

WPC Atkinson

Spackman had phoned Mr Honke (Kevin's solicitor) prior to Ms Atkinson giving her evidence and told him that should the defence decide to call Ms Atkinson then she was going to change her original statement and say that as she was getting changed after her shift she had suddenly remembered that Kevin was the driver of the car. Spackman's telephone call prompted Mr Honke to send an inquiry agent to interview Ms Atkinson who reiterated her original claim that Kevin was not the driver of the car. WPC Deirdre Atkinson gave evidence at Kevin's trial and reported that she had seen the subsequent getaway car being driven by an unknown driver from the public house on the 11th October 1994 two days before Mr Magill's murder. She went on to say that Kevin was known to her and was not the driver of the car. WPC Atkinson's statement fits in with Kevin's explanation that he returned the car to his partner's uncle on the 10th October.

It appears that Spackman did not contact Ms Atkinson to change her statement but the fact remains that Mr Honke is adamant that Spackman threatened to get WPC Atkinson to change her statement and fabricate evidence against Kevin.

In the CCRC statement of reasons in the case of Khan and Bashir it states at paragraph 49 that Spackman had been instrumental in getting a witness to retract his statement due to his unprofessional conduct:

..."There was new evidence from the sales assistant (Mr Leslie) at the Sunglasses Hut, who claimed that it was not Mr Khan and Mr Bashir who had bought the sunglasses from him. Mr Leslie also stated that he had retracted his original statement owing to words being put in his mouth" by DS Spackman...."

The question that must be asked is who is to be believed concerning this matter, does it seem plausible that Mr Honke would concoct such a conversation with Mr Spackman.