

Allan Titford Fights for Justice

Allan Titford Fights for Justice for 25
Years
and Gets 24 Years Jail!

DID THE CROWN WITHHOLD VITAL EVIDENCE TO PROTECT ITS KEY
WITNESSES?

Crown becomes involved in matrimonial dispute – Why?

On the 15 March 2011, the One New Zealand Foundation Inc wrote to Susan Cochrane asking her what was the hold up in taking her husband Allan Titford to Court. Her reply on the same day was, “The hold up now is the Crown have taken over so they can look into it, change charges either throw some out, add new ones or whatever they think right”. Why would the Crown get involved in a matrimonial dispute between Mr and Mrs Titford and their children unless they had a vested interest, such as silencing Mr Allan Titford in his fight for justice when the Crown acquired his freehold titled land at Maunganui Bluff for Te Roroa’s “alleged” Treaty of Waitangi claim.



Susan Cochrane Photo RNZ

Mr Graham Cochrane destroys the Titford's Homestead at Maunganui Bluff?

Since Mr Titford's trial two Affidavits have been produced showing Susan Cochrane knew that her father Graham Cochrane had burnt down the Titford family home at Maunganui Bluff and not her husband Allan as she stated. The Affidavits state, her father had confessed to Susan and Alyssa Titford just before he died that he had burnt the house down as it was the only way he could get them away from the place as he was sick of the situation that she was in, but Susan and Alyssa had remained silent on this fact during Mr Titford's trial, Susan accusing Mr Titford of setting fire to the house.

The Affidavits also shows statements were made to Detective Eddie Evans of the Whangarei Police and Mr Titford's Crown paid lawyer, Mr John Moroney's office that Susan and Alyssa knew Mr Graham Cochrane, Susan's father and Alyssa's grandfather had burnt the house down at Maunganui Bluff but also withheld this evidence. Why was this vital evidence not presented to the Court? See previous Post.

Why did the Police not lay charges under, "Section 134 of the Crimes Act"?

In a draft letter to the Commissioner of Police on the 10 February 2011, Susan Cochrane states, "I have a 15 years old daughter who has a 23 year old boyfriend (Gene Hanham). They were both living under my roof for 9 months sharing the same room under view of others so were guaranteed that there was nothing sexual going on". Very strange as Susan was in the process of charging her husband for sexual assault and rape but was quite happy for her 15-year-old daughter to sleep with a 23-year-old man and in front of her other young children!

Later, Susan's 15-year-old daughter ran away from home.

The Police eventually found her living with the 23-year-old man. When questioned, Susan's 15-year-old daughter told the Police she was afraid to go home because Susan or her family would beat her up and starve her. The Police must have believed her or had evidence to this effect and handed her over to CYF. The CYF and the Police allowed this 15-year-old child to continue living with a 23-year-old man. Why?

In an email from Susan on the 15 March 2011 she states, "Ulanda still hasn't come back, CYFS are coming tomorrow but because they have no concerns with her where she is and the Police have no concern, I can't do much. It's up to her if she wants to come home". But she was a 15-year old child sleeping with a 23 year old man and both the CYFS and the Police had no concerns!

Not long after Susan's 15-year-old daughter became pregnant and had a baby to the 23-year-old man, surprise, surprise!

As the Police and CYF knew a 15-year-old girl was living and had a baby to a 23-year-old man, why was he not charged under, "Section 134 of the Crimes Act"?

Also interesting to note that when Allan Titford went looking for his 15-year-old daughter the Police were more interested in charging him with breach of bail than finding his daughter. By this time Mr Titford had been separated from his family for about 18 months and would never have allowed his underage daughter to sleep with a 23-year-old man.

The question that must be asked, were the Police more interested in protecting their key witnesses than charging a 23-year-old man under "Section 134 of the Crimes Act"? The Police and CYF knew that a 23-year-old man was sleeping with a 15-year-old girl but failed to act. Was it because it would not look very good on the news if Susan Cochrane's daughter had been allowed by Susan, the Police and CYF to sleep with a 23 year-old-man and become pregnant when they were in the process of jailing Mr Titford for 24 years for sexual assault and rape involving his wife?

Also, if the Police had evidence that stopped them from sending Susan's 15- year- old daughter home because she would be beaten up and starved, why was Susan and her family not charged with child abuse? All this from a woman that was in the process of accusing her husband of sexual assault and rape! Again, it would not look good on the news for the Crown's key witness!

Husband sunk boat with axe for insurance – Don't think so!

Susan Cochrane also stated her husband sank his first fishing boat with an axe to claim the insurance but now the company that built the boat states it had a steel hull, therefore very unlikely that a steel hulled boat could be sunk with an axe. See below.

Why did Mr Titford's lawyer, Mr Moroney not call the crew members that were on the boat at the time it sank to verify Mr Titford had sunk his steel hulled boat with an axe? It is stated the boat had recently had propeller shaft repairs and developed a very bad vibration just before it sank and therefore, more than likely to be the reason it sank.

Ex-Wife says Titford sank boat for insurance.

Radio New Zealand News, Update 22 November 2013.

The former wife of Northland farmer Allan Titford said her husband told her soon after they married that he sank his own fishing boat to collect an insurance payout.

Titford, a prominent farmer and anti-Treaty activist, was sentenced in the Whangarei District Court on Wednesday to 24 years in prison for the violent abuse of his family over two decades, fraud, perjury and arson. The anti-Treaty activist was convicted of burning down his own farmhouse at Maunganui Bluff in 1989, hoping to put the blame on local Maori who had a land claim on his farm.

His ex-wife Sue Cochrane said Titford told her he put an axe through the hull of his fishing boat off the South Island's West Coast in the early 1980s. Ms Cochrane said her husband told her he was rescued by nearby fishing boats and used the insurance money to buy a better boat, which he later sold to buy the farm at Maunganui Bluff. Police say Ms Cochrane told them about the sinking and if anyone has further information they'd like to hear it.

But wait a moment; the hull was built from steel says the company that built it!

From: Trevor Robb [mailto:trevor@hadlow.co.nz]

Sent: Thursday, 20 March 2014 9:57 a.m.

To: 'Martin Doutre'

Subject: RE: Aeromarine Industries Ltd: Helene 1, 1969

Yes Martin, I am able to confirm that the Helene 1 as built by D F Robb & Co Ltd was of all steel construction. This should be able to be further confirmed by plans and approval given by the then Ministry of Transport, Maine Division.

Yours faithfully

Trevor Robb

Former Manager and shareholder of D F Robb & Co Ltd.

Where are the medical records Richard?

At the trial Susan Cochrane's brother Richard described virtually every time he went out working on the farm with Allan and Allan's son James, Allan would become angry with James and punch him to the ground, jump on his neck and back and kick him with his steel capped boots. Richard also said Allan had hit James with a 2x2 fence batten. At the time James must have only been about 12 or 14 years old and Allan about 90 - 100kgs. Others that have worked on the farm deny seeing this happen.

Surely, if Allan punched James to the ground then jumped on him and kicked him with steel capped boots or hit him with a 2x2 fence batten there would have been medical records of the serious injuries this would cause. The only medical record produced was when a cow had kicked James in the ribs, nothing else.

Why did Allan's Crown paid lawyer not request medical records.

If James had been assaulted as Richard describes there must have been medical records of some nature. This was vital evidence that was allowed to go unchallenged by the Court. It was also found that Richard Cochrane has a number of convictions to his name.

Mr Allan Titford was denied witnesses in his fight for justice.

One of the most crucial aspects of a fair legal trial is the right to call witnesses on both sides, without this there is no trial. There was no way Mr Titford was going to have a fair trial as his Crown paid lawyer decided not to call one witness in his defence after Mr Titford had made out a list of those he wanted as witnesses. Why would his lawyer decide not to call any witnesses when the prosecution had about 10 very well "groomed" witnesses? We must ask ourselves, whose side was he really on, could it be, "He who pays the piper calls the tune"?

Before the trial Mr Michael Botur, a freelance writer had rung the Whangarei Court and had spoken to the Registrar of the Court as well as a spokes-person from the Whangarei Police station who had both given him their views on Mr Titford's upcoming trial. Surely this would be, "Contempt of Court"? It must be remembered, "Charges are not Evidence of a Crime".

Also, why did the Police edit the taped interviews of the children that were shown to the Court as evidence? Once again this is similar to the Crown Law Office tampering with the Sale documents to acquire Mr Titford's farm for the "alleged" Te Roroa claim.

There must be a retrial into the withheld evidence and the false laid charges.

These are the main issues why there must be a re-trial but there are many more and I am sure many more will appear at the re-trial. For 25 years Susan and Allan had worked as a team to find all the true facts on Te Roroa, the land sale and the previous claims over the years that had all been denied through lack of evidence.

It wasn't until the Waitangi Tribunal came along and Te Roroa was allowed to twist their history and previous evidence for their claim to be accepted by the Tribunal and a recommendation made to Government in their favour. But there was a problem, a major problem; Mr Allan Titford had freehold title to the land they were claiming.

After the Crown owned Rural Bank froze Mr and Mrs Titford accounts and took over the running of the farm, Mr Titford's debts escalated to \$2.25 million through mismanagement, the "alleged" Maori claim on his land and false Police charges. The Crown, the Police and the Rural Bank allowed Te Roroa to harass the Titford's until they had no other option than leave their farm and flee to Tasmania for safety. Mr Titford then had to sell his freehold titled farm under value and under duress to the Crown or go bankrupt with his father's farm also taken as it was held as collateral over the loan. Interesting to note the Rural/National Bank had the Crown Law Office include a clause in the Sale Agreement stating, Mr Titford could not sue the National Bank. Had the Crown and the Bank worked together to bankrupt Mr Titford to acquire his farm "under duress" and "without legal advice" for Te Roroa's "alleged" claim?

Since this time Mr and Mrs Titford, the One New Zealand Foundation, Martin Doutre and Jean Jackson have continued researching Te Roroa's history and can find no evidence that Te Roroa had any claim to Maunganui Bluff. They sold it under the laws of New Zealand at the time; therefore have no claim over Maunganui Bluff what's so ever, the 2 chiefs sold it as willing seller/willing buyer in 1876!

Mr Titford agreed in 1995 to sign the Sale Agreement drafted by Phillips Fox Solicitors in 1994, but without his knowledge or consent the Crown Law Office drafted a completely new Agreement in December 1995 with many extra clauses, forcing him to sign it under duress and without legal advice or declare bankruptcy and lose the lot.

The Crown Law Office again tampered with the Agreements before having the Minister's sign them on behalf of Her Majesty the Queen. Mr Titford and his lawyer were refused copies of the documents after the Ministers had signed them as they would have known they had been tampered with and therefore, null and void!

The Ombudsman's officials also found in 2006 that the Crown Law Office tampered with the Agreements after Mr Titford signed it and witnessed Crown's Notary Public.

Since the Sale Agreements were signed, Mr and Mrs Titford and the One New Zealand Foundation have brought this evidence to the Governments attention, but they have refused to hold an inquiry into the tampered with documents by the Crown Law Office to acquire Mr Titford's farm "under duress" and "without legal advice".

Allan Titford Fights for Justice and Ends up in Jail for 24 Years! Be very afraid!

For 25 years Mr and Mrs Titford and the One New Zealand Foundation has been fighting the Crown for taking Mr Titford's freehold titled farm for Te Roroa's "alleged" Treaty of Waitangi claim, a claim without one document of evidence and a claim that was rejected by Parliament in 1942. The Crown in return has continued to harass Mr Titford at every opportunity they could until they found a matrimonial dispute was developing between Mr and Mrs Titford and the Hon John Carter became involved by offering Mrs Titford immunity if she would

help the Crown convict Mr Titford to silence him forever. The Police then asked her and her family to write a list of anything that would convict Mr Titford, the Police even taking over and adding charges themselves. People disputed many of these charges but Mr Titford's Crown paid lawyer would not allow them to appear in his defence. Mr Titford was jailed for 24 years for defending his property without one witness appearing in his defence. Is this justice?

This was not a trial we would expect in New Zealand, it was a "Kangaroo Court" where the Crown got involved in a matrimonial dispute between Mr and Mrs Titford. Where Mrs Titford and her children were given immunity to lay charges whether true or false against her husband with the help and encouragement of the Crown and the Police. The whole family were extremely hostile witnesses determined to put their husband, father or brother-in-law behind bars for a very long time with the Crown's help and encouragement, whatever the cost!

The People of New Zealand deserved better than this!

The People of New Zealand deserve better than this from their elected Members of Parliament and Justice system. This would be the worst case of confiscated land in New Zealand from an innocent New Zealand Citizen of his freehold titled property by Government officials over a 25 year period, hoping by jailing him it would all go away.

Well the One New Zealand Foundation Inc has news for them. The documents we have on file left by those involved at the time will never allow it to go away until an inquiry is held where all the documents are opened for public scrutiny and those responsible, brought to justice.

But first Mr Titford must be released from jail. From the documented evidence we have on file, we believe he is held in jail as a Political Prisoner for corrupt acts by Government

and its officials over a 25-year period; then jailed by a “Kangaroo Court” for 24 years to silence him.

The continuing treatment of Allan Titford for over 25 years by the Crown is probably the worst miscarriage of justice to any individual in the history of New Zealand – ever!

For information to substantiate this article, log onto: <http://allantitford-politicalprisoner.com/wordpress/> or contact the One New Zealand Foundation Inc at email: enquiries@onenzfoundation.co.nz. We believe in fair justice for all the people of New Zealand, irrespective of race, colour or creed. 24/03/2014 (C).

Compiled by Ross Baker, spokesperson for the One New Zealand Foundation Inc.