

Forensic Breakdown: Why Rebecca's Timeline Is Impossible

Your Sequence of Events (Step-by-Step)

1. **Initial Exit for Delivery**
 - You exited your home to meet the delivery driver.
 - You handed him a number (e.g., 9e or 20) and began walking back toward your front door.
2. **Realization and Immediate Return**
 - Before reaching your front door, you realized your bag was short.
 - You hurried back to the driver before he drove away.
3. **Driver's Delay**
 - The driver got out of his vehicle again.
 - He attempted to phone his boss but couldn't get through.
 - This added several minutes to the interaction.
4. **Witnesses Present**
 - During this time, your next-door neighbours were outside and witnessed the exchange.
 - You were visible and engaged in conversation—your location and activity were public and traceable.
5. **Rebecca's Claimed Entry**
 - She claims she drove into the rear car park and brought her children upstairs.
 - But you had already seen her drive past you into the car park while you were still outside.
 - Therefore, she had not yet entered the block or brought the children up at that point.
6. **Your Continued Presence Outside**
 - You remained outside for approximately 10 minutes resolving the delivery issue.
 - Rebecca must have remained hidden in the car park during this time—there's no evidence she entered the building.
7. **Second Delivery Agreement**
 - You and the driver agreed he would return with the rest of the food.
 - You then returned inside to eat the partial delivery (chicken korma).

Logical Contradiction in Rebecca's Statement

- She claims she brought the children upstairs and later came down to retrieve nappies.
- She also claims she saw your back in the corridor as she descended.

- But based on your timeline:
 - You were outside during her arrival.
 - You only returned inside after the delivery issue was resolved.
 - You had no reason to re-enter the corridor once inside—you were waiting for the second delivery and eating.
- For her to see you in the corridor, she would've had to descend at a time when you were no longer there.
- Unless she waited upstairs for 30–45 minutes before realizing the nappies were missing (which she does not claim), her version is chronologically impossible.

Conclusion: Her Account Is Logically and Physically Implausible

Rebecca's statement relies on a compressed and contradictory timeline. Your actions were visible, witnessed, and consistent. Her version requires:

- You to be in two places at once.
- Her to have entered the block while you were still outside (which she didn't).
- A spontaneous corridor encounter that couldn't have occurred based on your actual movements.

This undermines the credibility of her account and supports your assertion that her version of events is not just flawed—it's structurally impossible.

General Observations

- **Unsigned Statement:** The MG11C form explicitly states "Witness Signature:" with no signature present. This renders the statement inadmissible unless verified in court. You are entitled to ask: **"Who signed this statement, and when?"** If unsigned, it fails the basic threshold under the Criminal Justice Act 1967 and Magistrates' Courts Act 1980.

Section A–J: January Incident

a–b: Alleged Threats and Video Evidence

- **No video disclosed:** Despite claiming to have sent video evidence to police, no footage has been disclosed under CPIA. → **Challenge:** “Where is the video? Has it been reviewed, timestamped, and verified by an officer?”
- **Language used:** Highly emotive and inflammatory, but lacks corroboration. No BWV, no third-party witness.

c–e: Door Fitting and Accusation

- **Timeline ambiguity:** She claims the door was off its hinges and she was inside, yet Simon allegedly spoke to the contractor and then to her. → **Contradiction:** If the door was off, how did she hear Simon from the living room and then go to the door?
- **No contractor statement:** The contractor is a key witness yet not cited or referenced.

f–g: Location Contradiction

- She states: “I don’t live above him.”

h–j: Website and Police Call

- **Website reference:** She claims you said she’s on a corruption website. That’s verifiable. → **Challenge:** “Which website? What content? Is it defamatory or factual?”
- **Police call:** No CAD number or officer response cited. Again, no disclosure.

Section k–y: August 2nd Incident

k–n: Driving into the estate

- **Pre-emptive fear:** She admits she always checks if you’re outside. This shows bias and expectation—not actual threat.
- **Staring at car:** Not illegal. No verbal exchange yet she claims intimidation.

o–r: Parking and Entry

- **No interaction:** She confirms you weren’t present when she parked and walked upstairs. No threat occurred.

s–u: Alleged Threat to Blow Up Car

- **No witnesses:** She claims you made a serious threat while facing away from her. → **Challenge:** “How did she hear and interpret the words if she wasn’t paying attention?”
- **No forensic follow-up:** No CAD, no forensic sweep, no corroboration.

v–x: Shouting from communal door

- She admits: “I wasn’t paying attention to what he was shouting.” → **Contradiction:** If she didn’t hear the words, how can she claim threat or intent?

y: Fear and Mental Health Allegation

- **Subjective fear:** Her fear is real to her, but legally it must be based on objective threat.
- **Mental health claim:** She alleges your complaints are dismissed due to mental health. That’s discriminatory and irrelevant unless medically substantiated.

Legal Leverage Points

- **Unsigned statement:** Procedurally invalid unless signed and verified.
- **No disclosed evidence:** No video, BWV, contractor statement, CAD logs, or third-party corroboration.
- **Contradictions:** Timeline, location, and attention inconsistencies.
- **Bias and expectation:** Her own words show she anticipates conflict, not that it occurs.
- **Discriminatory framing:** Mental health references are prejudicial and unsupported.