

Corte Appello PERUGIA

Da: jacob beans [s0501927@stu.newi.ac.uk]
 Inviato: venerdì 30 settembre 2011 2.56
 A: Corte Appello PERUGIA
 Oggetto: please read its important Si prega di leggere il suo importante

Amanda knox lied about not being there at the time of the murder Patrick was correct who took the stand and gave his testimony. when she was arrested in 2007 she claimed at the start that she was there which is correct .! she met Rudy a number of occasions which is in the court records from the 2009 trial.

when i looked at the court records there was not one statement about Rudy nothing at all. !! even though we know Rudy killed Meredith which is correct and raped Meredith The knife is the correct knife which was the prosecution says the cuts on Meredith are not right for the blade this is untrue as Meredith has more thicker skin due to being west Indian and the climate is different there which tends to make the wombs more thicker and smaller when healing and exposed to air and sunlight. ! when Amanda has been in jail since 2007 and she has had 2 years to think about this. ! when people in prison for crimes they seem to have really brilliance in thinking and detail as well. They have nothing but time to think .!! and Amanda knows exactly what happened that night and shes not saying anything she needs to be held in jail untill she comes up with the truth and tells the truth to the court to what happened on that night. ! The only other theory is she was forced to take part in the sex games .! and wont come clean about this. the time from the student house to Raffs appartment is about 5 minuets walk .!! so DO NOT RELEASE HER OUT OF JAIL UNTILL SHE COMES UP WITH THE TRUTH ON WHAT HAPPENED GIVE HER THE SAME SENTENCE AS RUDY UNTILL SHE PROVES OTHERWISE TO THE COURT. She knows more than what she says. ! This is not fair to the Kercher Family i dont see this being right to let her go untill the truth comes out as everybody wants to the truth and she should not be released at all. !! she never said one thing about Rudy in her statements even though he killed poor Meredith. !!

Amanda Knox ha mentito di non essere lì al momento del delitto Patrick era corretta, che ha preso la parola e ha dato la sua testimonianza. quando è stata arrestata nel 2007 ha affermato all'inizio che lei era lì che è corretto. ! Rudy ha incontrato in diverse occasioni che è in atti processuali dello studio 2009.
 quando ho guardato il casellario giudiziale non è stata una dichiarazione di Rudy niente affatto. ! anche se sappiamo Rudy uccisero Meredith che è corretto e violentata Meredith Il coltello è il coltello che è stato corretto l'accusa dice che i tagli su Meredith non è giusto per la lama questo è falso come Meredith ha la pelle più spessa a causa di essere occidentale indiana e la il clima è diverso c'è che tende a rendere l'utero più spesse e più piccole quando la guarigione ed esposta all'aria e alla luce solare. ! quando Amanda è in carcere dal 2007 e ha avuto 2 anni per pensare a questo. ! quando la gente in prigione per crimini che sembrano avere davvero brillantezza di pensiero e di dettaglio, come pure. Non hanno nulla, ma tempo per pensare. ! Amanda e sa esattamente cosa è successo quella notte e shes non dire nulla ha bisogno di essere tenuti in prigione fino a quando lei si presenta con la verità e dice la verità al tribunale per quello che è successo quella notte. ! L'unica altra teoria è stata costretta a prendere parte ai giochi di sesso. ! e di solito vengono puliti di questo. il tempo dalla casa dello studente a Raffs appartamento è di circa 5 minuetti piedi. ! così non la STAMPA DA CARCERE FINO A LEI VIENE CON LA VERITA 'su quanto accaduto darle stessa frase RUDY Fino a quando non dimostri il contrario ALLA CORTE. Lei sa più di quello che dice. ! Questo non è giusto per la famiglia Kercher non vedo questo diritto è quello di lasciarla andare fino a quando la verità viene fuori come tutti vogliono la verità e non dovrebbe essere rilasciato a tutti. ! lei non ha mai detto una cosa su Rudy nelle sue dichiarazioni, anche se ha ucciso povera Meredith. !

thanks Andrew Greenwood F.D.S.c

Corte Appello PERUGIA

Da: jacob beans [s0501927@stu.newi.ac.uk]
Inviato: venerdì 30 settembre 2011 3.08
A: Corte Appello PERUGIA
Oggetto: RE: please read its important Si prega di leggere il suo importante

Knox Testimony, Audio #3[End of break.]

CP: Thank you, signor Presidente.

AK: Ummm, I would like to speak in Italian. Thank you.

GCM: Yes, yes. As we said at the beginning. But if you should have any uncertainty, you may return to the language more familiar to you.

AK: Very good.

GCM: But if you speak in Italian, we obtain a more immediate perception of what you are saying. Go ahead, avvocato.

CP: Signorina Amanda, listen. On the evening of November 1, 2007, did you hear Meredith, poor Meredith, scream?

AK: No.

CP: In the interrogation of November 6, 2007, at 5:45, you declared that before she died, you heard Meredith scream. How could you know that Meredith screamed before she was killed? Who told you?

AK: So when I was with the police, they asked if I heard Meredith's scream. I said no. They said "But if you were there, how could you not hear her scream? If you were there?" I said "Look, I don't know, maybe I had my ears covered." So they said "Fine, we'll write that down. Fine."

CP: [louder] But I can tell you that on November 6, the police did not know that Meredith screamed before she died, so why would they suggest it to you?

AK: I imagine that maybe they were imagining how it might have been.

GCM: Fine, we can ask questions, but excuse me, avvocato, always with a tone that is reasonably --

CP: [even louder, cutting in] So the police suggested it to you?

GCM: Avvocato, avvocato, but please keep your tone reasonable calm.

[Voices]

CP: Is there an objection? I think the microphone is too near.

GCM: Ask question without having to be warned--

CP: Okay, okay. You're right, Presidente, but the microphone was too near.

GCM: In a cordial manner.

CP: I'm sorry, Presidente.

GCM: Fine. Go ahead.

CP: Before Meredith died, did you cover your ears?

AK: No.

CP: Why at 5:45am on November 6 did you state that before she died you covered your ears?

AK: In my confusion, under the pressure of the police, I had to follow a reasoning that they had suggested to me, saying that I should have heard a scream of Meredith. The fact that I couldn't remember this fact suggested that I must have covered my ears. So I followed that reasoning.

CP: Did they hit you to make you say this?

AK: They hit me twice, before I said the name of Patrick, to make me say a name that I couldn't give.

CP: You declared that you remained in the house in via della Pergola, in the kitchen. Were you in the kitchen when Meredith died?

AK: No.

CP: Who told you? Who suggested that to you?

AK: I kept following their suggestions. They asked me if I was in her room when she was killed. I said no. They said but where were you? I said I don't know. They said, maybe you were in the kitchen. I said, fine.

CPL: How long, during your time in the Questura, were you confused?

AK: The whole interrogation lasted so long, and the whole time I said I had nothing to do with all this and that I remembered being at Raffaele's place. But they yelled at me for so long. The development of this state of confusion followed the fact that for hours and hours and hours, they called me a stupid liar. I don't know what to call it, a state of confusion, because in the end I was just confused, I was confused for a little while, but I didn't even know what to be confused about. It was very strange. I was under pressure.

CP: So you confirm that the police told you that Meredith screamed and that you covered your ears.

AK: They asked me if I had heard a scream. I said no. They said it couldn't be possible, because if I was there, I must have heard her scream or something. How could I possibly not have--

GCM: Excuse me, avvocato, but this question has already been asked and answered.

CP: Let's talk about November 5. Okay, on November 5 you met Patrick in front of the Università per Stranieri.

AK: After class, yes.

CP: Can you tell us about that meeting and what you said to each other?

AK: So, I was on my way to Raffaele's house, and I crossed Piazza Grimana and he was standing outside of the Università per Stranieri. He joined me, and asked me "How are you, what's going on, where have you been?" and all that. "Do you want to talk to journalists?" I said no, I wasn't doing well, I couldn't really talk to them, the police told me not to talk to them. Then he asked me about the police, for example. I told him they were interrogating me and I couldn't talk. Then I asked him, I told him I didn't feel like going out at night, I didn't feel like going to work. He said that was okay. That's all. Then I went to Raffaele's house.

CP: Is it true that Patrick asked you on that morning only if you wanted to talk to the La Stampa Straniera?

AK: No. He also asked me what the police had been asking me.

CP: For what reason did you go to the Questura on November 5? Were you called?

AK: No, I wasn't called. I went with Raffaele because I didn't want to be alone.

CP: Were you scared?

AK: In general, yes.

CP: You went to the Questura because you were scared?

AK: I was always with Raffaele because I was scared.

CP: But I tell you that in your spontaneous declarations to the GIP you said you came to the Questura because you were scared.

GCM: Yes, that's what she said.

CP: You were scared. Of whom?

GCM: The question is: Of whom were you scared? [The interpreter says: "Who were you afraid of?"]

AK: When I talked with my family after everything that happened, sometimes in the Questura or outside, my stepfather told me to be very, very careful, because maybe if someone could know Meredith was alone at home on that night, he might have been observing the house, then this person might also know how to find me, and he could be nuts. And I was scared because they hadn't caught the person who did this. And I was just scared in general to be alone.

CP: Were you scared of Rudy?

AK: Of Rudy? No.

CP: That evening, did you go to the Questura to accuse Patrick? [The interpreter translates: "On that evening, you went to the Questura to meet Patrick? Especially to meet Patrick?"]

AK: To meet Patrick? At the Questura?

CP: Not to meet -- to accuse!

LG or CDV: I object to this question. I object to this attempt to suggest an answer. She already said why she went to the Questura. She explained it twice.

GCM: That is true. She has already explained why she went to the Questura on the evening of the 5th.

CP: Okay, let's talk about your memorandum of November 6.

AK: Okay.

CP: Did you, on the morning of November 6, ask the agents of the judicial police for paper to write on?

AK: Yes.

CP: Did you also spontaneously ask for a pen?

AK: Yes.

CPL In what language did you write your memorandum?

AK: In English.

CP: When you wrote it, were the contents suggested to you by the police?

AK: No. It wasn't. I wrote it to explain my confusion to the police. Because when I told them that I wasn't sure, and that I didn't want to sign their declaration, and that I thought it was all a big mistake, they didn't want to listen. When I told them that I wasn't sure, they said that I would remember everything later, that I should be patient, and keep trying to remember. I was feeling uncomfortable about these declarations that I had made, so I asked for paper to explain my confusion, because I really wasn't sure.

CP: When did you write the memorandum? More or less?

AK: I don't remember.

CP: In the late morning? After you were served with an arrest warrant? Towards midday?

AK: Well, I was still in the Questura.

CP: Yes, but in the late morning? Of the 6th?

AK: You know, there was so much confusion during the night, and so many hours of interrogation, that my sense of time was gone.

CP: When you wrote the memorandum, were you hit by police?

AK: When?

CP: When you wrote the memorandum. Were you hit by police?

AK: No.

CP: Mistreated?

AK: No.

CP: Did the police suggest the contents?

AK: No.

CP: You gave it to them freely?

AK: Yes.

CP: Voluntarily?

AK: Yes.

CP: Listen, in this memorandum, you say that you confirm the declarations you made the night before about what might have happened at your house with Patrick. Why did you freely and spontaneously confirm these declarations?

AK: Because I was no longer sure what was my imagination and what was real. So I wanted to say that I was confused, and that I couldn't know. But at the same time, I knew I had signed those declarations. So I wanted to say that I knew I had made those declarations, but I was confused and not sure.

CP: But in fact, you were sure that Patrick was innocent?

AK: No, I wasn't sure.

CP: Why?

AK: Because I was confused! I imagined that it might have happened. I was confused.

CP: Did you see Patrick on November 1, yes or no?

AK: No.

CP: Did you meet him?

AK: No.

CP: Then why did you say that you saw him, met him, and walked home with him?

AK: Because the police and the interpreter told me that maybe I just wasn't remembering these things, but I had to try to remember. It didn't matter if I thought I was imagining it. I would remember it with time. So, the fact that I actually remembered something else was confusing to me. Because I remembered one thing, but under the pressure of the police, I forced myself to imagine another. I was confused. I was trying to explain this confusion, because they were making me accuse someone I didn't want to accuse.

CP: Okay, let's talk about your conversation on November 10 with your mother.

AK: Yes.

CP: Did you ever tell your mother, in English, that you felt horrible because Patrick was in prison because of your fault?

AK: Yes, so many times.

CP: Did you say it on November 10?

AK: I don't remember the dates, but I talked about it with my mother, yes.

CP: So if you were perfectly aware that Patrick was in prison by your fault, that he was innocent, why didn't you tell the penitentiary police?

AK: Well, it's true that after several days in prison, I did come to realize that what I had imagined was nothing but imagination, not a confusion of reality. So I realized that he wasn't guilty of these things, and I felt really really bad that he had been arrested.

CP: Why didn't you tell the penitentiary police?

LG: She told them, she wrote it!

* CP: Excuse me, I'm asking a question! And she didn't tell them!
I'm sorry! She didn't tell them, avvocato Ghirga!

GCM: [simultaneously, trying to stop them] Please, please. Let's avoid these arguments. Listen, excuse me, avvocato. You have the right to object to question. Some have already been made, and the Court will decide. But these dialogues between lawyers are not allowed.

LG and CP [at the same time]: You are right, Presidente. Yes, sorry, sorry.

GCM: And the tone of the questions should always remain cordial.

LG: I accept the reproof. He asked why she didn't tell the penitentiary police. May I object to this question? She wrote it in the memorandum of the 7th, on the following morning, to the police that were around her. She wrote it, it is in the dossier of this trial!

CP: That is not true!

* [Background talking]

GCM: Excuse me, excuse me, but this question is not admitted because it was already asked, avvocato. It's the second time. Please avoid repetitions, also because the examination of the accused is certainly tiring, so if we could limit the--

CP: We can suspend proceedings, Presidente.

GCM: We could also suspend proceedings, but the indication is to avoid repeating questions that were already asked by the same party.

CP: All right.

GCM: Go ahead.

CP: In the memorandum of the 7th, why didn't you mention Patrick?

AK: I think I thought that everything would be clear since I had written that everything I had said in the Questura wasn't true. So that meant also the fact that Patrick--

CP: But you didn't mention Patrick.

AK: I said what I had done myself, and that was the important thing. The fact that I hadn't been with him, for me that showed that I couldn't say what had happened that night, in the house. I could only say what happened to me, and the fact was that I wasn't with him.

GCM: Excuse me, avvocato, where is this document?

CP: It's there, Knox's defense produced it, the memorandum from the 7th.

GCM: The 7th.

LG? Yes, we acquired also the 7th.

GCM: So we have it. Go ahead.

CP: On the 7th you wrote "I didn't lie when I said the murderer might be Patrick." Why did you write that in your memorandum of the 7th?

AK: Honestly, I thought, like the police had told me -- the police had told me they had already found the guilty person. And they had suggested Patrick so much that I thought maybe it really was him. But apart from that, in that memorandum that I wrote in prison, the important thing for me was to tell what I knew, and what I knew was where I was on that evening.

CP: Patrick was in prison because of YOU! You didn't even say it to the PM on the 8th.

GCM: Excuse me, excuse me.

LG? I object to the way this question is posed! It contains value judgments that are not opportune. Guilt or fault is something which hasn't yet been determined. It can't be the object of a question.

GCM: That is the position of the Court. Questions should not contain evaluations.

CP: Signorina, more simply, this is my question.

GCM: Go ahead.

CP: In the memorandum of the 6th you name Patrick. On the 7th you write another memorandum confirming that Patrick is the assassin. But on the 10th, you tell your mother that you feel terrible because you got him put in prison and you know he is innocent. Do you confirm this?

AK: At the moment when I named Patrick, I didn't know if he was innocent or not. I only said it because I was following the suggestion of the police. But when I wrote in the memorandum that I couldn't accept the things I had said in the Questura, for me that meant I couldn't know whether he was the murderer or not, I could only know that I wasn't there.

CP: But then why on the 10th, three days later, did you say "I feel bad

about what I did to Patrick?" To your mother?

AK: Because I knew that they arrested him because I gave them his name. But they are the ones who suggested the name. They wanted me to accuse him, and I didn't like that.

CP: To your mother, in that telephone conversation, you say--

GCM: Excuse me, avvocato. To just return to this question. The defense is expressing his perplexity and we also feel it. You are saying: "I didn't know if Patrick was innocent or not." This is on the 6th and the 7th. But on the 10th, you essentially say that he's innocent. So what the defense lawyer is asking is, what happened in between to make you change your mind? To change your conviction about the role of Patrick? It's this.

AK: Well, yes. I knew he was in prison uniquely because of my words. At first I didn't know this. I thought the police somehow knew whether he was guilty or not. Since I didn't know, I was confused. But in the following days I realized that he was in prison only because of what I had said, and I felt guilty.

CP: Why didn't you tell the police this in the following days, or to the PM?

GCM: Excuse me, avvocato? The days following which day?

CP: I'm talking about the 10th of November. The day of the conversation with her mother? Why didn't you ever tell the police or the pubblico ministero?

AK: I had clearly written down in the memorandum that everything in my declarations couldn't be true because I didn't really remember them. And then, whenever police came to talk to give me paper or anything, they treated me like "Oh, so you have another truth now." So this was my way of telling them that nothing I had said in the Questura was usable.

CP: But you accused Patrick in the memorandum.

GCM: In which memorandum?

CP: In the ones of the 6th and 7th.

GCM: But chronologically, we had already gotten to the 10th.

CP: Okay, fine, let's talk about the 10th.

GCM: Yes. Change your question.

CP: I'll move forward.

GCM: Go ahead.

CP: I'll repeat my question. On the 10th, you said to your mother: "It's my fault that he's here. I feel terrible." Why didn't you say this to the pubblico ministero?

LG? I object! He's already asked this question. And it was answered.

GCM: Yes. It was already asked.

CP: Yes, but she hasn't answered!

LG? Yes, she HAS answered!

CP: Can she answer? I didn't understand.

GCM: Excuse me, excuse me. Please.

CP: I didn't understand her answer, President. Can you explain?

GCM: So, the question was asked and has been asked again because--

CP: [speaking over him] Because I didn't understand the answer!

GCM: --the defense lawyer has not understood why -- in what regards the police, the accused has said that when they came to bring her paper, they said "Oh, another truth," so her relations with them were such that she did not feel that she could tell them this circumstance. It remains to ask why she did not tell the pubblico ministero. This is what the lawyer is asking. For what concerns the police, we have heard her position and her answer. We're talking about the period after the 10th of November, when this conversation with the mother was recorded. In what concerns the pubblico ministero, the lawyer is asking you why you didn't feel the necessity, like with your mother, of telling him that Patrick Lumumba, as far as you were concerned, had nothing to do with all this.

AK: We are talking about when I was in front of the judge?

GCM: After the 10th of November.

AK: Frankly, I didn't have good relations with the police after that period, nor with the pubblico ministero, because he also had suggested declarations that got written down in the declarations. I didn't know where to turn. I felt better talking to my defense than to the police.

CP: Excuse me, but apart from your mother, who else did you tell about this?

AK: I wrote it down, and I also told my lawyers.

CP: Can you be a bit clearer about this?

AK: You mean about whom I told?

CP: I mean about the fact that Patrick had nothing to do with the crime and was in prison because of you. As you yourself said. Who did you tell besides your mother?

AK: I also told my lawyers.

CP: And in the Tribunale degli Esame, why didn't you say that Patrick had nothing to do with it?

GCM: Avvocato, avvocato, please, let's avoid this. Or at least give a chronological reference.

CP: I think I'm talking about November 30th. On November 30, you were in front of the Tribunale degli Esame. Why didn't you declare this circumstance, that Patrick was foreign to all this, totally innocent?

AK: So, that date is when I arrived here, to the Camera di Consiglio?

CP: Yes.

AK: That's it. So I said, I made a spontaneous declaration in front of those judges, saying that I was very upset about the fact that Patrick had been put in prison because of me. I said that. If I'm not mistaken.

CP: Listen, the first time you ever actually said that Patrick had nothing to do with it, when was it? Do you remember? Of these people you told, was it to your lawyers? Or was it your mother on the phone on the 10th?

AK: That Patrick had nothing to do with it? I imagined that he was innocent because--

CP: But when did you said it for the first time? In the phone call with your mother on November 10th?

AK: I don't know when the first time I told someone was.

GCM: Excuse me. Before you told your mother, did you tell anyone else?

AK: Yes, I wrote it in my memorandum of the 7th.

[End Audio #3]

From: s0501927@stu.newi.ac.uk

To: ca.perugia@giustizia.it

Subject: please read its important Si prega di leggere il suo importante

Date: Fri, 30 Sep 2011 00:56:17 +0000

Amanda Knox lied about not being there at the time of the murder Patrick was correct who took the stand and gave his testimony. when she was arrested in 2007 she claimed at the start that she was there which is correct. ! she met Rudy a number of occasions which is in the court records from the 2009 trial. when i looked at the court records there was not one statement about Rudy nothing at all. !! even though we know Rudy killed Meredith which is correct and raped Meredith The knife is the correct knife which was the prosecution says the cuts on Meredith are not right for the blade this is untrue as Meredith has more thicker skin due to being west Indian and the climate is different there which tends to make the wounds more thicker and smaller when healing and exposed to air and sunlight. ! when Amanda has been in jail since 2007 and she has had 2 years to think about this. ! when people in prison for crimes they seem to have really brilliance in thinking and detail as well. They have nothing but time to think. !! and Amanda knows exactly what happened that night and shes not saying anything she needs to be held in jail untill she comes up with the truth and tells the truth to the court to what happened on that night. ! The only other theory is she was forced to take part in the sex games. ! and wont come clean about this. the time from the student house to Raffa's apartment is about 5 minutes walk. !! so DO NOT RELEASE HER OUT OF JAIL UNTILL SHE COMES UP WITH THE TRUTH ON WHAT HAPPENED GIVE HER THE SAME SENTENCE AS RUDY UNTILL SHE PROVES OTHERWISE TO THE COURT. She knows more than what she says. ! This is not fair to the Kercher Family i dont see this being right to let her go untill the truth comes out as everybody wants to the truth and she should not be released at all. !! she never said one thing about Rudy in her statements even though he killed poor Meredith. !!

Amanda Knox ha mentito di non essere lì al momento del delitto Patrick era corretta, che ha preso la parola e ha dato la sua testimonianza. quando è stata arrestata nel 2007 ha affermato all'inizio che lei era lì che è corretto. ! Rudy ha

• incontrato in diverse occasioni che è in atti processuali dello studio 2009.

quando ho guardato il casellario giudiziale non è stata una dichiarazione di Rudy niente affatto. ! anche se sappiamo Rudy uccisero Meredith che è corretto e violentata Meredith Il coltello è il coltello che è stato corretto l'accusa dice che i tagli su Meredith non è giusto per la lama questo è falso come Meredith ha la pelle più spessa a causa di essere occidentale indiana e la il clima è diverso c'è che tende a rendere l'utero più spesse e più piccole quando la guarigione ed esposta all'aria e alla luce solare. ! quando Amanda è in carcere dal 2007 e ha avuto 2 anni per pensare a questo. ! quando la gente in prigione per crimini che sembrano avere davvero brillantezza di pensiero e di dettaglio, come pure. Non hanno nulla, ma tempo per pensare. ! Amanda e sa esattamente cosa è successo quella notte e shes non dire nulla ha bisogno di essere tenuti in prigione fino a quando lei si presenta con la verità e dice la verità al tribunale per quello che è successo quella notte. ! L'unica altra teoria è stata costretta a prendere parte ai giochi di sesso. ! e di solito vengono puliti di questo. il tempo dalla casa dello studente a Raffe appartamento è di circa 5 minuetti piedi. ! così non la STAMPA DA CARCERE FINO A LEI VIENE CON LA VERITA 'su quanto accaduto darle stessa frase RUDY Fino a quando non dimostri il contrario ALLA CORTE. Lei sa più di quello che dice. ! Questo non è giusto per la famiglia Kercher non vedo questo diritto è quello di lasciarla andare fino a quando la verità viene fuori come tutti vogliono la verità e non dovrebbe essere rilasciato a tutti. ! lei non ha mai detto una cosa su Rudy nelle sue dichiarazioni, anche se ha ucciso povera Meredith. !

thanks Andrew Greenwood F.D.S.c