Justice should be blind, but the police should not be

Desire Sprenger's husband was murdered and his body dismembered and burnt — but because investigators didn't collect the right tissue samples, the corpse had to be exhumed before DNA tests could be carried out, writes Carolyn Raphaely.

'There is no reason why the police should not be able to collect a full complement of tissue samples from a crime scene,' said the former Cape Town commercial lawyer Vanessa Lynch, who led the investigation into the murder of her father, Dr Michael Sprenger. "But the police should not be able to destroy or alter evidence. If they do, they are not adhering to the rules of the game.'

Never before has the South African public been confronted with the scale of the crimes and the police's inadequate response to them. To say that the police are not adhering to the rules is an understatement. The police are destroying evidence, altering evidence, collecting evidence, and then destroying it or altering it. This is not acceptable.

'In the case of the murder of Mike Sprenger, the police destroyed evidence, altered evidence, and then destroyed it again. In the case of the murder of Vanessa Lynch's father, the police destroyed evidence, altered evidence, and then destroyed it again. In the case of the murder of Desire Sprenger's husband, the police destroyed evidence, altered evidence, and then destroyed it again.

'The police should be held accountable for their actions. They should be held accountable for destroying evidence, altering evidence, collecting evidence, and then destroying it or altering it. They should be held accountable for not adhering to the rules of the game.'
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Can the truth have two sides?

L

ORD DEYRE, Chief Justice of Swaziland, has described the country’s justice system as in a state of disarray and urged a free press to do its utmost to improve it. In his annual report on the state of the judicial system, he lamented the lack of adequate resources and the constant political interference that hinders the delivery of justice.

The Chief Justice argued that the country’s justice system is facing numerous challenges, including a lack of courts, judges, and lawyers, as well as inadequate funding. He also highlighted the need for more training and support for the judiciary to ensure that it can effectively perform its duties.

In response to the Chief Justice’s remarks, the government has announced plans to increase funding for the judiciary and to implement reforms to improve the delivery of justice. However, critics have accused the government of using the judiciary as a tool to suppress political opposition and have called for greater independence of the judiciary.

The issue of justice and human rights has been a long-standing concern in Swaziland, where the government has been accused of using the security forces to suppress political opposition and human rights activists. The government has denied these allegations, arguing that it is necessary to maintain order and security in the country.

The Chief Justice’s comments come at a time of growing concern about the state of the judiciary in Swaziland. The country’s highest court has been criticized for failing to address allegations of corruption and abuse of power, and for its failure to hold the government accountable for human rights abuses.

The government has announced plans to implement reforms to improve the delivery of justice, including the creation of a new criminal court and the establishment of a national human rights commission. However, critics have warned that these reforms are unlikely to be effective unless they are accompanied by greater independence of the judiciary and a commitment to upholding human rights.