

D/C sums up.

agree looney can be inspired from gen. crisis
can not seriously challenge fact that
bulk of goods were stolen.

∴ whole case of case is guilty knowledge.

as Pro. ev. falls into 3 gps

- (a) Matthews
- (b) Police. (conv. statement)
- (c) General nature, circumstances surrounding case.

(a) Matthews - should not hang a dog
on the ev. biased statement that
he had been forced into it. He had seen
at Garage 2 yrs. did not start to
steal until 6 mos ago. Is it likely they
would have held their hand for 18 mos.

(b) Police. at 1st impersim. ev. by Gen.
police offers seems apt. to upset. They
are human and subject to error.
draw attention to discrepancy between
total. evs. after ~~earlier~~ Barbell is
putting in an incriminating statement
which his colleague omits - and which
rec. denies.
re important conversation between
mother & son. A vital statement why did
Pol. offer omit it earlier. He did not
omit other less important conversations
Pol. offers do not leave out such vital
matters when making their notes. Pro.
may say mother interested witness - but
remember client bears unblemished character
and entitled to as much credence as
Pol. offers. 227