How Did The Suffolk Constabulary Kill Ian Roy Durrands?

The title of this article is not *if* the the Suffolk Constabulary killed Mr. Durrands. That I take for granted. It is not even *why* they killed him. It is *how* did they kill him? Did the Suffolk Constabulary drive Mr. Durrands to suicide in the same manner in which the Texas police killed #sandrabland ? Or did the Suffolk Constabulary have a direct physical role in Mr. Durrand's death? Did officers of the Suffolk Constabulary smash Mr. Durrands' skull with a blunt instrument, and then throw his dead carcass off the Orwell Bridge so that it landed head first on the rocks below thus concealing the true cause of the blunt force trauma that shattered his skull? Did the Suffolk Constabulary fake a suicide to conceal a murder? Did the Suffolk Constabulary further defile Mr. Durrands' reputation even after his death?

This story starts when Mr. Durrands had an affair with a married woman, Mrs. *Corrina* Horne. Mrs Horne is the owner of Corrina's Jewellery Box, a bridal shop in Felixstowe, Suffolk, UK. Now Mr. Durrands should not have cheated with another man's wife; Mr. Durrands is an adulterer. But that is his only crime. Indeed, that is not even unlawful in the United Kingdom. He did not deserve to die for having an affair with a consenting adult.

Mrs Horne's husband found out about the affair. He was not happy about it. So, Mrs. Horne told her husband a lie. A really bad lie. Mrs. Horne told her husband that she had not really had an affair with Mr. Durrands. Rather she told her husband that Mr. Durrands had raped her. There were obvious red flags in Mrs. Horne's story: Not least of which is how Mr. Durrands was able to rape Mrs. Horne over and over and over again at so many different times, and at so many different places, for such an extended period of time, before she mentioned these repeated rapes to anybody. Corrina's story lacked credibility, she needed to embellish it. So, embellish it she did: She told her husband that Mr. Durrands had also raped her daughter, a mere child. Mrs. Corrina Horne manipulated her daughter into confirming this story. Mrs. Horne got her daughter to lie for her. This in and of itself is abuse of her own child.

Now Mr. Durrands was by profession a computer consultant. He needed a weapon to fight back against these false accusations, and so he turned to his profession. He created a website to tell his side of the story. Mrs. Corrina Horne already had a website for her business, it's domain name was corrinasjewellerybox.co.uk. Mr. Durrand bought the domain name corrinasjewellerybox.com to host his website. The domain name was chosen so as to be confusingly similar to Mrs. Horne's domain name; her's ending in .co.uk, his ending in .com. Thus he thought that his site would receive some traffic that was intending to access her site.

It is worthy of note how long it took the Suffolk Constabulary to track down Mr. Durrands as the author of his website. It took at least 2 years. During this time the police arrested and interrogated other people in their attempt to find the person that had created corrinasjewellerybox.com. If they had merely typed the domain name corrinasjewellerybox.com into the domaintools.com site they would have found Mr. Durrands' name, address and telephone number in a few seconds. This incompetence will become significant later in the story. Indeed, it is for that reason that this information is presented now. The investigative incompetence of the
Suffolk Constabulary will feature in one of the red flags raised later in this story.

Initially Mr. Durrands' site told only the story of the accusations being made against him, and his rebuttal of those accusations. But Mrs. Horne made complaints to the Suffolk Constabulary to fight back against Mr. Durrands' website. The Suffolk Constabulary chose to side with Mrs. Horne against Mr. Durrands. The Suffolk Constabulary arrested and generally harassed Mr. Durrands for a prolonged time. Once the Suffolk Constabulary had picked sides they would not accept crime reports made by Mr. Durrands about repeated harassment by Mrs. Horne and her accomplices. But yet the Suffolk Constabulary were very enthusiastic to take repeated crime reports from Mrs. Horne about how she was being harassed, stalked and put in fear by Mr. Durrands, even though there was no evidence to support these scurrilous accusations. This kind of wilful ignorance is a character trait that the Suffolk Constabulary has demonstrated on numerous other occasions in many unrelated cases. It is a wilful perversion of justice by the police. Indeed, since many police officers collaborate in this behaviour, it is a conspiracy to pervert justice. Why do police officers behave in this way? Once they have committed to one version of events they stubbornly exhibit a childish refusal to admit their mistakes and correct their errors. This behaviour pattern seems engrained in the organizational culture of the Suffolk Constabulary: No police officer wants to be the one to let the side down by exposing the incompetence of their colleagues.

At this time Mr. Durrands' website morphed into open criticism of the Suffolk Constabulary. He published details of how the police were harassing him. The Suffolk Constabulary were not happy about these facts being published, and ramped up their efforts to hurt Mr. Durrands. In particular the accusations that Mr. Durrands had raped Mrs. Horne's child were now front and centre in the battle. Mr. Durrands reacted to this by goading the Suffolk Constabulary into charging him with child sex abuse. This standoff of accusations and denials went on for years. Mr. Durrands wanted his day in court. He wanted to clear his na
me. His message to the Suffolk Constabulary was Put up or shut up . Mr. Durrands was a brave man.

Now the behaviour of Mr. Durrands in wanting to face his accusers across a court room is not rigorous proof of his innocence. But yet it is not the behaviour normally associated with a guilty man. By this time the Suffolk Constabulary seemed content to let the matter drop, to take no further action. They had realised that their case against Mr. Durrands was so weak that they would probably lose. Not only would the police lose the case, but they would also lose face. In this situation a guilty man would probably just crawl into a hole and hope the situation would just go away. This is especially true given the demonizing accusations that he faced. Most guilty men would shy away from publicity in this situation. And by all accounts the Suffolk Constabulary wante
d the case to just go away.
But Mr. Durrands was not having it: He continued to goad the Suffolk Constabulary into charging him, and eventually they did just that.

This is the point in the story when the brutality of the British Criminal Justice System was brought to bear on a dissenter that had dared to challenge them. The police's arsenal of dirty tricks can break anyone, even a brave and determined man like Mr. Durrands. His life was systematically destroyed, he was turned into a broken man. He was subjected to psychological torture of a ferocity that has compelled many strong and courageous men to make false confessions to heinous crimes they did not commit. But still Mr. Durrands held on to the one remaining thing he had left in this world: His insistence of his innocence. The thugs and bullies that call themselves police were unable to take that away from him.

Mr. Durrands was granted court bail. But one of the conditions was that he shut down his website. The system would spin this as stopping his harassment of Mrs. Horne, but in reality it was to give the police and Crown Prosecution Service bragging rights that they had achieved something. In any event it was suppression of free speech, the act of a draconian government. Why should Mr. Durrands be forbidden to tell his side of the story when he is being demonized by the press?

Many months went by and eventually the trial began in Crown Court. The trial was expected to last several weeks. But one week into the trial, on a Monday morning, Mr. Durrands had disappeared. But who alerted authorities to his disappearance? According to the Eastern Daily Press (1) the police were notified by a relative at 12:40pm on the Monday that Mr. Durrands had disappeared. Red Flag number 1: Since Mr. Durrands was the defendant in a Crown Court Trial, and he did not show up at court, surely the bailiffs would notify the police. They would not have left it for his family to report. Red flag number 2: The notification made by the bailiffs would have been a fugitive from justice, a breach of bail, not merely a missing person report. Red Flag number 3: Mr. Durrands would have been expected at court about 9:30 am, and so that is when he was discovered to be missing. Why would the police even accept a missing

person report for an adult that had only been missing 3 hours and 10 minutes? They normally wait 2 days before accepting a missing persons report. Red flag number 4: Mr. Durrands' body was found in the River Orwell at 1.15pm. That is just 35 minutes after he was reported missing. That is remarkably efficient for the Suffolk Constabulary. Remember the Suffolk Constabulary could not even track down the author of Mr. Durrands' website for 2 years or more, but yet they suddenly became so competent that they could find his dead carcass beneath the Orwell Bridge in 35 Minutes. How did they get so competent so fast? Unless of course they knew exactly where to look. Perhaps they knew where to look because that is where they dumped his body. Red flag number 5: Mr. Durrands' carcass was found by the Harwich lifeboat; an ocean going lifeboat that just happened to be several miles inland up the Orwell River at just the right time. Red flag number 6: Mr Durrands' car was found in a layby near the Orwell Bridge; if he committed suicide by jumping then he must have walked onto the Orwell Bridge. Why not simply drive onto the bridge, stop the car, and jump? It is not as if he would have to pay the parking fine or towing and impound charges if he abandoned his car on the bridge!

The reporting of this case by the mainstream media has been highly misleading, a deliberate attempt to sensationalize this story, and to demonize Mr. Durrands. The Easter Daily Press article states that Mr. Durrands was on trial over a string of child sex allegations . Heart reported that Mr. Durrands was accused of 24 child sex offences including sexual assault . They paint a picture of Mr. Durrands as a serial paedophile. In fact Mr. Durrands was only accused of sexually assaulting one child: Mrs. Horne's daughter. At least Heart got Mr. Durrands age correct at 61 years old. The BBC reported his age as 53 years. So much for fact checking by the mainstream media.

The reaction of members of the public to this story has also been highly enlightening as to the psyche of the public at large. On Twitter several people have expressed pleasure at Mr. Durrands' death. **Davidgeorgeking** , who descibes himelf as Christian, Foster Carer, Family Man, Campaigner for justice. Corbyn supporter Labour Left, Work should Pay & Anti-Bullying, make life Fairer for everyone! commented that I don't think anyone who has experienced abuse at the hands of a paedophile will loose much sleep over that! I won't either .
Catherine Grace
, self descibed as I joined Twitter cause I'm NOSEY like that! Christian PrayerWarrior I endured
#
ChildhoodSexualAbuse
ages 4-16...I fight for current victims. tweeted must have known a few names and/or had evidence to back it up.
Rachel Hayes
and
MartTheTaxi

simply tweeted good . Clearly they must approve of the death of Mr. Durrands. And the story was retweeted without comment by @mwilliamsthomas . He describes himself as TV Investigative Reporter (ITV, This Morning & Ch4 News) Criminologist. International Peabody & 2 x Royal Television Society, BAFTA nominee. Views are my own. . Yeah right: Some investigative reporter he is! He propagates a false story without any fact checking. This is typical of the standard of reporting that we must expect from the mainstream media. No wonder the general public have such a distorted view of reality when they are fed this propaganda by sources they trust.

So, this is a cross section of how the public react to the death of a person accused of being a paedophile. The public, and at least one **Investigative Reporter** believe the police version of events without question. The public are baying for blood. But with Mr. Durrands' death the trial was terminated. Judge John Holt dismissed the jury and recorded a result of defendant deceased . No attempt was made to continue the trial in absentia to find the truth. The death of Mr. Durrands' ended any hope he had to clear his name.

So, did he jump or was he pushed? If indeed it was a suicide then Mr. Durrands was driven to suicide by a brutal regime covering up for it's own incompetence. The circumstances bear a shocking similarity to the case of #sandrabland that is currently receiving national attention in the United States. She died in police custody just three days after being arrested for acting like a free person in a first world country . She was happy, elegant and asserted her rights. Now she is dead. Mr Durrands likewise asserted his right to free speech and to clear his name in a court of law. Mr. Durrands is now dead. But was this a suicide? Given Mr. Durrands' courage as demonstrated by years of surviving bullying by the Suffolk Constabulary, his determination to clear his name and his own insistence that the trial must happen, why would he kill himself one week into the trial he tried so hard to force to occur? Who benefits from Mr. Durrands' death? If the Police and Crown Prosecution Service were losing the case, then they save face by ending a trial and preventing a verdict. The stigma of a suicide makes Mr. Durrands look guilty; why would he act in a manner so contrary to his cause when so close to achieving vindication? Hopefully after reading this article the public will not be so swift to assume that Mr. Durrands is guilty.

References

1.

http://www.eadt.co.uk/news/felixstowe_man_ian_durrands_who_was_on_trial_over_string_of_child_sex_allegations_is_found_dead_in_river_orwell_1_3824128

2.

https://twitter.com/mwilliamsthomas/status/527936082445209600

3.

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Death_of_Sandra_Bland

4.

http://www.eadt.co.uk/news/felixstowe_man_charged_with_committing_25_sexual_offences_1_2233575

5.

http://www.heart.co.uk/suffolk/news/local/felixstowe-man-charged-24-child-sex-offences/

6.

http://www.bbc.com/news/uk-england-suffolk-29816092