

[REDACTED]

**Sent:** 25 December 2010 8:16 PM  
**To:** extradition.review  
**Subject:** Independent review panel.

Firstly I wish to state that I am the father of Neil Entwistle who was extradited to the United States of America from the UK in February 2006.

It is good news that this new coalition government has thought to put together an independent panel reviewing the extradition arrangements as they stand, particularly to look at the US-UK Extradition Treaty as one of the five key areas. In my experience the requesting countries should be required to provide sufficient evidence to prove any allegations they make.

When my innocent son Neil was handed over to the US authorities on UK soil, at this point Neil was under the care of the Home Office until he arrived in the US. As Neil boarded the aeroplane to go the US, he was left alone with the US authorities. Neil was not offered the chance of an independent witness or legal representative to accompany him on this flight. On this flight Neil was questioned by US Marshal's, and yet was not read his Miranda Rights. As soon as Neil entered the aircraft he was immediately placed in shackles. This aircraft landed on a military airbase in the US, and civilians would normally be excluded from this area, except for authorised personnel. As Neil appeared from the aircraft he was still in shackles, and in the airspace above him were two civilian helicopters loaded with media cameras covering the event. On the airstrip were at least a hundred news reporters covering this orchestrated spectacle. At this time all the main TV stations in the State of Massachusetts were broken into, where all the main TV programmes covered this event, ensuring that they gave the impression that Neil appeared guilty. A jury was to be picked from this audience, what chance was there of a fair trial?

I strongly condemn the actions of the Home Office in leaving Neil open to this type of abuse from the US authorities. Previously when notified of these events, the Home Office have had no comments to make, so I assume they would allow this to happen again to someone else.

In the information that was supplied to extradite Neil, there were false claims made by the US authorities. Within the information they go on about Neil's computer activity, and yet in trial Elliot Weinstein defence lawyer held up the laptop involved and stated that no fingerprints or DNA were ever taken from the laptop. This was not disputed by the prosecutors and so where was the evidence? Also in the information supplied by the DA's Office ( who it was proved in trial by the defence lawyers Stephanie Page, that they together with the prosecutors and State Police, had failed to supply forensic evidence to the medical examiner, prior to him doing his autopsy) was a statement that they made stating they had a match of Neil's DNA on the butt of the alleged murder weapon. The statement made by the DA's Office with regards to Neil's DNA being on the butt of the alleged murder weapon, was not true according to defence lawyer Elliot Weinstein, as no oral swab had been taken from Neil, which is the only way that this claim could be made. In an affidavit supplied by the defence lawyers dated 6th September 2006, Gwen Pino, Supervisor with the Massachusetts Department of State Crime Laboratory, has attested that "in order for DNA analysis to be reliable, a DNA standard sample should be taken directly from a suspect or defendant in accordance with laboratory policy guide lines". Therefore this claim by the US authorities is untrue.

In the same information the DA's Office provided, they contradict a statement made by my innocent son Neil. My son's statement was the same as the police officer who found the bodies involved. This State Police Officer, Sgt Sutton was under oath, risking a charge of perjury if he lied, when he gave the very same account as my innocent son. These people were trying to create a smoke screen to implicate my son, after all these are the very same people that it was proved in trial, withheld forensic evidence from the medical examiner.

I have in my possession all the relevant paper work to back up my statements, and can also call on lawyers if necessary to back up my claims.

All the best with your review.

Best Regards,



Sent: 12 January 2011 10:19 AM



**Subject:** Extradition of Neil Entwistle.

Dear John Mann MP,

In reply to a letter I received from you, which included a letter that you had received from the Minister responsible for the extradition policy. CTS Reference M9390/10.

Within this letter the Minister referred to the fact that it was for my innocent son Neil to ask for a legal representative or witness to accompany him on this flight. Who then was present to ensure that any such request would have been fulfilled? Certainly not representatives of the British government, as they were busy ensuring that the US authorities were able to listen into our private telephone calls from home throughout that year.

Even though my innocent son Neil had been and still is a model prisoner, the US Marshal's on the flight immediately shackled him to totally demoralise him and then taunted him. They then questioned him on the flight without him being read his Miranda Rights. As he disembarked from the aeroplane he was greeted by the worlds media to ensure that he was given no chance of a fair trial. Up until this point my innocent son Neil was under the responsibility of the Home Office, and a precedence had then been set to allow my innocent son Neil to be tortured in jail over an eighteen month period before the trial.

The US authorities who orchestrated all this, were the very same people as was proved in trial to have withheld forensic evidence from the medical examiner, which would have proved that someone other than Neil did the crime, otherwise why was this evidence withheld?

Is there any wonder that the new coalition government is looking into the extradition process between the UK and US. The Rt Hon Sir Scott Baker who is leading this review panel in the interests of justice, and has received my thoughts on the subject, for which I was very grateful.

I would like to know why the British government has been quite willing and eager to destroy my family? My own thoughts are that it is because we are working class.

Regards,

Clifford Entwistle

This email was received from the INTERNET and scanned by the Government Secure Intranet anti-virus service supplied by Cable&Wireless Worldwide in partnership with MessageLabs. (CCTM Certificate Number 2009/09/0052.) In case of problems, please call your organisation's IT Helpdesk. Communications via the GSi may be automatically logged, monitored and/or recorded for legal purposes.

[REDACTED]

---

**Sent:** 14 January 2011 12:02 PM

[REDACTED]

**Subject:** Neil Entwistle's extradition

Dear John Mann MP,

Further to my email to you dated 12/01/2011, concerning the extradition of my innocent son Neil Entwistle. This email was in response to a letter I received from you ( CTS Reference M9390/10 ) in which the Minister concerned in answer to my query, stated that it was for my innocent son Neil to ask for a witness or legal representative to accompany him on the flight to the US on being extradited.

As I stated at the end of my email, I believe that we as a family were treated unfairly by the British government due to the fact we are working class. To this I wish to add that there is in my opinion, another reason for the way that my family were treated unfairly by the British government. Personnel within certain department of the British government, saw the precedent set by their counterparts over the pond, and could see an opportunity for promotion to be gained here, at only the expense of the working class.

As an example I shall use Michael Fabbri lead prosecutor in my innocent son's trial, who after the trial gained the prestigious award as the ' Lawyer of the Year '. This after it was proved in trial that the prosecutors withheld forensic evidence from the medical examiner. Michael Fabbri in trial instructed a key witness on the stand, to not disclose the contents of texts made between herself and the deceased only a short time before the shooting. On the request of Julian Gibbs ( extradition section ) who I supplied evidence to in December 2009, where it was shown that Michael Fabbri provided false information to warrant Neil's extradition.

What of the US police officers involved in my innocent son's case, well they were either promoted or received commendations for their work. This work included entering my son's home twice without a search warrant, therefore illegally. Also as proved to Julian Gibbs, that they provided contradictions in their statements to create a smoke screen to incriminate my innocent son.

As if as a normal British working class family, we haven't got enough to cope with fighting this kind of treatment by the US authorities, we have our own government assisting them in every way possible to the detriment of my family. What more can I say, the evidence is there for everyone to see.

Regards,

Clifford Entwistle

This email was received from the INTERNET and scanned by the Government Secure Intranet anti-virus service supplied by Cable&Wireless Worldwide in partnership with MessageLabs. (CCTM Certificate Number 2009/09/0052.) In case of problems, please call your organisation's IT Helpdesk. Communications via the GSI may be automatically logged, monitored and/or recorded for legal purposes.

[REDACTED]

---

**Sent:** 25 January 2011 9:38 AM

[REDACTED]

**Subject:** Neil Entwistle

Dear John Mann MP,

In addition to my recent emails to you concerning my innocent son Neil Entwistle, who was extradited to the United States in February 2006, I wish to add even more evidence to show that the main prosecutor in the trial Michael Fabbri, is not at all interested in my son receiving justice.

When you open the attach file added to this email, you will see one main difference in the three photographs included. These three people are involved in the same trial and holding the same gun.

Every piece of evidence that came through the court room in the trial was contained in a protective bag and if taken out of the bag, handled with gloves. There are still unidentified fingerprints on this gun, and this case is far from over. What if at a later stage an examination of the gun needs to be taken again? This very gun was even allowed to go into the deliberation room.

In the photograph of Michael Fabbri, he is at the time giving his closing argument. His concern is not about whether my son Neil gets a fair trial, only that my innocent son Neil gets convicted. Our government did it's level best to assist this man Fabbri, for him then to destroy my family.

Regards,

Clifford Entwistle

This email was received from the INTERNET and scanned by the Government Secure Intranet anti-virus service supplied by Cable&Wireless Worldwide in partnership with MessageLabs. (CCTM Certificate Number 2009/09/0052.) In case of problems, please call your organisation's IT Helpdesk. Communications via the GSI may be automatically logged, monitored and/or recorded for legal purposes.



June 16: Deanna Dygan holds up a gun entered into evidence.



June 17: Chemist Laura Bryant of the Massachusetts State Police crime lab holds the alleged murder weapon during Entwistle's trial.



Prosecutor Mike Fabbri holds up the murder weapon. (AP/noon)