

# Some oddities regarding Version 1

**Disclaimer:** Every criminal case which is a case of circumstantial evidence, where there is no confession nor the dead or alive victim is found, will have some oddities to be explained. Oddities occur in such cases in principle always as a result of missing information. Every single oddity on one side and single evidence on the other side may, as a single objective, be rejected by any more or less well founded argumentation. To judge on a case of circumstantial evidence is only possible through an overall view of all the evidence and apparent contradictions as well, which has to be done, hopefully in the future, by a professional judge in a court of competent jurisdiction. Thus the following samples of oddities are just markers one has to think about besides the pure evidence. The listed oddities can therefore be regarded only as puzzles to investigators but never as a sole decision maker.

See also [Some oddities regarding Version 2](#)

---

## Oddities regarding the time of event 3rd/4th May

### Sample 1

#### Small time scale of the event

An oddity is the seemingly small time scale of the event, which means that [everything happened between 17:30 to 22:30](#) (five hours). In this time first the accidental killing occurred, then [the plot had to be made](#) and arranged, the [wall had to be cleaned](#), collaborators to be found and instructed, the [dead body](#) to be obscured. And all this had to be done with the shock and grieve of the parents to be considered.

**Although this is possible and also feasible but it requires an uncanny cleverness and coolness.**

---

### Sample 2

#### Rumors on Death earlier than [3rd May 2007](#)

So also [rumors](#) occurred that the death of Maddie occurred earlier, e.g. at evening 2nd of May and was obscured on the day 3rd. Such rumors are funded on the fact that the time of [the last photo](#) cannot be proven for sure, as digital camera clocks are easy to be manipulated. Indeed also the [Tapas Group](#) alleged to have not taken any photos on the evening 3rd although all possessed cameras and smartphones to do so. Photos but which could show some of the McCann's and give evidence to some very crucial questions, as e.g. [which clothes has Gerry McCann worn](#) on the evening 3rd indeed?

The non-independent witness [David Payne](#) claims to have seen Madeleine at 18.30 on the 3rd May. Kate said he was at the [Apartment](#) for 30 seconds ([Kate's book](#) Madeleine). David but said he was there for half an hour. *Rumors* also were elevated because of the [Payne-Allegation](#) implying that Maddies death occurred from some very malignant reasons.

Also but there is the fact that there were **personal links between Kate and the nannies** responsible for Maddie. This were [Catriona Baker](#) and [Charlotte Pennington](#). From Catriona's 18th April 2008 Rogatory: *"I visited the family in their home at their invitation to see how they were getting along in November of 2007."* She was there at the time of the so called [Rothley Meeting](#). Catriona's Rogatory is also confusing: *"Kate went to get Madeleine from the Tapas Bar area and according to what I remember she was wearing sporting clothes and I assumed that she was practicing some form of athletics. It was around **15h25/18h00**".* It is also interesting to note that Charlotte Pennington is missing from the nannies list. All employees had a number, but not Charlotte Pennington. There has been speculation that Charlotte came as a nanny to one of the [Tapas 9](#). This but cannot be substantiated. Charlotte lived in Howick, New Zealand from when she was 18 months old. Kate McCann worked in a hospital in Howick, New Zealand in 1996.

You may look at some more reasoning at →[UnterDenTeppichGekehrt](#): *"An attempt at a reconstruction of a theoretically possible course of events"*. See also e.g. Youtube Video →[McCanns..crying story or crying wolf?](#) also tells some critics on the 3rd of May.

**The Oddity here is, that this [sinister background](#) could not be substantiated further.**

---

## Sample 3

### The questionable credibility of the [Smiths Sighting](#)

The Sighting made by the Irish family Smith would clearly point to Gerry McCann as a possible offender. But the overall credibility may be questioned. See details at →[what-happened-to-madeleine-mccann, Martin Smith timeline](#)

---

## Oddities regarding the aftermath of the event

### Sample 1A

#### Conspiracy Theory

It is obvious that the McCann's from the beginning of the events until today (which is close to 7 years now) got an [unprecedented high support](#) of some of the most influential and richest people of the UK. The most amazing aspect but is the [complete refusal of Police and Prosecutors in the UK](#) to investigate the [McCann's and the Tapas](#) Friends personally. There were never made any house searches nor sharp cross reference interviewing of this seemingly highly involved witnesses and possible offenders by evidence of the [Portuguese criminal files](#).

This can be explained by just two possibilities:

1. that those professional UK Investigators and Prosecutors are (eventually by some yet unknown evidence) absolutely sure of the innocence of the McCann's by some [professional means](#)
2. or there must be a desperate [conspiracy](#) involving the British establishment, especially here the [UK law enforcement](#) authorities.

The last possibility but would mean, that not only the McCann's, but also the Upper British Society would be [rotten to the core](#).

**Can this really be possible or isn't it nothing but one of those [farcical Conspiracy Theories](#)?**

---

## Sample 2A

### Continuing Search

How can the [continuing search](#), now nearly seven years, for Madeleine be explained?

**Could any parents stand this obvious enormous stress that long if not innocent?**

---

## Sample 3A

### Why is there no leakage?

If the [Tapas 7](#) lay, why wasn't there any leak or confession by the seven witnesses in now nearly seven years?

**Hard to believe.** (Remark: An Answer may be found within the [The Rothley Meeting](#))

---

## Sample 4A: Kate's Faith

Especially Kate McCann is known to be a strict Catholic women. Well, without any moral judgement, the [Madeleine-Fund](#) transformed them from large debt to large cash owners. But could money account for losing faith and betraying her child and her own God? Even if she confessed to priest Fr Jose Manuel Pacheco (see [Odd. Vers.2](#) sample 1A) and thus believes she got rid of her severe sin, anyway she then would be a continuing frankly liar and fraudster to her believe in God.

**This is also hard to believe.**

---

## Sample 5A

**McCann's were cleared by the Portuguese Authorities in 2008**

The McCann's, Newspapers and e.g. Wikipedia's article on Madeleine McCann states this: **"In July 2008, the McCanns were cleared by the Portuguese Attorney-General"**.

On 10-Sept-2007, one day after McCann's left Portugal, the **Summarizing PJ Report 2007 →police report P.J. 10 SEP 2007** was made public (see also [Chief Inspector Tavares de Almeida \(PJ\)](#)). It states clearly Madeliene [died](#) in [Apartment 5A](#) and the parents are main suspects, deliberately lied to the police, and have faked the abduction with the help of [their friends](#).

On 2 Oct. 2007, [Dr Amaral](#) was removed from the investigation into Madeleine's disappearance. The Portuguese judicial authorities then appointed a new investigation co-ordinator. He reported to the District Attorney (not the Attorney-General as stated on Wikipedia) for that region of Portugal, **Jose de Magalhaes e Menezes**. He issued a report on the investigation, signed off by **Deputy Attorney-General Joao Melchior Gomes**, which was made public in **July 2008**. The McCanns rely on this report for their claim that they were 'cleared'. The quotation that the McCanns rely on is this, found on page 4,649 of the file of police documents in the case released to the public later that year:

On 21-July-2008, the Final Report →**The PJ's Final Report & The Archiving Dispatch (The PJ's 57-page 'Final Report' summary & the Public Prosecutor's Archiving Dispatch)** was published:

1. On **page 4,649** his final statement: *"I order...the filing of the papers concerning the suspects [Gerald Patrick McCann](#) and [Kate Marie Healy](#) [the surname then used by Dr Kate McCann], as there is **no evidence that they committed any crime defined by Article 277.1** of the Code of Criminal Procedure"*.
2. On **page 4648**, he declares: *"...it must be clearly understood that **this is not equivalent to final and irreversible closure** of the enquiry"*.
3. On **page 4647** of the same report: *"No evidence was obtained which would enable the average person...to arrive at a clear and honest conclusion as to how the child was taken from the apartment (dead or alive, and if dead whether by negligent or wilful manslaughter)"*. On the same page, the District Attorney adds: *"**We do not have any grounds whatsoever for saying, with the necessary degree of certainty, exactly what crime(s) may have been committed against Madeleine McCann**"*.
4. On **page 4643**, also **pages 4597-8**: *"Whilst it is an undeniable fact that Madeleine disappeared from [Apartment 5A](#) in the [Ocean Club](#), the manner and **circumstances in which it happened are unclear**, despite the huge number of investigations, and the potential range of crimes suggested. **The potential range of crimes suggested** throughout the enquiry - including abduction for sexual purposes or other uses and accidental death and hiding of the body - **still stands**"*.
5. On **page 4605**: *"The **possibility of abduction** was exhaustively investigated. **No ransom was ever requested, nor were there any sufficiently consistent clues found to support this theory**"*.

(See some more details on →[Have her parents been 'cleared' of any involvement in her disappearance?](#))

See also at →[McCannFiles](#):

**"While one or both of them may be innocent, there is no clear evidence that eliminates them from involvement in Madeleine's disappearance."** - The [assistant chief constable of Leicestershire](#), in an official submission of Leicester Police to the Family Division of the High Court, in July 2008 (as the McCann parents wanted to get all files regarding the case at LP)

"You will also be aware of the Madeleine McCann case. Both this and the [Ben] [Needham](#) case are categorised as a **missing persons**, rather than child abduction cases, as there is no evidence in either case to support whether the children were or were not abducted." - The **Foreign and Commonwealth Office** responding to a Freedom of Information request in connection with missing Ben Needham

**"The potential involvement of the family in the disappearance of Madeleine McCann cannot be discarded**, and it can be considered that, when pondering the basis for research, this hypothesis deserves as much attention as the criminal with sexual motivations that has been previously prioritised." - Lee Rainbow, at the time, **senior behavioural investigation consultant at the National Policing Improvement Agency**

---

## Sample 6A

### The credibility of [Cadaver Dogs](#)

Indeed if the Cadaver Dogs did smell [Cadaver Odour](#) e.g. on [Cuddle Cat](#) this would be a blank [smoking gun](#) in the McCann's hands. Innocence or not thus may be credited to the Dogs. So on pages 249-250 of [Kate McCann's book 'Madeleine'](#), she writes criticising the credibility of the dog-team:

*"At one point the handler directed the dogs to a spot behind the couch in the sitting room, close to the curtains. He called the dogs over to him to investigate this particular site. The dogs ultimately 'alerted'. I felt myself starting to relax a little. This was not what I would call an exact science". In a second passage Kate writes: "...we were in an underground garage where eight or so cars were parked, including our rented Renault Scenic. It was hard to miss: the windows were plastered with pictures of Madeleine. In medicine we would call this an 'unblinded' study, one that is susceptible to bias. One of the dogs ran straight past our car, nose in the air, heading towards the next vehicle. The handler stopped next to the Renault and called the dog. It obeyed, returned to him, but then ran off again. Staying by the car, PC Grime instructed the dog to come back several times and directed it to certain parts of the vehicle before it eventually supplied an alert by barking...when researching the validity of sniffer dog evidence later that month, Gerry would discover that false alerts can be attributable to the conscious or unconscious signals of the handler...this certainly seemed to be what was happening here...".*

---

From:

<http://genreith.de/MMcC/> - **Just five hours in May**

Permanent link:

[http://genreith.de/MMcC/doku.php?id=oddities\\_regarding\\_version\\_1](http://genreith.de/MMcC/doku.php?id=oddities_regarding_version_1)

Last update: **2015/10/10 21:25**

