**Criminal Cases Review Commission – A20160125**

**Grounds of Appeal:**

1. Both the Council and the Police have declined to interview my witnesses.
2. The charge sheet states that I “… approached [Julie Davies] on numerous occasions … about her pet in the High Street.”, but the two occasions on which a confrontation occurred (initiated by Julie Davies, diverting her path in order to confront) were witnessed, with one of my neighbours insisting that Julie, “Leave the man alone”; this last, significant, witness, has not been interviewed.
3. My witnesses were not present in court and the relevant witness statements were not acceptable (and thus not read) to the magistrates, with the Chair, Malcolm Pearson, declaring that Julie represented merely the ‘more credible witness’, with no evidence of harassment presented.
4. At the Crown Court appeal, again my principal witnesses were not present and their statements not considered by the Panel, with the presiding judge, Michael Challinor, declaring, despite Mr Dann, the CPS’ prosecuting barrister, even, affirming my good character, that I had criminally harassed Julie Davies “beyond reasonable doubt”.
5. Subsequently it has emerged, that Julie’s ‘cock and bull story’, given under oath, contained at least one ‘material’ falsehood, claiming that her [dangerous] dog bit the postman’s bag rather than his leg; the court is not concerned by Julie’s perjury.
6. Also subsequent to the Crown Court hearing, Michael Challinor has stated that my conduct “had little to do with any issue relating to [Julie Davies’] dog”; referring again to the charge sheet, both the argument, and, in a manner of speaking, the case, then, have been won, but, bizarrely, the conviction remains.
7. It would appear, then, that the half-dozen justices sitting in this case have, collectively or individually, acted with considerable antipathy towards me. Given that I do not smell, do not swear and that I provided some compensation for my common-place ‘Teutonic’ appearance with a splash of colour in court (including a conventional Paisley-patterned tie), some other force must be at work. My correspondence and my presentations will have included some indication as to my dislike of the local dogs, including Julie’s hateful hound, defecating both to the front and to the rear of my Stourbridge premises; the Wolverhampton Court stated that it would at least try to ensure a Panel free of dog-lovers, but Michael Challinor indicated, rather alarmingly during the last hearing, his knowledge of, and potential liking for, the dog; the Court will not indicate whether or not the Panel was, ultimately, prone to bias and has not conceded any incompetence.

**DWAustin**

**13th June 2017**