

---

Subject: Re: UK Law Endorcement Priorities

Posted by [David Johnston](#) on Mon, 05 Apr 2021 17:30:29 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

On 2021-04-05 10:57 a.m., Adam H. Kerman wrote:

> David Johnston <davidjohnston29@yahoo.com> wrote:

>> On 2021-04-05 8:11 a.m., BTR1701 wrote:

>

>>> Pedophile found guilty of 50+ sex crimes:

>>> 2 years in prison

>

>>> <https://www.dropbox.com/s/9s0weeonmn68mzx/Brit-1.jpg?dl=0>

>

>> In that there was a charge for each picture.

>

> Why can't we have the actual press release rather than a picture of a

> lead line?

>

> <https://www.gmp.police.uk/news/greater-manchester/news/news/2021/april/paedophile-sentenced-to-over-two-years-in-prison-after-being-found-guilty-of-over-fifty-child-sex-offences/>

>

> They found one girl he was in communication with, but she at no point

> met him for sex. He was arrested on bait the police provided.

>

> I'm missing the bit in the press release as to why police targeted him

> in the first place as there was no complaint.

They were doing that thing where cops catfish as teenagers online to see who approaches them.

>

>>> Lying about your travel itinerary to the Wuhan Flu police or traveling for

>>> 'unapproved' reasons:

>>> 10 years in prison

>

>>> <https://www.dropbox.com/s/xed63mdrd8cs8gx/Brit-2.jpg?dl=0>

>

>> You are comparing an unusually low penalty for one crime to the

>> theoretical maximum for another.

>

> I don't agree that the penalty was unusually low. Sounds about right

> given that he was baited and there was no victim

I wouldn't go that far. I doubt that girl really appreciated getting a skeezy old guy (from her perspective) dick pic. So yeah, I think there was a victim.

and everything else

- > stems from having photographs on a computer. I'm sure the police are
- > patting themselves on the back for taking a man off the streets who
- > would have potentially kidnapped a girl for sex. It's just that there
- > are lots of unsolved cases with actual victims that police never seem to
- > prioritize, given that cases like these are so much easier to make.

>

- > The two of you are oddly in agreement.

>

- > Johnston, if you were actually interested in discussing government
- > restrictions on travel in what had been a relatively free society before
- > Boris became prime minister, maybe you can justify your own lack of a
- > horrified reaction that there is a legal (not theoretical) maximum
- > penalty on the books of up to 10 years.

<shrug> I'm a tough room. There ain't much that horrifies me. Do I think that a 10 year sentence would be excessive? Sure. It's my opinion that such an offense should be under a year. But just as that guy has never quite physically molested a real girl, that sentence hasn't actually been handed out to a real perpetrator and I doubt it ever will be.

>

- > But I'm sure you are uninterested.

>

---

Subject: Re: UK Law Endorcement Priorities

Posted by [David Johnston](#) on Mon, 05 Apr 2021 17:37:42 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

That was a weird redirect.

---