

# Time Line of the Titford Case

Good news everybody, this information is so troubling to some people they are prepared to hack and take down our websites.

We must be doing something right.

Meanwhile if the Allan Titford – Political Prisoner site has disappeared again you may copy and paste the URL (corrected 16 April) from here.

<http://allantitford-politicalprisoner.com/wordpress/>

Keep reading after the Time Line of the Titford Case below .  
There is a link to a couple of very interesting letters from Sue Cochrane .



## **Would I Be Able to Get Control of the Trust?**

Susan Titford/Cochrane/Kakarana.

Below is an email from Susan Titford to Barrister Greg Denholm

asking him if her husband was in jail would she get control of the Trust. Was Susan's plan to jail her husband for a very long time so she could take control of the Trust Allan had set up with inheritance money from his family? **Criminal Intent perhaps?**

If Allan had done the terrible things to Susan and her children she alleged, then surely taking control of the Trust would be the least of her worries at the time. Susan alleged Allan had raped her, assaulted her and the children plus forcing her to lie on his behalf to keep him out of jail, but this was the first time the rapes, assaults and forced to lie had ever been mentioned publicly by Susan or her 7 children in their 22 years of marriage. Read more .... [Would I Be Able to Get Control of The Trust?](#)

### **Time line of the Titford Case**

One Hundred and Ten Reasons Why Allan Titford Must Be Given a Re-trial.

1. Te Roroa tried to steal land from Ngapuhi and sell it to the Crown in 1874.
2. Ngapuhi threaten to take up arm to defend their land.
3. The chiefs agreed, Waipoua No 2 for Te Roroa and Manganui for Ngapuhi.
4. Te Roroa sold their land in 1876 to the Crown as willing seller/willing buyer.

5. Te Roroa tried to get more money from the Crown in 1876 but failed.
6. Te Roroa only began to claim for Manuwhetai after the chief that sold it had died.
7. In 1937 an inquiry was held but the Court found there was no evidence.
8. Parliament rejected the Te Roroa's claim in 1942.
9. Mr Titford bought his farm in 1987 with freehold title issued by the Crown.
10. Mr Titford borrowed \$600,000 from the Crown owned Rural Bank.
11. The farm included a Council approved beachfront subdivision.
12. The subdivision when sold would clear his debt to the Rural Bank.
13. Te Roroa lodged a claim with the Waitangi Tribunal a month later.
14. The Crown agreed to the claim in a 'Statement of Fact' in 1990.
15. The claimants harass Mr Titford and erect signs on his subdivision.
16. The signs state Mr Titford's freehold titled land was "Maori Land".
17. The Crown and Police also refer to Mr Titford's land as "Maori Land".
18. People stopped buying sections or cancelled sales.
19. First house burnt to the ground and no charges laid.
20. Mr Titford continues to have stock shot and machinery sabotaged.
21. Mr Titford accused of setting fire to his family home. (Second house).
22. Affidavits show Susan Titford's father, Graham Cochrane set fire to the house.
23. In 1992 the Waitangi Tribunal stated, "The land must be returned to Te Roroa".
24. Mr and Mrs Titford and the ONZF began the fight for the their rights.

25. Mrs Titford was just as keen as Allan in researching the Te Roroa claim.
26. Mr and Mrs Titford found Te Roroa had no claim to this land.
27. Allan and Susan together wrote the book, "Robbery by Deceit"
28. The Crown encourages Te Roroa to harass Mr and Mrs Titford.
29. Mr Titford receives death threats, but the Police refuse to act.
30. Mr Titford is charged with many offences but is found not guilty on all counts.
31. The Rural Bank freezes Mr Titford's account and takes over running the farm.
32. Mr and Mrs Titford flee with their young daughter to Tasmania for safety.
33. Mr Titford's debts climb to \$2.25 million dollars with the Bank running the farm.
34. A Crown's representative travels to Tasmania with an agreement to buy his farm.
35. Mr Tiford did not want to sell his free hold titled farm he had just bought.
36. The Crown and the Bank gang up on Mr Titford to sell or go bankrupt.
37. The Crown offers Mr Titford's father and brother a bribe to declare Allan insane.
38. The family refuses to take the bribe of \$500,000.
39. Eventually Mr Titford is forced to sell his farm under duress in 1995.
40. He discusses the sale agreement with his solicitor, Clive Jackson.
41. The Crown offered Mr Titford a price well below its true (certified) valuation.
42. Mr Titford was forced to sell his farm 'under duress' or forced into bankruptcy.
43. This would include his father's farm held by the bank as collateral on the loan.

44. Phillip Fox Solicitors drafted the original agreement in 1994 for the Crown.

45. He agreed to the sale agreement on 8 December 1995 with one amendment.

46. The amended agreements arrive on the 11th but it is a completely new agreement.

47. The Crown Law Office had drafted a new agreement with many extra clauses.

48. A new clause stated Mr Titford could not sue the Bank for mismanagement.

49. Mr Titford makes a large amendment to page 11 and only initials 4 pages.

50. He also amended the Deed that the Te Roroa claim was an "alleged" claim.

51. The Crown also agrees that the Te Roroa claim is only an "alleged" claim.

52. Mr Titford has the amended agreement witness by the Crown's Notary Public.

53. Mr Titford signs the agreement 'without legal advice' and 'under duress'.

54. The Crown removed Mr Titford's 4-initialed pages before they execute it.

55. The Ombudsman's officials confirm the documents had been 'tampered with'.

56. Mr Titford and his lawyer were refused copies of the executed documents.

57. In 1995 the Crown stole their farm, assets and capital for an "alleged" claim.

58. Mr and Mrs Titford and family return to New Zealand to start again at Awanui.

59. The Crown continues to harass Mr and Mrs Titford.

60. By now Mr and Mrs Titford have seven healthy children.

61. All the assets were now placed in 'Trust' as Allan did not trust the Crown.

62. By 2009 Susan had had enough of the harassment and decided to leave Allan.

63. Susan writes to Barrister Greg Denholm.

64. She asks, "If Allan was in jail would I be able to get control of the Trust".

65. Was this, "Criminal Intent to jail Allan to get control of the Trust"?

66. Susan writes to the Minister of Justice about Perjury.

67. He tells her if she can prove she was forced to lie she would not be charged.

68. Hon John Carter hears of the separation and holds a meeting with Susan.

69. He offers her immunity if she will co-operate with the Crown and Police.

70. It seems Susan has had enough, "If you can't beat them, join them"!

71. Carter asks Susan to make a list of anything that would convict Mr Titford.

72. The Crown then takes over, deleting some charges and adding many others.

73. The Police interview the children behind closed doors.

74. The Police censor the interview recordings before presenting them to the Court.

75. It was stated at the trial Susan offered the children \$5000 each.

76. It was stated the \$5000 was to testify against their father at the trial.

77. Susan allowed her 15-year-old daughter to sleep with a 23-year-old man.

78. Susan's daughter ran away and the Police found her with the 23-year-old man.

79. She said the family would beat her up and starve her if she went home.

80. The Police informed CYF but they decided to leave her where she was.

81. The Police and CYF allowed her to continue to sleep with the 24-year old man.

82. Susan 15-year old daughter became pregnant to the 24-year old man.

83. No charges were laid against the man under 'Section 134

of the Crimes Act'.

84. No charges were laid against her mother Susan or the family for 'Child Abuse'.

85. Mr Titford was arrested for breach of bail while looking for his daughter.

86. Mr Titford was acquitted after being jailed for 3 months.

87. Susan and her family were the Crown's main witnesses against Mr Titford.

88. Affidavits state the Police and Mr Titford's Crown paid lawyer withheld evidence.

89. Susan claimed Mr Titford claimed insurance for sinking his fishing boat.

90. She claimed he sank it with an axe but the boat had a steel hull.

91. Susan's brother Richard accused Mr Titford of assaulting his son James.

92. He accused Allan of punching James to the ground and jumping on this neck.

93. Also kicking him with his steel capped boots when on the ground.

94. Mr Titford was about 95 kilos and his son was 12 or 14 years of age.

95. No medical records were produced of these vicious attacks.

96. Surely there would be medical records if the offences really took place.

97. Richard Cochrane, Susan's brother has many convictions against his name.

98. Mr Titford's Crown's paid lawyer did not allow one witness in Mr Titford's defense.

99. Susan accused Allan of rape, but no medical records or evidence were produced.

100. It is stated Susan offered the children \$5000 each if they would support her.

101. Susan wanted to take control of the money and assets held by the Trusts

102. Susan joins forces with Allan's account and the Crown to

take over the Trusts.

103. The Crown with Allan's accountant's help, writes Allan out of the Trust.

104. Allan's bail conditions would not allow him to go within 250 klms of his farm.

105. The Court orders the farm at Awanui, now in Trust to be sold.

106. The value of the farm has drastically reduced due to Mr Titford's bail conditions.

107. Susan Cochrane will end up with the remaining assets and funds of the Trust.

108. Mr Allan Titford, an innocent New Zealand farmer will rot in jail for 24 years.

109. Once again the Crown has stolen Mr Titford's assets, leaving him a broken man.

110. Mr Allan Titford, New Zealand's First Political Prisoner!

### **The blame must be laid firmly at the Crown's feet.**

The blame must be laid firmly at the Crown's feet, Allan Titford bought a 1750-acre farm at Maunganui Bluff and the Crown issued him with "freehold title" to the land. This should have been the end of the story, but it was only the beginning of a very long sad story that lasted 25 years and saw Alan Titford jailed by the Crown for 24 years. The Crown is suppose to protect its citizens and their property but in this case the Crown destroyed 9 young peoples lives forever and those responsible must be brought to justice!

I was at a meeting with Susan Cochrane/Titford and Minister John Carter after he found out there was a matrimonial dispute between Mr and Mrs Titford. The Minster promised Susan immunity if she would help the Crown and Police to lay charges against her husband to silence him over the "freehold titled" land the Crown stole from him to help settle Te Roroa's "alleged" Treaty of Waitangi claim, a claim that had been rejected by Parliament in 1942 after a full judicial inquiry.



Susan wrote to the Minister of Justice asking how she could evade being charged for Perjury. The Minister said if she could prove that she had been forced to lie then she would not be charged. Susan, her children and her brother then made out a list of charges they 'dreamt up' over the 25-years she had been married to her husband Allan Titford.

The Crown then took over Susan's list of charges, deleting some and adding many others then 'grooming' their witnesses to support each other at the trial. Remember this started as a matrimonial dispute between a husband and wife that the Crown turned into a witch-hunt to silence Mr Titford for possibly the rest of his life for speaking out for his Human Rights.

Both Allan and Susan Titford and their children need help as the ONZF and others have all the evidence to show the Crown used dubious methods to steal Mr Titford's "freehold title" farm to help settle Te Roroa's "alleged" Treaty of Waitangi claim and to also put Mr Titford behind bars for 24 years by using Susan Cochrane, her children and brother Richard.

I am doubtful Susan and her children are telling the truth as I have spent a lot of time staying with them in Tasmania and New Zealand researching the claim and helping Allan on the farm and they have stayed with my wife and I on the Sunshine Coast. In all this time I have never seen any physical abuse to Susan, James or any of the children by Mr Titford. The verbal abuse is something completely different, but each gave as good as the other but that was it, there was never physical abuse of any nature.

If Mr Titford did these terrible things he was charged with, then we believe there should be many of the Crown's officials in jail with him as they were the cause of all this disruption to a young innocent farmer, his wife and his young family over a 23-year period.

What happened to “Innocent Until Proven Guilty” in our country, we should all be extremely afraid until a re-trial is held where all the withheld evidence is open for public scrutiny and all those found guilty of corruption or withholding evidence, to swap places with Mr Titford. We believe Susan Cochrane and the children need help and Mr Titford a fair trial and compensation from the Crown for stealing his “freehold titled” land, pain and suffering and the loss of his family. Until Mr Titford gets a fair trial, the ONZF will never give up, we have all the evidence but without your help, the Crown’s officials will continue to use every available method they have at their disposal to stop Mr Titford from having a fair re-trial where all the evidence is heard.

One of the most crucial aspects of a fair legal trial is the right to call witnesses on both sides, Mr Titford was never given this opportunity at his recent trial, the Crown made sure it never happened and he was unfairly jailed for 24 years by this “Kangaroo Court”.

Allan Titford must have a retrial where all the evidence is open for public scrutiny!

Compiled by Ross Baker, Researcher, One New Zealand Foundation Inc from document we have on file left by those involved since the beginning of this disgraceful treatment by the Crown of an innocent New Zealand Citizen and his young family. The Crown stole his “freehold titled” property “under duress” and “without legal advice” then “tampered with” the documents to help settle Te Roroa’s “alleged” Treaty of Waitangi claim, a claim that had been rejected by Parliament in 1942 after a full Court inquiry by Chief Judge Shepherd in 1939. 8/4/2014. This article may be copied in its entirety but not altered or modified in any way. (C)

For information to substantiate this article, log onto:  
<http://allantitford-politicalprisoner.com/wordpress/> or

contact the One New Zealand Foundation Inc at email:  
[ONZF@bigpond.com.au](mailto:ONZF@bigpond.com.au). We believe in fair justice for all the  
people of New Zealand, irrespective of race, colour or creed.  
24/03/2014 (C).