child pornography but are they really? What we found is that most of these links were inactive. One, however, was active. This link was offering pornography of children as young as one year old. In the course of fact checking, because we did not want to accuse an innocent man, we followed some of the links and found pornographic images of young girls. We did not want to investigate further but we did this to demonstrate to our viewers that this is fact.

So the predictive software had worked out that what was going on behind the scenes on Ricky Dearman's computer was nothing to do with health and fitness – the predictive software told us that these websites might be a front for child pornography.

Please note that predictive software cannot lie. It cannot be compromised or intimidated into silence. It is automated; designed to analyse online behaviour.

We emailed this website to ask which predictive software they use and how it works but they have not yet received a reply.

The child porn site you were looking at may not have been registered by Ricky Dearman and the material we examined may not originate from him either. It is, however, quite possible that this is the case. The software strongly suggests that he and the other users of his websites have at least accessed this IP address. When we look up who registered *littleorgies* we find someone at an address in the Ukraine calling themselves **V Smirnoff**, which may well, of course, be a fake name.

Please note that as Dearman seems to be removing his websites or moving things around, things will have changed over the past three weeks. When we checked the predictive software on 16 April 2015 the only trace of child pornography we were offered was this: the gay website is probably nothing illegal although dorns may have paedophile connotations.

Tellingly, back in March, when we dug further into the predictive software it revealed that users of this child pornography sites appeared to be accessing a collection of medical sites to do with diagnosing whether an adult man – or female child – has a sexually transmitted disease. Many of these websites look the same, as if they have been created by the same person.

Call for Police Action via the British Public and McKenzie Friends as the 'Legally Competent' Authority

The latest findings regarding Ricky Dearman via Online Investigations are, we feel, are important enough now to warrant a full Police investigation into every aspect and detail of the children's original allegations and also, the allegations of a professional-level cover-up which has also, conspired to abuse their collective powers to wrongfully incriminate, intimidate and control otherwise, innocent parties and victims/witnesses in this case.

According to the evidence presented here, we have ample reason to suspect that Justice Pauffley may herself be a part of the alleged paedophile ring.

In the light of the original allegations, it cannot be easily dismissed that Justice Pauffley not only only ignored the issues in the mother's Position Statement on 26 January 2015, she had also appropriated to herself on 22 December 2014 the Judicial Review filed against the Metropolitan Police to reopen the case in the Administrative Court, but then ignored that! Furthermore, despite the children having retracted their retractions, which under normal circumstances should have raised concerns that their original allegations could well have been true, the judge continued to favour the father in more than one aspect. It was directly BECAUSE of Justice Pauffley's refusal to take the application for the Judicial Review forward and failure to demonstrate impartiality that this case went public, after appeals to the Home Secretary had also gone unheeded.

Furthermore, it is to be noted that Justice Pauffley goes to great lengths in her efforts to cast doubt on and discredit Dr Hodes who fully supports the children's original allegations and who stood by her report that both children had endured repeated sexual abuse via anal-penetration showed signs of Post Traumatic Stress Disorder.

Also, there are questions regarding the professional integrity of child psychologist Dr Sturge.

Her personal testimony reflects her failure to note known and common signs of PTSD in both children during their original allegations and also neglects to pick-up on some very serious discrepancies in the children's later narrative whereby the mother and Mr Christie had become the alleged abusers who had forced them to lie.

Considering Dr Sturge is described by Justice Pauffley as one of Britain's most experienced child psychologists, either she is proven professionally negligent in this case or else, she is criminally complicit in paedophilia: Witness statement B:

31. 'Dr Sturge assessed the children on 5 November 2014... P commented, "Abraham [Mr Christie] loved my Mum so much. He even blamed her for being in the gang." p144

32. It has never been suggested that given the short time Mr Christie had known Ms Draper, that he could have been responsible for the extent of repeated abuse as revealed via medical examination. It is also highly improbable that a man who was coaching a mother's two children to memorise false allegations in order to report them credibly to police, would also, in the presence of those children, have "even blamed her for being in the gang." What 'gang' - surely, he wasn't referring to the 'Satanic Cult' that both he and mum were allegedly, 'coaching' the children to lie about?

33. Though it may seem a very little thing, that statement from P as child who in light of the evidence and according to the EU legal requirements for suspicion in good faith, is probably suffering in the hands of alleged abusers who have contrived to control her, speaks volumes. It is these 'little things' about which Authorities investigating child sexual abuse need to be vigilant and most particularly, a High Court Judge presiding over a case in which the mother and her McKenzie Friend are absent, however this had come about.

39. Dr Sturge: 'P related that Mr Christie would tell her that "for lying she would go to prison for 20 years and never see her grandparents or Mum again."

Is that statement allegedly issued by Mr Christie, most probably said by a man trying to get a child to tell the truth or is it more reflective of a man trying to force a child to lie? WHY would a child go to "prison for 20 years" for lying unless those possible 'lies' are so serious they could cause a very lot of damage to a lot of innocent people? WHY would a man allegedly, forcing a child to lie then threaten that child with 20 years in prison for lying? Where is the "common sense"?

We very strongly feel that the above observations fully support the children's original testimony in which they claim that Mr Christie employed some force in getting the children to disclose. While we do not applaud his methods, we do however, feel they are reflective of shock (considering the horrific content of the allegations) and a sudden and intense need to be sure that the children are telling the truth. Certainly his comment that 'P' "could go to prison for 20 years for lying" appears to support our conclusions here more than it supports the notion he was actively engaged in coercing the children to lie.

In a case such as this which outlines so many extremely serious allegations including repeated acts of murder, such discrepancies and errors of professionalism in analysis of testimony and evidence, amount to a very serious degree of professional negligence. If this is the level of response to reports of child abuse by British children, it is no wonder sexual abuse and trafficking of children is ENDEMIC in our country.

Children's Safety & EU Directive 2011/92

We have here presented substantial evidence warranting valid grounds for suspicion in good faith that the two children prominent in this case and many more remain at serious risk. We therefore hereby repeat our demand that the child witness/victims in this case be instantly removed from all risk of further abuse and coercion and placed in care of their Grandparents who are right now, the ONLY persons not implicated in any abuse against children.

We feel this is the most compassionate action considering the levels of professional negligence exposed in this case and/or professional/criminal conspiracy. The children have suffered terribly as a direct result and regardless of whether their allegations are true or false. Certainly, both children would greatly benefit from contact with their Grandparents who are familiar to them. Given that the allegations DO include professionals among family courts, social services, police etc., the children's Grandparents are the only persons we the public trust in terms of their being the least likely to further abuse or coerce the children.

EU Directives fully support both our case for suspicion and concern and therefore, that children have been left at risk via a professionally-negligent and unlawful (and possibly criminal) Court Judgement which has not only entirely denied all suspicions against the alleged abusers without open proof or provision of any evidence to substantiate their innocence but is seemingly paving the way for the children to be delivered into the custody of their allegedly abusive father, in SPITE of him NEVER being fully investigated by police. This is a truly shocking act of criminal negligence.

We refer to Mr Dearman's recent interview on BBC TV. Ricky Dearman is a professional actor and certainly, we have ample reason to suspect a 'performance' as he shares his ordeal as an alleged paedophile and baby-killer. It is noticeable that at no point does Mr Dearman discuss the trauma his children have suffered if indeed, they were forcibly coached to give false testimony against him. Given the BBC's own complicity in covering up paedophile activity, we the Public authority have very little confidence in the corporation's involvement in this case.

If anything, our suspicions are further increased by the BBC's patent support of Mr Dearman and especially considering all the many failings of professionals involved in this case. We feel the BBC has behaved with bias against the public as a legally recognised competent authority because at NO POINT do they bother to acknowledge that the public has a RIGHT to be very concerned about the risk posed by multiple, paedophile professionals in power and authority over our nation's children.

The British public have a LEGAL RIGHT to be SURE that children are NOT being abused by authorities we are expected to TRUST. Basically, the BBC are supporting Justice Pauffley's decision that the

public is "evil and foolish" for showing any interest and concern in this case. That is an outrageous stance to take when we consider the ongoing and very serious levels of child trafficking and abuse of children we KNOW is happening throughout the world and across Britain.

HOW are British police ever to combat crimes against children unless victims report allegations and/or the public support them with reports of evidence and suspicions? HOW are those allegations and suspicions and evidences EVER going to achieve results of arrests and convictions if authorities REPEATEDLY REFUSE TO INVESTIGATE ON THE GROUNDS THAT THE ALLEGATIONS ARE "IMPROBABLE"?

Indeed, it is noticeable that NONE of the alleged abusers came out and publicly defended themselves and declared their innocence when the allegations were made public; 200 people? Certainly enough of them to present a united front in a public declaration of innocence. Instead, they all quietly scuttle away, close down their FB accounts and/or changing their names and jobs: Their collective silence on the issue of them all being suspected of child sexual abuse and murder is NOT a sign of innocence.

Why no public statement of reassurance issued by the head teacher and teachers of Christchurch School?

We cannot forget that: **Mr Dearman, an alleged paedophile and baby killer was unable to make any contact with his children for a whole year, due to his need of therapy for domestic violence and all of this via 'involvement on the part of the London Borough of Camden; in December 2008 [when] a core assessment was prepared. Between May 2010 and October 2013, therapeutic sessions occurred intermittently at the Tavistock Clinic.'**

Motive & Intent

In conclusion, we contend that there is both motive and intent on part of all the aforementioned accused to conspire in their united efforts toward controlling and silencing victims/witnesses via the secrecy prescriptive of the Family Courts whose powers are simultaneously, suspected to being used as a weapon against a very concerned mother and her McKenzie Friend. That manifests as a very serious loophole in the Family Court Justice system, for surely the prime purpose of these Courts is to PROTECT children?

Because our suspicions are in GOOD FAITH according to all available evidence, we now doubt the legal foundations of the Family Courts and their strict adherence to "privacy"/secrecy as an important aspect of child protection. This case exposes the manner in which a system founded on secrecy can be infiltrated by abusers and employed toward protecting abusers and providing a continual supply of victims.

The very fact that suspicions EXIST concerning the probabilities and possibilities of the myriad ways in which Family Court secrecy can be exploited by abusive professionals, is a legal and valid point of EVIDENCE against the validity of those Courts in terms of EU Directives on child protection and

doubly so, when we have absolute undeniable evidence that thousands of professional people in positions of public trust HAVE BEEN and ARE engaged in abuse of children.

It is precisely because so MANY professional people are implicated in this case that we have even more valid reason to suspect an Establishment desires for a cover-up. Certainly in event of the children's allegations being proven true, this would be a huge public scandal and the very structure of the Family Court System. With so many professionals named and shamed, public trust and confidence in British authorities would be left in tatters.

This possibility itself constitutes further provision of motive and intent toward committing the crime of a cover up, thereby leaving untold numbers of vulnerable children at serious risk.

Essentially, to take part in or uphold an Establishment conspiracy for solidarity in the face of possible public discovery of so much collective criminality against children, it is an act of terror against the most vulnerable members of our society whom the Established Authorities are TRUSTED to serve and protect under a LAWFUL system of power.

We feel the motive and intent for alleged abusers to use their powers to cover up their crimes is far greater than the motive and intent behind a mother and her partner's decision to abusively coach her own children to report such detailed and horrific allegations. Certainly, in reporting the allegations, Ella Draper at no point stood to gain or profit in ANY way except to be ASSURED her children and others were SAFE.

Ella Draper's motive and intent in this case most strongly show her to be acting purely out of concerns for child safety and certainly, she had tried every means possible before this case went public.

While it is regrettable that alleged abusers if innocent, have had to face negative publicity, it is very unfair to judge the mother and her McKenzie Friend as having behaved "maliciously" in their decision to go public. It is not the fault of victims of abuse if the accused suffer resulting shame and suspicion. It was NOT the fault of mother or her McKenzie Friend that police FAILED to immediately investigate and that the Family Courts supported their lack of action.

It is in fact, NEGLIGENT Authorities who have by their inaction necessitated the publication of this case. Already it may have been too late for a reliable investigation, all alleged abusers having most likely and possibly been forewarned regarding the children's disclosures long before the case went public. It is equally likely/possible they were relying on Family Court powers to keep this whole case a secret from the British public. In the 6-month interim between the original allegations and their publication online many alleged abusers have taken steps to conceal their identities and/or have changed jobs etc.

Certainly, we cannot deny, that all alleged abusers were very likely/possibly forewarned about the children's disclosures long before this case went public and it is equally likely/possible they were relying on Family Court powers to keep this whole case a secret from the British public; in the

interim between allegations and publicity, all alleged abusers have taken steps to conceal their online identities and/or have changed jobs etc.

We cannot fail to accept the FACT that Ella Draper put herself at risk of imprisonment for sake of protecting her own and other children. She has since lost all contact with her children. Is THAT a "motive" for "coaching" her children to tell lies i.e. so she might lose contact with them permanently? Or, is she psychologically deranged?

No evidence of any mental health problems on the mother's side has been presented. What HAS been presented is evidence of Mr Dearman's severe mental health problems. It is an important point to consider in this case, because our judgment must fall on side of one scenario or the other: Either the children were forcibly coached, or, they were accurately reporting their experiences of abuse.

The evidence presented in this Report overwhelmingly validates cause for concern around original allegations and therefore, fundamentally questions the validity of the retractions and raises suspicions of crime and conspiracy around all the accused in this case.

In such a scenario of the multiple commission of and concealment of crimes against children, a 'united front' of officialdom through its stance is telling the British public that the perpetrators of these hideous crimes are more important and valuable than our CHILDREN! Of what use to society are these officials and professionals if they conspire to protect those exploiting their own positions of trust to abuse and harm children? Why does any public need an Authority that protects child abusers and silences their victims and indeed, collectively conspires to bury those crimes under a veil of secrecy?

Legal Directives

In the absence of due process of law, the Public cannot know for sure who in authority is either complicit or not complicit in supporting paedophile rings. We feel very strongly, therefore, that the secrecy shrouding the whole issue of child abuse must end. We, the public need to know all the facts concerning crimes against children in order to be more aware, more vigilant, more rapid and more systematic in reporting suspicions.

Keeping the issue in a kind of "twilight zone" is NOT helping or protecting the children, this approach is in fact discouraging reports of abuse as there is a predetermined social emphasis on disbelief toward witnesses. This is the exact OPPOSITE of the legal EU Directives: Witnesses reporting crimes against children are legally afforded absolute credibility and as mentioned earlier, police approach is to consider all suspects guilty until proven innocent.

The lawful approach NEEDS to be with emphasis of credibility given to witnesses and victims because of the insidious nature of this crime and the absolute fact that paedophiles commonly operate in gangs and are often people of means, power and influence. Threats and fear are an underlying and very real issue for concern.

During the course of our analysis of evidence, facts and circumstances as well as considering all of those in light of probability and possibility surrounding this case, we have proven beyond reasonable doubt that there is genuine, good faith and justification for our suspicions and serious concerns for children who remain in the care of allegedly abusive parties.

In ignoring or brushing aside the probabilities and possibilities presented by the already-available corroborating evidence in this case (and more is emerging on an almost daily basis) and in swallowing without question the children's retractions, Justice Pauffley has by the same token declined to consider the consequences for these children and many others in similar positions should she have drastically got matters wrong. There is an unacceptable level of hubris in her swinging condemnation of the mother and her associates and her haughty condemnation of members of the public continuing to exercise our own discernment and knowledge of the case in asking questions and demanding answers as is our right under EU law. We very strongly feel that Justice Pauffley's judgment cannot be given ANY legal credibility among British Police; Justice Pauffley herself is now a SUSPECT in this case.

In light of the above, it is clear that the Metropolitan Police need now to make a choice: do you serve EU Child Protection Law & Directives or do you serve the suspect and possibly corrupted UK Family Courts which are operating in IGNORANCE of EU law and are proven to be so via the facts and handling of this case alone?

Legally, you have only ONE option and that is to serve the Law and when it comes to national and international crimes against children and investigating an alleged national and international paedophile ring engaged in baby trafficking and murder, EU Law takes absolute precedence over UK Law and the UK Family Courts. It is therefore your legal duty to immediately ACT and take immediate steps toward protecting children and investigating suspects.

Finally, the Police are forewarned that this case is being presented before the EU Institutions as further evidence of Britain's infringement of EU Child Protection Laws. The public as 'competent authority' in this case, is taking note of all UK authorities' lack of action as evidence of either criminal negligence and/or complicity in paedophile activity, murder and child trafficking.

It is profoundly to be hoped that a consortium of '**Police Against Child Abuse**' will be keen to ensure that the Home Office commissions a special investigation into a special case with immediate effect in the new Parliament.

Deborah Mahmoudieh and Sabine K McNeill

19 May 2015

Edited by Belinda McKenzie