

## The prosecution of Amanda Knox: it's not over yet!

By Caroline Dobraszczyk

The trial received extraordinary news coverage around the world. It was for the brutal murder of a pretty, young UK girl called Meredith Kercher. But the focus was almost exclusively on another young and very attractive girl from the USA, called Amanda Knox – one of the accused in this brutal and quite horrific case. Almost from the start of the case, when the body of Meredith Kercher was found in her bedroom with her throat slashed in the villa in Perugia that the two girls shared with two other girls, Amanda Knox was photographed, written about and filmed constantly: during the investigation; her arrest; the trial; her release; and then during the latest decision of another trial. There was constant use of her nickname 'foxy Knoxy'.<sup>1</sup>

The case has raised a number of very interesting issues, particularly from a feminist perspective, not all of which can be explored fully in this article. Issues such as: sensational media reporting; the focus on Knox's looks; the detailed focus on the alleged sexual motives and sexual 'goings on' of all the accused; the use of drugs and the party lifestyle (particularly that of Knox and her co-accused – Italian boyfriend, Raffaele Sollecito); the focus on what Knox was wearing; whether women usually commit such brutal crimes; her parents' wealth; hiring a PR firm to 'manage' the media; and her 'status' as a foreigner abroad. There was no doubt that she was a foreigner from the 'land of the free' in a small, romantic city where they really do things very differently, especially when it comes to law and order.

Another interesting issue, particularly in a high profile case, is whether to actually analyse the evidence for oneself and come to some decision as to what the result should be. However, my focus in this article will be the 'unusual' legal process – 'unusual' for us, that is – that has gone on and continues to go on. The Italian legal system is very different to our own, although there are some similarities to our criminal justice legal system. The next step in this 'saga' is also very interesting, that is: whether Amanda Knox will ever be extradited from the US back to Italy, to face a lengthy term of imprisonment. First however, some background to the case.

### Background

In early September 2007, Amanda Knox arrived in Perugia, Italy, a city about half way between Florence and Rome. She was 20 years old. She went there to study Italian, which she loved, at the University for Foreigners. This is a small school that focusses on language. Knox was already a student at the University of Washington, studying Italian, and her plan was to master the Italian language and immerse herself in the culture for nine months in Perugia before doing a summer



creative writing course taught in Italian in Rome, hosted by the University of Washington. Any credits she obtained from the University in Perugia for studying Italian would be transferred to the University of Washington.<sup>2</sup> She found a place to stay, being the top floor of no. 7, Via della Pergola, which was a villa occupied by two Italian girls. They were both in their late twenties and working in law firms. The basement was rented by a group of young male students.<sup>3</sup> Knox then went travelling for a few weeks and was advised that there would be another girl moving in. Her name was Meredith Kercher, a British exchange student. Knox writes that 'They [her other two flatmates, Filomena and Laura] said she was quiet and nice – from outside London. They urged me to come back soon so we could 'get the party started'.<sup>4</sup> She writes that 'Around our house, marijuana was as common as pasta.'<sup>5</sup> Knox then met Kercher on 20 September 2007, which was the day Knox moved into the villa. She writes that Meredith, who was half Indian was '...exotically beautiful, a Brit majoring in European studies.'<sup>6</sup> Amanda also got a job working in a bar nearby which was owned by a Congolese man, Diya Lumumba, called 'Patrick'.

Amanda Knox met Raffaele Sollecito on 25 October 2007, 'by chance'.<sup>7</sup> On this night she and Meredith went to a string and piano quintet performance at the university. Amanda writes that she and Meredith '...sat together by the door of a high-ceilinged hall. During the first piece – Astor Piazzolla's 'Le Grand Tango' – I'd just turned to Meredith to comment on the music when I noticed two guys standing near us. One was trim and pale with short, disheveled brown hair and frameless glasses. I was instantly charmed by his unassuming manner. I smiled. He smiled back.'<sup>8</sup>

The rest, as they say, is history. Amanda and Raffaele did meet that night and quickly fell into a relationship. They spent a lot of time together and significantly were together on 1 November 2007. That is All Saints' Day, a day to honour the dead, and

is also a public holiday in Italy. That afternoon Amanda was at the villa, waiting for Raffaele. The two girls, Laura and Filomena, were away and Meredith left the villa to spend time with friends. She said ‘ciao’ to Amanda as she went out the door.<sup>9</sup> Raffaele eventually came; they smoked a joint and they both went back to his house. Amanda writes that ‘we wanted a quiet, cozy night in.’<sup>10</sup> Patrick had sent her a text message that she did not need to work that night and she wrote back ‘okay, ...see you later. Have a good evening!’ (This became highly significant during the trial as providing Knox with free time, and is perhaps also, very significant for the latest decision against her). The pair also did not have to drive Raffaele’s friend to a bus stop to pick up her suitcase, which they thought they would have had to do that night. They watched a movie and according to her version of events, stayed at his house all night. They had known each other for exactly one week.

### The murder, the investigation and the trial process

The next day, 2 November 2007, Amanda’s version of events is that she woke early and went back to the villa. She immediately thought something was strange when she found the front door open. Then she found some blood stains in the bathroom sink she and Meredith shared, and a large blood stain on the bathmat.<sup>11</sup> Soon after, police arrived as two mobile phones had been handed in to them, both of which turned out to be Meredith’s. By this stage Filomena and Raffaele had arrived, and they were all worried as to the whereabouts of Meredith (Laura was in Rome on business). Amanda had knocked on Meredith’s door but there was no answer and the door was locked, which Amanda found unusual.<sup>12</sup> Eventually Meredith’s door was forced open and the grim discovery was made. Amanda writes, ‘It was only over the course of the next several days that I was able to piece together what Filomena and the others in the doorway had seen: a naked, blue tinged foot poking out from beneath Meredith’s comforter, blood splattered over the walls and streaked across the floor.’<sup>13</sup>

She also writes, ‘I didn’t find out until the months leading up to the trial – and during the trial itself – how sadistic her killer had been. When the police lifted up the corner of Meredith’s beige duvet they found her lying on the floor, stripped naked from the waist down. Her arms and neck were bruised. She had struggled to remain alive. Her bra had been sliced off and left next to her body. Her cotton T-shirt, yanked up to expose her breasts, was saturated with blood. The worst report was that Meredith, stabbed multiple times in the neck, had choked to death on her own blood and was found lying in a pool of it, her head turned toward the window, eyes open.’<sup>14</sup>

The police investigation that followed quickly determined that the break in was staged. That is, the window in one of the rooms was smashed and a large rock lay in the centre of the room. Nothing was taken, no jewellery, no computers. The scene was consistent with the rock having been thrown from inside, using the shutters in the room as a buffer. There was no glass on the outside.<sup>15</sup> The time of death was ascertained to be approximately 11pm.

Amanda and Raffaele were interviewed extensively. (The other two flatmates and their boyfriends had alibis). Amanda described the process as horrendous. Police spoke to her at length, and at one stage, she says she was hit at the back of her head, to get her attention and to stop lying.<sup>16</sup> Some of the questioning was only in Italian without an interpreter.<sup>17</sup>

She writes, ‘The authorities I trusted thought I was a liar. But I wasn’t lying...I was twenty, and I barely spoke their language... They [police] try to scare people, to coerce them, to make them frantic. That’s what they do. I was in their interrogation room. I was surrounded by police officers. I was alone. No one read me my rights. I had no idea I could remain silent. I was sure you had to prove your innocence by talking. If you didn’t, it must mean you were hiding something.’<sup>18</sup>

Eventually, after many hours of interviews, she named Patrick Lumumba, the owner of the bar where she worked, as the killer, and said that she had been in the house when Meredith was killed. He eventually got alibi evidence to prove he was not at the villa and Amanda retracted this version of events, almost as soon as she said it, explaining that she was so exhausted by the interview process that she gave in. At one stage Raffaele, also during his interview process, said that Amanda had left his house on the night of the murder and asked him to lie for her.<sup>19</sup> It seems that he retracted this version at a later time. Not long after she named Patrick, Amanda was taken into custody.

But it was the DNA evidence that became crucial in the case and, at least initially, this implicated both Amanda and Raffaele as well as a third person, Rudy Guede. Police found a knife at Raffaele’s apartment which had Meredith’s DNA on it, as well as Amanda’s, and evidence that bleach had been used there. There was also the likelihood that the villa had been cleaned thoroughly.<sup>20</sup> Investigators found Raffaele’s DNA on a bra strap belonging to Meredith (the bra having been found under furniture six weeks after the initial search). Three sets of footprints were found: Guede’s and others consistent with Amanda’s and Raffaele’s. A ‘homeless hippie type’ said he saw both Amanda and Raffaele in the town square which was near the villa, on two occasions on the night of 1 November, i.e., at

nine o'clock, and then close to midnight.

There was much DNA evidence in Meredith's bedroom which was traced to Guede. Guede changed his story many times as to what happened that night, implicating and absolving Amanda on numerous occasions.<sup>21</sup> Amanda states that she only saw Rudy on two occasions. First, when she met him when he played basketball with the boys who lived downstairs, in about mid October 2007. Meredith was with her at this time and they all walked to the villa together. She then saw him once after that, at the bar where she worked. She had taken his drink order.<sup>22</sup> He was an unemployed 20 year old from the Ivory Coast who had been previously caught breaking into offices and homes.<sup>23</sup>

Amanda went through an 'Interrogation Day', which was a process whereby Amanda answered questions put to her by the prosecutor. By this stage she had been found to be 'formally under investigation for the murder of Meredith Kercher'. This was part of the court process.<sup>24</sup> Her family had retained two lawyers, Carlo Dalla Vedova and Luciano Ghirga. She met with them weekly.

In late June 2008 Amanda was formally advised that she had been charged with murder. The relevant charge document stated that she, Raffaele and Rudy had, in collaboration, murdered Meredith by strangulation and a 'profound lesion by a pointed cutting weapon', that Rudy had, in collaboration with the others, committed rape, that she and Raffaele had illegally carried a knife and that Amanda had falsely accused Lumumba of the murder.<sup>25</sup> There were in fact five crimes: murder; illegally carrying a knife; rape; theft; simulating a robbery; and a sixth charge just for Amanda, of slander, regarding her allegations against Patrick.<sup>26</sup>

The pre-trial hearing was scheduled between 18 September and 28 October 2008. Guede's lawyers asked for an abbreviated trial, which means that the judge's decision is based solely on the evidence. No witnesses are called. If found guilty, the sentence is reduced by a third. He was found guilty and given 30 years (although his sentence was reduced to 16 years on appeal). The hearing was before one judge. Only two witnesses gave evidence in relation to Amanda's and Raffaele's hearing: the prosecution DNA expert and a man who claims to have seen Amanda, Raffaele and Guede together on Halloween, the day before the murder. (According to Amanda, this evidence was totally implausible).<sup>27</sup> Both Raffaele and she were ordered to stand trial.

The trial was conducted between January and March 2009. She describes it as a 'spectacle'.<sup>28</sup> The trial was in fact a combination

of the criminal charges and some civil claims, i.e., on behalf of the Kerchers, a claim for five million euros to compensate for the loss of their daughter. Patrick was suing Amanda for slander for an amount to be determined and the owner of the villa was suing her for 10,000 euros for damages and lost rent!<sup>29</sup>

The trial was really based on the DNA evidence, the expert witnesses, some other witnesses of varying credibility, the flatmates and motive. The prosecution closing arguments dealt with the fact that Filomena's window was too high to be a credible entry point into the villa; that Amanda wanted to hurt Meredith because she was critical of Amanda's 'sexual easiness' and was much more reserved; that the three of them attacked Meredith and forced her to have sex; that in the process, Raffaele had cut off Meredith's bra strap and had used his knife to threaten and wound Meredith; that Amanda used a knife, pointing it upward toward Meredith's neck and wounded her on the right side of the neck and tried to strangle her; Amanda then made the deepest wound on the left side; that during the interrogation the woman who had called Amanda a liar and told her to stop lying, was described as very sweet, and the prosecutor knew this because he was there; and in relation to the accusation of Patrick, by Amanda, that police were doing their job: they were trying to make her talk and these were normal and necessary investigative techniques. Finally the prosecution showed a 3D computer generated animation with the accused looking like avatars. This was objected to by the defence team but it was shown. It demonstrated the blood splatters in Meredith's room.<sup>30</sup>

On 4 December 2009 Amanda and Raffaele were found guilty of all the charges. She was sentenced to 26 years and Raffaele to 25 years.

The 407 page report from the judge emphasised that Amanda and Raffaele found themselves with nothing to do that night; they met Rudy by chance and they went to the villa where Meredith was alone; at the villa Amanda and Raffaele were fooling around and Guede started raping Meredith; Amanda and Raffaele then joined in; 'the criminal acts were carried out on the force of pure chance. A motive therefore of an erotic, sexually violent nature ... found active collaboration from Amanda Knox and Raffaele Sollecito'.<sup>31</sup> The court had disregarded the evidence of the eye witnesses and they found no animosity between Meredith and Amanda. The court found that '...extreme evil was put into practice. It can be hypothesised that this choice of evil began with the consumption of drugs which had happened also that evening, as Amanda testified'.<sup>32</sup> The court went on to say that given Raffaele's interest in knives it is probable that he convinced Amanda to carry a knife with her.<sup>33</sup>

The defence then prepared for an appeal. Amanda writes that 'In Italy's lower and intermediate levels, the judges and jurors decide the verdict. And instead of focusing on legal errors, as we do in the United States, the Italian appellant court will reopen the case, look at new evidence, and hear additional testimony – if they think it's deserved.'<sup>34</sup> Amanda's team asked for the court to appoint independent experts to review the DNA evidence and a judge ordered that this was to occur and that the case was complex enough to warrant a review.<sup>35</sup>

The new expert report when it finally came was positive for the defendants. Basically the independent expert had identified more than fifty mistakes the forensics team had made.<sup>36</sup> Closing arguments in the appeal began on 23 September 2011 (before a judge and jury), and on 3 October 2011 both defendants were found not guilty of all of the charges – except that Amanda was found guilty of the slander charge, and received a sentence of three years, but as she had already served this time she was free to go.<sup>37</sup>

And home she went. The courtroom erupted when the decision was handed down. She writes 'The crowd cheered. Some booed.'<sup>38</sup> She was quickly taken from the courtroom, driven to Rome where she stayed overnight in a safe house with her mother and some family members and the next day, flew to Seattle. Outside the court there was a wall of people and cameras, faces practically pressing against the glass, and a high-speed chase to Rome.<sup>39</sup> There were journalists on board her flight back to Seattle.<sup>40</sup> When she finally touched down in Seattle, she gave a news conference. She thanked all her supporters and said that her family is the most important thing to her right now.<sup>41</sup>

### It's not over yet

But the prosecution now were not content with this result. They appealed this decision to the Italian Court of Cassation. On 26 March 2013 the court ordered a new review of the case largely due to the finding that the Appeal court had not considered all the evidence and had ignored discrepancies in both the defendants' evidence.<sup>42</sup> The retrial began on 30 September 2013. Amanda maintained her innocence in a written statement to the court which was sent to her lawyer in a lengthy email and presented to the court. Raffaele gave a statement to the court in November, maintaining his innocence.<sup>43</sup>

On 31 January 2014 the court reinstated the guilty verdicts against both defendants. Not only that, her sentence was increased to 28 years and six months while Raffaele received the same sentence of 25 years. The court also ordered that damages

should be paid by the defendants to the Kercher family.

The verdicts were handed down by the president of the Florence Appeals Court, Alessandro Nencini. This appeal decision was made by two judges and six lay members of the jury. Judge Nencini said in an interview that 'a chance decision on the part of Knox to change her plans on the night of 1 November 2007 initiated a series of events that culminated in the brutal killing of Ms Kercher...Crucially...the court had arrived at a motivation for the crime.'<sup>44</sup> The court has 90 days in which to release its reasoning for upholding the guilty convictions. Judge Nencini said 'At the moment all I can say is that at 20.15 that night, they had different plans; then these were ditched and the occasion [to commit the crime] was created...If Amanda had gone to work she probably wouldn't be here now. There were coincidences and on this we have developed our reasoning. We realise this will be the most controversial part.'<sup>45</sup>

Raffaele has had his passport confiscated. On the day of the latest verdict he was found by police, with his girlfriend, in a hotel in Venzone, which is about 40 km from the Austrian border, close to Slovenia and 322 km from Florence.<sup>46</sup>

The situation now is that the defendants can lodge an appeal against the latest decision, to the highest court in the country, the Court of Cassation. In a statement issued after this verdict, Knox has said that she was 'frightened and saddened by this unjust verdict'.<sup>47</sup> She added 'Having been found innocent before, I expected better from the Italian justice system...There had always been a marked lack of evidence. My family and I have suffered greatly from this wrongful prosecution. This has gotten out of hand...[There was an] overzealous and intransigent prosecution, prejudiced and narrow-minded investigation, unwillingness to admit mistakes, reliance on unreliable testimony and evidence, character assassination, inconsistent and unfounded accusatory theory, and counterproductive and coercive interrogation techniques that produce false confessions and inaccurate statements.'<sup>48</sup>

Public reaction has of course been numerous, loud, strong and varied. A writer from New York magazine states that the Italian law is 'totally insane', allowing for double jeopardy which is 'constitutionally prohibited in US law'. He writes that Knox is 'the poster child for not studying abroad'.<sup>49</sup> However, the contrary view is clearly that the American media '...makes a mockery of the Italian magistrates who professionally managed this appeal, and who regularly risk their lives prosecuting the mafia in that very same courtroom. Has American arrogance ever been so bold? Have the western media ever been so complicit in such an orchestrated public relations sham?'<sup>50</sup>

## The Italian Code of Criminal Procedure<sup>51</sup>

The first thing to note is that the role of the prosecutor, i.e., the *Pubblico Ministero* (the public prosecutor) is to investigate the crime during the preliminary investigations. Technically he/she is a member of the judiciary: a magistrate, and should investigate the crime in a fair way, i.e., to try and find the truth, not only to look for evidence that can lead to a conviction. A judge seldom intervenes during the preliminary investigations. The prosecutor can ask a judge for orders to limit the movements of a defendant, known as ‘precautionary measures’. This cannot be ordered unless there is proof that the defendant has committed a crime.

Self incriminating statements made by someone during the investigation process are inadmissible. The police or the prosecutor summon the defendant during the preliminary investigations and inform him/her of the alleged criminal behavior and the evidence gathered against him/her, if it is not detrimental to the investigation. The defendant (*indagato*) may defend him/herself or he/ she may refuse to answer any questions. The person when interrogated must not be influenced by the use of any psychological or physical means and they must be willing to provide the information (*animus confitendi*). Before the interrogation begins the *indagato* must be informed that the statements can be used against him/her in court.

When the prosecutor decides that there is enough evidence to make out the case, a notice is served on the suspect advising of the charge and that all the evidence can be examined by the suspect and his/her attorney. The suspect can then, within 20 days, file a defensive brief, appear before the prosecutor to make spontaneous statements or ask the prosecutor to question him/her. Further the suspect can ask the prosecutor to carry out specific acts of inquiry.

When the preliminary investigations are over, if the *Pubblico Ministero* thinks that the evidence could not justify a conviction, he must not proceed with any charges. If however he decides that he can make a case, he summons the defendant to appear before the judge of the preliminary hearing. All the evidence is presented by the *Pubblico Ministero*. The defendant can try and prove his innocence. The judge has to decide whether the evidence justifies a guilty verdict or not. This process is similar to our committal process.

The trial may then follow. A defendant can be called to give evidence but he may refuse to answer any or all questions. Also he/she can choose to make spontaneous statements to the judge. For a defendant to be found guilty the judge must

be internally convinced, i.e., *intimo convincimento*. Because of this test there are no rules that predetermine the weight to be attributed to any piece of evidence. Witnesses are cross-examined and the judge may choose not to admit testimony that is patently superfluous, or questions that are irrelevant or irregular. Both parties must file a brief before the beginning of the trial detailing all evidence they want to present.

Most courts have professional judges and no juries. The exception is in the *Corte d’Assise* which is made up of eight judges; two are professional and six are lay judges, i.e., citizens who are not technically jurors as in our trial system. The *Corte d’Assise* deals with major felonies such as murder and terrorism.

In relation to appeals, both the prosecutor and the defendant can appeal a judgment before the *Corte d’Appello* that will retry the defendant. The judgment of the Appeals Court can also be appealed to the Court of Cessation however this court cannot rule on the merits. Both the Court of Appeals and the Court of Cessation can uphold, modify or quash the sentence. It is possible that the Court of Cessation may determine that further fact finding is required to reach a final judgment so it remands the case to another criminal division of the Appellate Court. The defendant can then be tried again but the judge must conform to the points of law applied by the Court of Cessation.

There is no doubt therefore that the system is quite different to our own but nevertheless, it provides for a thorough and detailed examination of all the issues.

## Extradition?

An obvious question is whether, assuming the Court of Cessation or a further Appeals Court upholds the sentence against Amanda, and there is finally, a final decision, will Italy then request the USA to extradite her so that she serves her sentence in an Italian gaol?

Harvard law professor Alan Dershowitz has stated that ‘As popular as she is here and as pretty as she is here – because that’s what this is all about, if she was not an attractive woman we wouldn’t have the group love it – she will be extradited if it’s upheld. The Italian legal system, though I don’t love it, is a legitimate legal system and we have a treaty with Italy so I don’t see how we would resist. We’re trying to get (fugitive NSA leaker Edward) Snowden back – how does it look if we want Snowden back and we won’t return someone for murder?’, he asked.<sup>52</sup>

CNN’s legal analyst, Sonny Hostin, says in an article online that US law dictates that a person cannot be tried twice on the

same charge. Because of this tension between the Italian and US law it is unlikely that US law will extradite her. When the fight begins, those are the grounds the US attorneys will be arguing.<sup>53</sup>

Another law professor, Stephen Vladeck from American University in Washington said that 'there's nothing in the treaty that requires Italy to uphold the US legal system.'<sup>54</sup>

It seems that the procedure in relation to extradition is as follows:

- First there is a treaty between Italy and the USA signed in 1984.
- The Italian embassy in Washington would send a request to the US state department, which would review it.
- If in proper order, the request is sent to the US Attorney's office.
- A warrant can be issued and the fugitive arrested.
- A court hearing would then be held to determine whether she is extraditable. USA law provides for specific rules and laws in relation to extradition proceedings. Lawyers appear on behalf of the extradition country, i.e., Italy, and Knox with her lawyers, would of course be entitled to oppose the order of extradition, which is sought in the hearing.
- If the court finds that she is extraditable according to US laws, the court enters an order of extraditability and certifies the record to the secretary of state, who decides whether to surrender the fugitive to the requesting government. In some cases the fugitive may waive the hearing process.
- If not, the fugitive is transferred to the agents appointed by the requesting country to take her. Although the order of extradition is not appealable by either the fugitive or the government, the fugitive may petition for a writ of habeas corpus as soon as the order is issued. The district court's decision on the writ is subject to appeal and the extradition may be stayed if the court so orders.<sup>55</sup>

## Conclusion

There is no doubt that this case has been fascinating at every stage. Many people, lawyers and non lawyers, have an opinion in relation to every point. What must not be forgotten is that a young girl was brutally murdered and justice must be done – as best as possible.

## Endnotes

1. A nickname Amanda Knox acquired from her soccer teammates because of the way she moved the soccer ball down the field: from 'Amanda Knox - Waiting to

be heard - A Memoir', Harper Collins Publishers, 2013, at page 31.

2. Ibid., p.7 and p.9.
3. Ibid., p.21.
4. Ibid., p.22.
5. Ibid., p.37.
6. Ibid., p.25.
7. Ibid., p.51.
8. Ibid.
9. Ibid., p.61.
10. Ibid.
11. Ibid., pp.65-66.
12. Ibid., pp.67-71.
13. Ibid., p.72.
14. Ibid., p.73.
15. Rundle, Guy, 'Amanda Knox's story, full of violence and lies', Crikey!, viewed 11 February 2014, p.3.
16. Ibid 1 at page 103. (not sure if this refers back to the memoir)
17. at page 113.
18. at page 104.
19. at pages 113-114.
20. Ibid 15 at page 4.
21. at page 4.
22. ibid 1 at page 220.
23. at page 220.
24. at page 164.
25. at pages 259-261.
26. at page 291.
27. at page 278.
28. at page 289.
29. at page 291.
30. at pages 351-355.
31. at page 395.
32. at page 396.
33. at page 396.
34. at page 397.
35. at page 411.
36. at page 428.
37. at page 444.
38. at page 444.
39. at page 447-448.
40. at pages 454-456.
41. at page 457.
42. Zurcher, Anthony, 'Amanda Knox murder conviction spurs debate on Italian justice', BBC online - Echo Chambers, viewed 31 January 2014.
43. Wilkinson, Peter, 'Amanda Knox retrial verdict: Six things to know', CNN, viewed 31 January 2014.
44. Day, Michael, 'Evidence of a motive' for the crime behind Amanda Knox verdict', The Independent online, 2 February 2014, p.1.
45. Ibid., p.2.
46. BBC News Europe- 'Kercher murder: Sollecito found near Austrian border'- online article -31 January 2014.
47. BBC News Europe-'Amanda Knox and Raffaele Sollecito guilty of Kercher Italy murder'- online article -31 January 2014,page 1.
48. pages 1-2.
49. ibid 42 at page 1.
50. at page 1.
51. my information in relation to this topic is obtained from Wikipedia.
52. ibid 43 at pages2-3.
53. at page 2.
54. ibid 47 at page 2.
55. USAM 9-15.700 Foreign Extradition Requests and ibid 46 at page 2.