

# [Update on Allan Titford.](#)

Allan Titford remains a model prisoner while held at the South Auckland Corrections Centre since 2013, even although the Ombudsman, the courts and his Case Manager has accused him of sexually assaulting his children to stop visiting rights to his young son Leo.

**Allan Titford was not charged or convicted of sexually assaulting his children, one of the worst crimes a man can commit, but the Ombudsman, the courts and his case manager continue to say he sexually assaulted his children! This is a lie!**

Mr Titford's Case Manager, Erica Hiyama in her report dated the 8 August 2015 stated, "*Allan currently is serving 24 year sentence for multiple charges of violent and sexual offences against his ex-wife and children*". Ms Hiyama, Mr Titford was not convicted of sexually assaulting his children!



This shows how little research Ms Hiyama put into Mr Titford's report. A serious mistake that stopped Mr Titford's young son Leo from visiting his father and a mistake that has put Mr Titford in great danger while in prison.

In a letter to the One New Zealand Foundation Inc. dated the 16 November 2015, Chief Ombudsman, Dame Beverley Wakem stated, "*In November 2013 Mr Titford was convicted of a number of offences including fraud, perjury, arson, assault of family members and sexual offences towards his wife and children*". Ms Wakem, Mr Titford was not convicted of sexually assaulting his children and puts him in great danger while in prison! Chief Ombudsman, Dame Beverley Wakem resigned from the Ombudsman's Office soon after making this very serious mistake. This was not the first time Chief Ombudsman, Dame Beverley Wakem has made errors when dealing with Mr Titford and his land confiscation at Maunganui Bluff..

On page 1, (2) of the Department of Corrections Panel Consideration dated the 13 March 2017, it states, "*Given the extensive and prolonged nature of Mr Titford's violent offending, a full psychological risk assessment needs to be undertaken to assess the dynamic risk factors underlying the reactive sexual and general violence that Mr Titford was convicted of. This leaves the inability to prove a clear risk analysis*". Mr Titford was not convicted of sexually assaulting his children and puts him in great danger while in prison as well stopping visiting rights to his son Leo!

The Appeal Judge, Justice Rhys Harrison also stated Mr Titford was convicted of sexually assaulting his children when summing up at Mr Titford's Appeal on the 14 July 2017. Judge Rhys Harrison, Mr Titford was not convicted of sexually assaulting his children and puts him in great danger while in prison! Why was this not challenged by Mr Titford's Barrister, Ron Mansfield at the time?

It is surprising Barrister Ron Mansfield, who represented Mr Titford at his Appeal base the Appeal on Mr Titford being unfit to stand trial. Why would he decide to fight Mr Titford's convictions on these grounds when Mr Titford was not allowed one witness in his defence? Did he want Mr Titford's Appeal to fail?

**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 trial.**

I agree Mr Titford should not have visiting right to his son Leo if he had been convicted of sexually assaulting his children, but no mention of sexually assaulting his children was made by anyone at any time before, during or after the trial, therefore no charges were laid.

**Mr Titford is completely innocent of sexually assaulting his children but the Ombudsman, the courts and his Case Manager are determined to say Mr Titford sexually assaulted his children resulting in him being refused visiting rights to his young son Leo and a great danger to him while in prison.**

Leo was only five years old when the decision was made to refuse him visiting rights to see his father, he is now 8 and still he is being refused. These are the most formative years of any young boy and for the Ombudsman, the courts and Mr Titford's Case Manager to deny him visiting rights based on false information is extremely unfair to both father and son.

During his trial, Mr Titford was refuse witnesses in his defence. All the evidence by his wife and children had little, if any cross examination by his lawyer Mr John Moroney and no documented evidence was supplied to support their claims.

The Universal Declaration of Human Rights, article 11, states: *"Everyone charged with a penal offence has the right to be presumed **innocent until proved guilty** according to law in a public trial at which **he** has had all the guarantees necessary for his defence"*. Mr Titford was refused witnesses in his defence at his trial.

**Allan Titford was not found guilty, he had a guilty verdict handed down by Judge Duncan Harvey who had only heard the Crown's witnesses before jailing him for 24 years!**

On the 2 February 2011 Mr Titford's daughter Ulanda wrote, *"And all the stuff we had to write and say about dad. I did not understand any of it. I tried to ask but was told just to do it. No one would explain nothing to me"*. It was stated at the trial that their mother, Susan Titford had promised the children \$5000 each if they would testify against their father.

There is no doubt, Allan Titford is a marked man because he stood up for his rights when his freehold titled farm was taken for Te Roroa's false land claim at Maunganui Bluff in 1995. After a full judicial inquiry by Chief Judge Shepherd in 1939 it was found Te Roroa had no claim to this land and it was rejected by Parliament in 1942, but after twisting the truth and omitted the sale documents etc., the Waitangi Tribunal found in the claimants favour.

While Mr Titford continues to fight for his rights and the rights of every New Zealander who owns free hold titled property, the Government and its departments are hell bent on making Mr Titford's and his son's life as miserable as possible.

**Under International Law, Mr Titford is innocent until proven guilty, therefore he deserved a new trial where he is allowed witnesses in his defence and the right through his lawyer to cross examine his wife and children!**

Ross Baker, Researcher, One New Zealand Foundation Inc. 8/3/2018. (Copyright)