Vange rape allegation retracted

AN ALLEGATION of rape on a teenage girl in Vange did not happen, police have said.

After speaking to detectives again, the 17-year-old girl admitted the allegation of a stranger rape in Vange on April 3 did not happen as she told them.

The victim will be re-interviewed about other allegations she has made.

Insp Tracey Harmen said: “Rape is a terrible crime and police will thoroughly investigate to find those responsible.

“In this case a young girl has made an allegation which has been proved to be false, we are however still investigating other allegations and our enquiries are ongoing.”

APR 8th April 2012 6:30 pm
0She will no doubt get a slap on the wrist.

Which is more than would have happened to someone who might have been accused of the non existent crime.

Report
All 9 of me 8th April 2012 6:39 pm
0Is because none of the blokes in Vange have any b*lls ?

Report
robbieboy598 8th April 2012 8:15 pm
0She should be sent to prison for the same amount of time the innocent man would have been if convicted

Report
shallotman 9th April 2012 9:23 am
0

robbieboy598 wrote:
She should be sent to prison for the same amount of time the innocent man would have been if convicted

Hear Hear.

Report
[Deleted] 9th April 2012 12:15 pm
0[Deleted]

Concerned swimmer 9th April 2012 12:46 pm
0She must have paid up

Report
Soouthchurch59 9th April 2012 3:36 pm
0People withdraw allegations of all kinds - for a multitude of reasons. Just because she now says that it didn't happen, it doesn't automatically follow that that's the case, or that *this* version is indeed the true one.
Concerned swimmer wrote:
he must have paid up
... another possibility is that she was intimidated into withdrawing her complaint.

Exactly.

Concerned swimmer wrote:
he must have paid up
... another possibility is that she was intimidated into withdrawing her complaint.

John the resonator wrote:

Concerned swimmer wrote:
he must have paid up
... another possibility is that she was intimidated into withdrawing her complaint.

If you must know it was very unpleasant because it was untrue and offensive to someone who has worked with children and young people all his career.

The woman in this story might have also made up an allegation for malicious reasons. In reality we do not know if she made up a serious allegation which could have ruined someone's life or whether she was indeed sexually assaulted but has been intimidated or for some other reason has decided not to take the matter further.

As I believe you have noted elsewhere I try and be reasonable. My mind is open to either or a number of possibilities, particularly as the reports often contain little detail. I am reluctant to jump to conclusions in situations like this. I think you know my style by now.

Does that sound reasonable to you?

bassobob wrote:

all lies in jest, still a man hears what he wants to hear and disregards the rest, to quote paul simon
John, how was it for you when julie999 accused you of being a paedophile?

Why do you ask?

If you must know it was very unpleasant because it was untrue and offensive to someone who has worked with children and young people all his career.

The woman in this story might have also made up an allegation for malicious reasons. In reality we do not know if she made up a serious allegation which could have ruined someone’s life or whether she was indeed sexually assaulted but has been intimidated or for some other reason has decided not to take the matter farther.

As I believe you have noted elsewhere I try and be reasonable. My mind is open to either or a number of possibilities, particularly as the reports often contain little detail. I am reluctant to jump to conclusions in situations like this. I think you know my style by now.

Does that sound reasonable to you?

in reality (echo reality) “the allegation was proved to be false”. don't be overly reasonable. draw legitimate conclusions. maybe you have the wrong victim here.

Report
John the resonator 10th April 2012 9:40 am
0
The church of asbo, I am not saying which is the victim am I? I have an open mind to either scenario. I simply felt as many had jumped to the conclusion she was lying I needed to put up another possibility. I have been involved in numerous situations in which there is a disclosure and then a retraction. It takes a lot of judgement to work out which was the truth and to be honest sometimes you never do resolve that question.

As for the accuracy of local newspaper reporting, a number of situations in which I was involved got into the papers as you can imagine. Never once was a headline or report precisely accurate. There is a gravitational pull (should appeal to our friend you know who) towards the sensational or at least hyped up.

Report
Bonky Badger 10th April 2012 10:11 am
0
If it is found that she made the whole thing up then she should be charged with wasting police time at the very least.

Report
John the resonator 10th April 2012 10:54 am
0
Bonky Badger wrote:
If it is found that she made the whole thing up then she should be charged with wasting police time at the very least.
.... absolutely agree.

Report
Soouthchurch59 10th April 2012 11:53 am
0
John the resonator wrote:

Bonky Badger wrote:
If it is found that she made the whole thing up then she should be charged with wasting police time at the very least.
.... absolutely agree.

Surely, it would depend on *why* she made it up.

Report
John the resonator 10th April 2012 12:11 pm
0
Soouthchurch59 wrote:

Bonky Badger wrote:
If it is found that she made the whole thing up then she should be charged with wasting police time at the very least.
.... absolutely agree.

Surely, it would depend on *why* she made it up.

What kind of hypothetical situations do you have in mind?
If it is found that she made the whole thing up then she should be charged with wasting police time at the very least. 
.... absolutely agree.
Surely, it would depend on *why* she made it up.
What kind of hypothetical situations do you have in mind?
It could have been seen (by her) as the lesser of two evils, when say, compared to having to explain X Y or Z to her parents.

Maybe.....

If it is found that she made the whole thing up then she should be charged with wasting police time at the very least. 
.... absolutely agree.
Surely, it would depend on *why* she made it up.
What kind of hypothetical situations do you have in mind?
It could have been seen (by her) as the lesser of two evils, when say, compared to having to explain X Y or Z to her parents.

Maybe.....
Bonky Badger wrote:

If it is found that she made the whole thing up then she should be charged with wasting police time at the very least.

.... absolutely agree.
Surely, it would depend on *why* she made it up.
What kind of hypothetical situations do you have in mind?
It could have been seen (by her) as the lesser of two evils, when say, compared to having to explain X Y or Z to her parents.

Maybe......
If, at a later date, she is (god forbid) actually raped do you think the Police will believe her?

Don't these stupid people realise the consequences of their actions?

Report
Soouthchurch59 10th April 2012 1:46 pm
0

Bonky Badger wrote:

Soouthchurch59 wrote:

John the resonator wrote:

Bonky Badger wrote:

If it is found that she made the whole thing up then she should be charged with wasting police time at the very least.

.... absolutely agree.
Surely, it would depend on *why* she made it up.
I don't see what difference that should make? Who cares why she did it - she did it.
If she's done it for no valid reason, I agree - lock her up. On the other hand, I don't know that she wasn't told by the monster that she has for a stepfather that if late home again, she'd be in whatever kind of trouble.

All hypothetical of course, but I don't know the facts - and neither do you.

Report
Soouthchurch59 10th April 2012 1:48 pm
0

Bonky Badger wrote:

Soouthchurch59 wrote:

John the resonator wrote:

Soouthchurch59 wrote:

John the resonator wrote:

Bonky Badger wrote:

If it is found that she made the whole thing up then she should be charged with wasting police time at the very least.

.... absolutely agree.
Surely, it would depend on *why* she made it up.
What kind of hypothetical situations do you have in mind?
It could have been seen (by her) as the lesser of two evils, when say, compared to having to explain X Y or Z to her parents.

Maybe......
If, at a later date, she is (god forbid) actually raped do you think the Police will believe her?

Don't these stupid people realise the consequences of their actions?
That will depend on the evidence I guess....
Bonky Badger wrote: If it is found that she made the whole thing up then she should be charged with wasting police time at the very least.

.... absolutely agree.

Surely, it would depend on *why* she made it up.

What kind of hypothetical situations do you have in mind?

It could have been seen (by her) as the lesser of two evils, when say, compared to having to explain X Y or Z to her parents.

Maybe......

That will depend on the evidence I guess....

The first action of any 'rape' case is surely to determine if the accuser is actually telling the truth, so if she has done this before, it will automatically swing any decision against her.

Bonky Badger wrote:

The first action of any 'rape' case is surely to determine if the accuser is actually telling the truth, so if she has done this before, it will automatically swing any decision against her.

I donate a pound to charity everytime a poster uses one of the following cop-outs:

"You don't know her/him (so you aren't allowed to make a comment I disagree with)."

Or my other favourite:

"You don't know anything about me." (ie. I don't have a good response to your argument).

This week alone, I've donated £500.

I would say that if you've lied about being raped then you are, in fact, incredibly stupid.

I dispute your reasoning for those comments. The fact is, you do not know anything about the case or the person making the accusations and then retracting. It isn't that you are not allowed to disagree. Of course you are, it's called debate and as someone else stated on here (John, I think) it would be very boring for us all to think the same.
It is far too easy to make assumptions from such limited information. I for one just find it sad that people automatically default to the negative without even considering all of the possibilities. Many of which may be beyond the typical. Without knowing ALL of the facts it would be stupid to vilify this person. Stating that you do not know ALL the facts is merely trying to make you think outside your usual thinking. Has diddly to do with not being allowed to differ in opinion.

When I made the comment on the other thread about you not knowing me, it had nothing to do with me not having a good response to your argument. It had everything to do with your assumptions about me which clearly were untrue. I say clearly, because to me it was clearly untrue. To you it was just that you made assumptions about me. I just find it incredibly frustrating and actually to me just says you don't have the ability to reason your argument either.

But then, those are my assumptions about you based on what you write on here.

AS for this accusation being retracted, I can only agree with everything John and Soothchurch59 have already said.

Report

Bonky Badger - 12th April 2012 7:41 am

opalina wrote:

I dispute your reasoning for those comments. The fact is, you do not know anything about the case or the person making the accusations and then retracting. It isn't that you are not allowed to disagree. Of course you are, it's called debate and as someone else stated on here (John, I think) it would be very boring for us all to think the same.

It is far too easy to make assumptions from such limited information. I for one just find it sad that people automatically default to the negative without even considering all of the possibilities. Many of which may be beyond the typical. Without knowing ALL of the facts it would be stupid to vilify this person. Stating that you do not know ALL the facts is merely trying to make you think outside your usual thinking. Has diddly to do with not being allowed to differ in opinion.

When I made the comment on the other thread about you not knowing me, it had nothing to do with me not having a good response to your argument. It had everything to do with your assumptions about me which clearly were untrue. I say clearly, because to me it was clearly untrue. To you it was just that you made assumptions about me. I just find it incredibly frustrating and actually to me just says you don't have the ability to reason your argument either.

But then, those are my assumptions about you based on what you write on here.

AS for this accusation being retracted, I can only agree with everything John and Soothchurch59 have already said.

I think you've proved my point with your pointless monologue.

The FACT (as said by the Police) is that the allegations are false. Any other facts in this case are moot. She knew she was committing a crime and wasting police time by doing such a thing. WHY she did it, I couldn't care less. She has now made it harder for the police to believe any other woman who cries rape.

No wonder justice and the criminal system is such a joke in this country if people are always trying to find excuses for criminal behaviour. People know right from wrong. Who cares why she did it?

I have reasoned my argument but I'm afraid that your only response is "you don't know the facts/me/her, etc." It's a very outdated defence used by people who don't really like alternative ways of judging a situation.

That's not a response - that's an attempt to close down anyone who doesn't agree with your line of thinking. If you followed your own line of thinking you wouldn't allow anyone to make comment about anything unless they were intimately involved with every person in the world.

I'm afraid you'll find most people don't care about her history, circumstances, etc. apart from people who have something financial to gain from dragging out the criminal process.

Report

Matthew of Basildon - 12th April 2012 4:04 pm

0

As several comments above suggest, there are many possible reasons for this to have accured.

However I've begun to wonder if it's not a similar situation a girl I knew back in college found herself in;
She was 16, had slept with a man the age of around 30 - 35, the night had ended with her discovery that the man already was in a relationship. From this, done in an attempt to spite the 'honourable gentleman' she contacted the plod and cried rape.

Obviously, as you'd expect, it was taken very seriously. However, throughout the delaing (I wont pretend I know what happened during this time) she realised quite how deep into this she was and admitted to lying.

She was given a slap on the wrist for this (!) and was basically told 'lying is naughty'.

So perhaps the situation could be similar, a realisation of just how far things would be taken if she continued with her story.

But just as likely it could be threats, pay-offs, even a joke!

We’ll never know unless our fine Echo does a follow up...?

Report
openspace 13th April 2012 1:45 pm
0
Rape is a despicable crime, but so is an allegation of rape that is then found to be false. There is absolutely no acceptable excuse for either.

Report
bazaarhorse 14th April 2012 7:50 am
0
robbieboy598 wrote:

she should be sent to prison for the same amount of time the innocent man would have been if convicted
I agree.

https://www.echo-news.co.uk/news/9638086.Vange_rape_allegation_retracted/