

[Amanda](#) says:

[February 16, 2014 at 16:43](#)

Hi Cinnamon,

1. Raffaele and Guede had never met each other. This was brought up in court as part of our defense. The prosecution has always felt that this was irrelevant, however, because Raffaele and Guede were supposedly obsessed with me and would do whatever I said. Or, more recently, the prosecution softened up that accusation with the theory that they committed murder out of "solidarity".
2. The hard drives destroyed were Meredith's, Raffaele's, Filomena's, and mine. I can't speak for everyone else's computers, but I can say that, at the very least, I had pictures on my computer from the few weeks I had lived in Perugia demonstrating my friendship with Meredith.
3. The defense has also brought up Raffaele's computer activity to demonstrate our alibi. However, the prosecution has argued to push back the time of the murder to after 11:30 p.m. even if this contradicting the results of her autopsy (in relation to her stomach contents).
4. Yes, Guede's Skype conversation was also submitted to the court by the defense as evidence.

[Amanda](#) says:

[February 16, 2014 at 12:52](#)

redsoxfan,

There were no fights in our apartment. Meredith once talked to me about the toilets needing to be brushed clean every time they were used, but this was a calm, friendly exchange. Please read the testimonies of my other housemates and Meredith's British friends for confirmation that no fights ever occurred.

Thank you,

a

[Amanda](#) says:

[February 16, 2014 at 08:08](#)

Hi jack slacker,

The day after the murder I had a hickey on my neck, NOT a scratch. I was not hiding my neck, and no one noted a scratch in the days leading up to my arrest. It was only months later that Laura Mezzetti came forward to suggest the hickey had been a scratch, because her memory had been tainted by the prosecution's publicity of the investigation. I did NOT have a ripped ear. I had pierced my ears multiple times in late October, so I was still caring/cleaning the piercings, but I never made the excuse that a piercing had been ripped.

My lamp was the only light source for MY room, but not Meredith's. Her room had an overhead light, and only one window that looked out into the forested valley. If, as you suggest, I were looking for something in the aftermath of the murder, I could have easily and more reasonably used the overhead light to see, rather than drag around my own side-table lamp. Furthermore, if I had been in that room, I would have left traces of myself. My guess is that Meredith borrowed my lamp, perhaps with the intention to read while in bed.

In the police station I was already pacing, swearing, shaking my head, and uttering, "I can't believe it," long before fingerprinting occurred, when everyone was together and just being questioned. I was upset over what I was learning about Meredith's death. I became upset when they asked me to look for missing knives in my house because it made the horror of her death so much more real. It was overwhelming. I was near delirious with exhaustion and fear when the police were interrogating me and confronting me with lies. I couldn't understand what was happening.

Aviello also testified in this latest appeal that the prosecution had forced him to sign the recantation of his testimony against his brother and the accusation against Raffaele (that he had been paid by Raffaele to testify). He said the prosecution had threatened that if he didn't sign this new testimony, they were going to charge him with perjury and furthermore make it impossible for him to undergo a sex change. he reiterated his accusation against his brother in court.

Do you have any further questions?

a

[Amanda](#) says:

[February 16, 2014 at 12:49](#)

jack slacker,

I did not kill Meredith Kercher.

What my defense team has put forth to the courts are facts. The evolution of this case proves how disintegrated and contorted the prosecution's case is. The investigation has received legitimate criticism not only from me, but from court-appointed experts.

I don't go out of my way to respond to all of the websites that repeat a mantra of unreliable information. I do, however, respond to questions posed to me. This is what I've done here with you today.

I'm sorry my attempts to communicate with you have served no purpose.
a

[Amanda](#) says:

[February 16, 2014 at 08:28](#)

jack slacker,

Because I lived in the house and made regular use of its facilities, my DNA was already there in the bathroom, the hallway between my room and the bathroom, and all common rooms. The trace of Meredith's and my DNA in Filomena's room was not a footprint and tested negative for blood. It is irrelevant.

Those who present evidence must guarantee the reliability of that evidence. Reliability is assured when protocol is followed, because contamination is a legitimate concern when processing DNA evidence. The investigators not only broke protocol by collecting evidence with dirty gloves, but the choice to collect further DNA evidence after the crime scene had been disturbed by further entrances by non-forensic investigators was absolutely illogical, unacceptable, and desperate.

Meredith's DNA could never be determined to be on the kitchen knife. The prosecution's very own equipment told them the LCN DNA was not a reliable trace given the equipment available. Advances in technology now cannot account for the technology of the time. The prosecution never could have asserted that Meredith's DNA was on that knife, and by doing so they committed a desperate act of perjury that was only uncovered when the defense was finally granted access to certain amounts of the documentation, which the prosecution desperately tried to hide. Furthermore, the kitchen knife does not correspond with Meredith's stab wounds, nor the bloody imprint of the knife on the bed sheet, and it never left Raffaele's apartment because I didn't carry his kitchen knife with me EVER.

[Amanda](#) says:

[February 16, 2014 at 08:35](#)

The footprint in blood on the bathmat is not Raffaele's. The measurements and qualities of the footprint correspond with Rudy Guede's feet and not Raffaele's, particularly the placement of the toes. This desperate attempt by the prosecution to attribute SOMETHING to Raffaele resembles their attempt to assign Rudy Guede's shoe print to Raffaele, which was also proven wrong. Similarly, the partial footprint which the investigators attribute to a female-sized foot has been proven to be simply a partial footprint from Rudy Guede's same shoe — it corresponds

with the markings. Again, the investigators are desperately trying to force the evidence against Rudy Guede on Raffaele and me.

All luminol footprints attributed to Raffaele and me tested negative for blood and were found to have Meredith's and my DNA, which means that, had they been made in blood, they would have tested positive (tests for blood are even more sensitive than tests for DNA). Furthermore, where would we have picked Meredith's blood up with our feet if not in Meredith's bedroom? But there are no traces of our DNA or hand prints or footprints in Meredith's blood.

Do you believe investigators whose careers depend upon not admitting their terrible mistakes, or do you believe independent experts who have nothing at stake?

[Amanda](#) says:

[February 16, 2014 at 08:38](#)

No one cleaned the house or the crime scene after the murder occurred. This is a desperate suggestion by the prosecution to account for there being no traces of Raffaele and me that should be there had we committed the crime with Rudy Guede. It is impossible to identify and clean genetic traces of certain individuals and not others. Furthermore, even clean-ups and stagings leave their traces: DNA, signs of wiping/cleaning...which does not exist in this case.

[Amanda](#) says:

[February 16, 2014 at 11:09](#)

DW,

No one cleaned the house or staged the body or a break-in. There are no signs of wiping away blood or DNA. There is no evidence of Raffaele or I maneuvering through the room. There is no indication that Meredith's body was manipulated if not in the course of the assault itself. There is no indication that Filomena's window was broken after her room had been rifled through (such as broken glass on top of the clothing, as the prosecution claimed but could not demonstrate). The only reason no obvious possessions were missing was because the burglary was interrupted by Meredith's arrival.

The claim that there must have been a clean-up and a staging of the body and a break-in arose because the objective evidence available at the crime scene did not correspond with the prosecution's theory. Rather, there was a distinct lack of objective evidence that must have existed were the prosecution's theory correct.

[Amanda](#) says:

[February 16, 2014 at 08:43](#)

Meredith was physically fit, but she was also petite and would have been overpowered by a physically fit male armed with a knife. She had defensive wounds — those bruises over her body and those cuts to her hands.

A single witness testified that she overheard a scream and multiple people running from the crime scene. However, when and if she heard anything is debatable, because she awoke from sleep to use the restroom without checking the time and because her windows were closed. Her daughter, who lived with her, didn't hear anything.

Other witnesses, a young couple, who were actually outside, testified that a young black man was fleeing from the direction of the crime scene and almost pushed them over in his hurry to escape. They did not see or hear any other persons fleeing.

[Amanda](#) says:

[February 16, 2014 at 11:18](#)

jack slacker,

The burglary was not staged.

The choice of entry depended upon the limitation of the choices available. Laura Mezzetti's windows were barred, and the terrace was directly visible from the street. Meredith's bedroom window was too high to reach, as was mine. Filomena's bedroom window looked out over the driveway, which was only immediately visible if one bothered to look through our out-of-the-way gate or down from the parking lot above the adjacent street, which Guede was seen to have come from and would have known if anyone were there to see him. Below Filomena's window was a window with a grate that facilitated reach up to the windowsill. The glass broke into the room, suggesting the rock was thrown from outside. The rock rolled underneath the desk, I believe, a not obvious place to put it were someone staging the room.

Meredith's and my DNA were found on the floor in Filomena's room, but not in a recognizable shape like a footprint, and not in blood.

For further thoughts on clean-up and staging, please see my response to DW.

a

[Amanda](#) says:

[February 16, 2014 at 08:58](#)

First of all, it was not dark when the body was discovered. It was the middle the day and light would have been coming in through Meredith's bedroom window. Indeed, the first words I heard

were Filomena Romanelli's screams of "A foot!" and "Blood!" followed shortly by "Meredith!" Blood was plainly to be seen by those who observed the room, as was a foot protruding from beneath the comforter.

My first understanding of the crime scene given the testimonies of those who saw inside which were being exchanged outside the house was that a body, wrapped in a comforter, had been found inside Meredith's closet, the throat cut. This is what I believed had been found based on Filomena's friends' accounts, and this is what I told the police, until I was corrected by the police themselves. I never refused to identify who had told me these things. I always said it was Paola and Luca.

[Amanda](#) says:

[February 16, 2014 at 11:23](#)

Raffaele did not call the police after the police arrived at the cottage. This was proven by the video surveillance of the garage across the street from our driveway.

I suggest reading Raffaele's account of his interrogation in his book, *Honor Bound*, to understand how the interrogators manipulated him. I further suggest that you read my account of my own interrogation in my book, *Waiting to Be Heard*.

The interrogators methods of confusing and manipulating us were by-the-book methods of producing false confession. I suggest you look up Professor Saul Kassin's work on the subject.

I was abused, and unfortunately the only source for that knowledge comes from my word versus the interrogators'. This is because the prosecution claims no audio recording of the interrogation exists, despite the fact that in every other instance of questioning and secret surveillance in that very same room there exists an audio recording.

[Amanda](#) says:

[February 16, 2014 at 11:37](#)

1) I originally came home to take a quick shower and change before rejoining Raffaele for a weekend out to visit Gubbio. The front door left open was a surprise, but nothing meaningful was apparent to me just yet. I wasn't scanning the floor, so I didn't notice the faint traces of Guede's bloody shoe prints in the hallway. It was late morning that I undressed in my bedroom, so enough light was coming in through the window that I didn't need to turn on my lamp, so I didn't notice it missing. I noticed the speckles of blood in the sink before taking a shower, but again, nothing sinister was apparent to me. The splotch of blood, which I noticed on the bathmat as I stepped out of the shower, was more unusual, but again, not immediately alarming because it's a girls bathroom, after all. Only once I saw feces was in Filomena and Laura's toilet did I start adding everything together and get creeped out enough to call my mom on the way back to

Raffaele's place, ask Raffaele for advice, and call each of my roommates. I did not go about my day as if nothing had happened.

2) I don't remember Raffaele ever saying I was running in a panic when I was back at his apartment. I was concerned when I told him about what I had seen, but I was trying to stay calm and not jump to conclusions I knew nothing about.

3) I did try to call both of Meredith's phones. One kept ringing. The other immediately stated the phone was out of service.

4) Raffaele called the police before the police arrived, as proved by the video surveillance of the garage across the street from our driveway.

5) Raffaele's demeanor over the phone was perfectly normal. He stated the facts as he knew them and asked for assistance. Have you listened to those phone calls?

6) Raffaele and I were the one's to alert the police and Filomena about Meredith's door being locked in the first place. We told them we had tried to break it down and hadn't succeeded. Filomena suggested that Meredith NEVER locked her door, and I merely pointed out, with Raffaele's help because I couldn't speak the language well enough, that that was not the case. Meredith had locked her door before, but we were equally concerned.

7) I called my Mom because I was alarmed by what I had seen, but I also didn't know what to make of it. In doubt, I called my mom and asked for her advice as to how I should react to the situation.

8) I don't wear make-up, and no police officer ever said I had smeared make-up. The police officer who suggested I "reeked of sex" said so much after the fact and clearly had a active imagination, inspired by the prosecution's portrayal of me as "Foxy Knoxy". It was further propaganda to create the idea of a sex-obsessed woman.

[Amanda](#) says:

[February 16, 2014 at 08:50](#)

jack slacker,

1) I never said I was on the computer all night. I checked my email on it in the course of the evening and Raffaele and I watched a movie, but we also went to bed.

2) I woke up at 6am, reached over to the nightstand and turned on the first cellphone I came across to check what time it was. I then fell back asleep. Marco Quintavalle, the store owner who claims to have seen me in his store at 7:45am, not only contradicted that testimony when he was initially questioned in the days after the murder, but his later testimony has changed over time: in

some he says I only looked around before leaving, in others he says I bought things, for which no evidence in his receipts exist. His own employee contradicted his testimony.

3) Raffaele and I only changed our story once, when under pressure by the police during our all-night interrogations. Small discrepancies in our testimonies (estimated time of eating dinner, for example) are normal discrepancies, considering we weren't checking the time for every normal activity we pursued that evening.

We have always given straight answers. It was the prosecution who simply never accepted those straight answers. They only accepted what they wanted to hear.