

“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.

The email to Barrister Greg Denholm was written about two weeks after Susan and Allan had visited my wife and I in Queensland on holiday and to look at purchasing a farm in North Queensland, even approaching the Bank for a loan. Both seemed excited about purchasing a farm at this time with Susan shopping and the 4 of us going out to meals etc. I believe they could not get a loan and perhaps this was the final straw in their fight for a fair deal in life and Susan had had enough of the stress of fighting bureaucracy and the Crown for over 20 years. Did it reach a point for Susan where, **“If you can’t beat them, join them!”**

Page 1 of 1

Ross Baker

From: "susan" <s.kakarana@xtra.co.nz>
To: <Anna@foyhalse.co.nz>
Cc: <rossbaker@austarmet.com.au>
Sent: Tuesday, 7 July 2009 2:16 PM
Attach: abuse.rtf
Subject: help

Greg

I was wondering if you could give me some person advice on what to do but the only way and I STRESS THE ONLY WAY to contact me is through my own personal secret email which is s.kakarana@xtra.co.nz not the usual email other wise I will be in severe trouble .

I ask that you do not mention anything to Allan.

After you read the attached pages, can you advise me what you would do if it was you?

I don't know what to do the kids are begging me to do something and I feel scared because if I do something and Allan was put in Jail I would have to live a life of having to watch out for him once he got out and if I do nothing then I have to worry something serous might happen to me or the kids, or even some one else. And if I just left we have no where to go.

If for instance, if he was in Jail would I be able to get control of the Trust back or would he still hold the title of Trustee?

If he was arrested would he be able to throw me and the kids off the farm since he is the Trustee?

We are no so depressed and unmotived that we have been hoping some Maori or Government would knock him off. That's how depressed and stressed we are.

I take tablets for stress and tablets for ulcers because if the stress.

Yours faithfully

Susan Titford

FREE Animations for your email - by IncrediMail!

[Click Here!](#)

14/02/2010

Perjury

Whether Greg Deholm advised Susan to write to the Minister of Justice is unknown, but on the 13 October 2009, Susan wrote to the Minister under the name of Ms Susan Kakarana asking him how she could be exonerated from being charged with Perjury. From the letter below, the Minister set out ways to be exonerated from being charged. It seems this set the stage for the alleged charges against her estranged husband Allan Titford to allow her to take control of the Trust with the help of the Crown and the Police.



Office of Hon Simon Power

MP for Rangitikei

Minister of Justice

Minister for State Owned Enterprises

Minister of Commerce

Minister Responsible for the Law Commission

Associate Minister of Finance

Deputy Leader of the House

01 DEC 2009

Ms Susan Kakarana
s.kakarana@bigfrog.co.nz

Dear Ms Kakarana

Perjury

Thank you for your query of 13 October 2009 regarding perjury.

At the outset I should point out that, as Minister of Justice, I am unable to offer legal advice on a specific case that has been considered by the courts. Our system of government requires that the courts operate independently of Ministers of the Crown, and that there is no actual or implied political interference in decisions by the courts in individual cases. However, I can make some general comments.

Section 117 of the Crimes Act 1961 creates a range of offences relating to corrupting juries and witnesses. In particular, it is an offence to dissuade or attempt to dissuade a person, by threats, bribes or other corrupt means, from giving evidence in any cause or matter, or to wilfully attempt in any other way to obstruct, prevent, pervert, or defeat the course of justice in New Zealand. Each of these offences is punishable by a maximum penalty of 7 years' imprisonment.

In deciding whether or not to initiate criminal proceedings for perjury, the Police would take into account all of the circumstances of the given case. In this regard, I note that section 24 of the Crimes Act provides that where a person commits an offence under "compulsion" they will be protected from criminal responsibility. Compulsion means that the person commits the offence only because someone else, who is present when the offence is committed, has threatened them with immediate death or grievous bodily harm. In order to rely on the compulsion provision, the person who commits the offence has to believe that the threat will be carried out.

If you would like any further information regarding perjury and the specific scenario you raise, I recommend you seek legal advice. Your local Community Law Centre will provide initial advice free of charge. Contact details for Community Law Centres are available at www.communitylaw.org.nz.

Yours sincerely

Hon Simon Power
Minister of Justice

The Trust.

Since the Crown stole Mr Allan Titford freehold titled farm at Maunganui Bluff for the *alleged* Te Roroa Treaty of Waitangi claim, Mr Titford set up a Trust to protect his assets if the Crown tried to bankrupt him again and steal his assets as they had in 1995 at Maunganui Bluff.

While he and his family were in Australia he set up a Trust and used this Trust to purchase a dairy farm at Awanui on their return to New Zealand. Most of the money to set up the Trust was inheritance money from his family. This farm was very run down when he bought it, but with hard work by all the family, they turned it around into a very profitable unit but still requiring more work as funds became available.

While most of the money was returned to the Trust to improve the farm, the Titford's still went away on family holidays, the pantry was always full, the children well dress and plenty of toys and electrical gadgets to play with. The children seemed happy although with 7 children in a small house, it was a battle at times to keep the peace as with any large family. Allan seemed to manage this while he was there but once Susan and the family left, the children went wild. One 15 year old daughter leaving home and becoming pregnant to a 23 year old man while under the care of the Police and CYFS but no charges were laid as it would have tainted the Crown's witnesses; Susan, her children and brother Richard.

It seems for some reason Susan wanted more and from the email to Greg Denholm wanted to take control of the Trust. From the letter from the Minister of Justice it seems she planned to accuse Allan of rape, abuse to her and the children and fraud to take control of the Trust.

Once Minister John Carter found there was a matrimonial dispute between Allan and Susan he set up a meeting with Susan. Susan invited me to attend this meeting held on the 9th February 2010. At this meeting John Carter told Susan that the Crown could give her immunity if she would make out a list of all the events she and the children could think of to convict Allan. Susan had previously made a list for Greg Denholm and this list was given to the Crown.

Susan states in her email below, "*The Crown has taken over, so they will look into it change charges, either throwing some out, adding new ones or whatever they think right*". But wait a minute this was a matrimonial dispute between Mr and Mrs Titford, so why was the Crown getting involved and adding new charges or whatever they thought right? Could it be to silence Mr Titford and his supporters for the corrupt methods used by the Crown to steal his freehold titled farm at Maunganui Bluff for Te Roroa's *alleged* Treaty of Waitangi claim in 1995?

Mr Titford was convicted of rape, physical abuse to his wife and children and fraud and was jailed for an unprecedented 24 years, but he was not allowed one witness in his defense at his trial. 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 that right at his recent trial, the Crown made sure it never happened and he was unfairly jailed for 24 years by a "Kangaroo Court" to silence him and his many supporters. We believe Mr Titford deserves a retrial where he is allowed witnesses in his defense, not a one sided witch-hunt by the Crown to silence him for stealing his freehold titled farm at Maunganui Bluff.

The Courts then stripped Mr Titford as Trustee of his own Trust and his freehold property at Awanui was put up for sale at well below its true value. This was due to Mr Titford's bail conditions of a 250-klm exclusion zone from his Awanui farm for the past 4 years, which allowed the farm without his care to return to its original state before he bought it. When the farm at Awanui is sold, Susan and the children will more than likely get control of the Trust set up using Allan's family inheritance money while Allan rots in jail for 24 years.

Could this whole case be based on Criminal Intent?

1. Susan Titford/Cochrane/Kakarana to get control of the Trust?
2. The Crown to silence Mr Allan Titford by jailing him for 24 years?

At the end of the day, whether it was 'Criminal Intent' or not, Susan Titford/Cochrane/Kakarana and the Crown got what they set out to achieve:

Allan in Jail, Control of the Trust and Allan Silenced for 24 Years!

Page 1 of 3

Ross Baker

From: "susan" <hikagirl@vodafone.co.nz>
Date: Tuesday, 15 March 2011 6:50 PM
To: "ross" <rossbaker@austamet.com.au>
Subject: Re: hi

The hold up now is the crown have taken over so they will look into it change charges either throw some out, add new ones or what ever they think is right. So it really wont get to court till next year they think.

Ulanda still hasnt come back cyfs are coming tomorrow but because they have no concern with her where she is and the police have no concern I cant do much. Its up to her if she wants to come home. ALthough I feel she is trapped as the boyfriend is controlling like Allan and I heard that she asked some one to pick her up one day and when they got there the boyfriend did the crying thing that Allan would do so she stayed. His mother wont even let me talk to her. The law here really stinks. Cyfs said the other day its probably just better to leave her to sort out if she wants to come home or not. But if they wont let her then she has no choice. Sue

-----Original Message-----

From: Ross Baker
Date: 15/03/2011 7:40:56 p.m.
To: susan
Subject: Re: hi

Thanks for this Sue. What's the hold up in taking Allan to Court, are they hoping he will do something silly. I still think they are terrified the Crown will be brought into it and so they bloody well should be.

Hope you have sorted out Ulanda, that was a real worry.

Please keep me informed and if I can be of help. Ross.

1/01/2014

Compiled by Ross Baker, Researcher, One New Zealand Foundation Inc. For further information, log onto: www.onenzfoundation.co.nz or www.allantitford-politicalprisoner.com/wordpress/