Interesting Cases

"Injustice anywhere is a threat to justice everywhere"

- Rev Dr Martin Luther King Jnr

"Everybody counts, or nobody counts"

- Michael Connelly's Detective, Harry Bosch

I've always been intrigued by crime and the motivation of those involved. Perhaps it was the early proximity to the celebrated Graeme Thorn case (he lived only 5 minutes from me) or the interest generated by the "Lane Cove murders", the mysterious deaths of Dr Bogle and Mrs Chandler in the 60s.

There was also the escape and hunt for escapees Simmons and Newcombe that I followed closely, with one part of the 6 year old me hoping they would get away (they didn't). Every morning I would turn on my small transistor to see if they'd been caught, one of my earliest memories of both the radio and an interest in current events. In my teenage years there were the Wanda Beach killings and many more. Humanity at it's worst and most fragile. Tragedy and intrigue combining.

Television came along and leveraged this fascination with all manner of detective and courtroom dramas, whilst novels dealt in different ways with the same themes. I read widely on criminology, profiling and the psychology of criminals. It followed that, in my professional life, these kinds of cases would always be of interest and several captured my full attention.

One concerned **Graham Stafford** whose case remains unresolved to this day. He was convicted of the murder of Leanne Holland but the Court of Appeal quashed the verdict. So, in theory, Graham is innocent.

Leanne went missing on the morning of Monday, September 23 1991 from the house in Goodna in which she was living with her father Terry, Graham and his partner, Melissa (Leanne's older sister). Leanne and Graham were alone in the house that morning and police alleged that he killed her in the bathroom and then disposed of the body (sometime in the next two days) in bushland about 9 kilometres from the Alice St residence.

Leanne's body was found at 1.42 pm on Thursday September 26. She had been terribly brutalised and there was a suggestion of cigarette burns and

butts were found at the scene. Graham did not smoke. After a very poor defence, he was convicted of the murder in 1992 and served 15 years for the crime.

The prosecution contended that Graham killed Leanne in either of two possible times on the Monday, took the body down the front steps (in full possible view of those at the Cecil Hotel across the road, neighbours and passers by) and then left it in the boot of his car, to which both he and Melissa had keys. There was some blood (not much) in the bathroom and traces of Leanne's on Graham's tool bag and a chux cloth that he said she had used to wipe a cut foot some time earlier. No motive was offered and all evidence, including from Melissa, was that he and Leanne got along well.

I had followed the proceedings casually at that time and, although it was a circumstantial case, saw no great problem with the verdict. I was hearing and reading only what was being presented as "fact" but, as the Court of Appeals would eventually determine, that was a mistake.

Things changed when I received a book from Professor Paul Wilson, a highly respected Criminologist at the time, who had co-authored a detailed analysis of the evidence with Graeme Crowley. I had known and liked Paul for many years and he had always been available to speak with expertise on cases in which my audience were interested. I initially read the book as a courtesy in preparation for a promised interview. I would, many years later, be profoundly shocked when Paul himself was found guilty of historic sex offences.

I had never met Graeme Crowley who, since resigning from the Queensland Police Service in 1992, had become a private inquiry agent employed mostly by insurance companies and Law firms investigating accidents. He rarely accepted work from private clients and explained to me how he became involved: "The family of Graham Stafford were referred to me by one of my Law firm clients and, in the circumstances, I accepted their instructions. By the time we spoke, Graham had been convicted of murder and sentenced to life imprisonment. The Queensland Court of Appeal had upheld the conviction and the family informed me they were seeking special leave to appeal to the High Court of Australia. The family gave me a detailed list of matters they wanted investigated and didn't believe for a second that their son was involved in the murder."

Crowley had investigated several murders in his time as a detective and, at first, was somewhat sceptical regarding the family's claims. After an initial contract of three months, however, he became increasingly disturbed at discrepancies he had found in the Crown evidence. In the meantime the application for special leave to appeal to the High Court had been refused. Since the completion of that first contract, he has worked on the case for 27 years and has never sent the family another invoice. As he told me recently:

“I formed the opinion that Graham Stafford was not involved in Leanne’s murder and was involved in a miscarriage of justice of the worst possible kind. I am still of that opinion.”

“Who Killed Leanne Holland?” was a compelling and disturbing book, which cast serious doubt on much of the evidence, including: the timeline, the amount of blood discovered at the alleged murder scene, the age of a maggot found in the boot of Graham’s car, disputed facts regarding tyre marks where the body was discovered and incorrect information at trial concerning a hammer believed to have been the murder weapon.

The circumstances concerning the hammer were particularly concerning. The impression had been left with the jury that Graham used the hammer to kill Leanne and that it had then gone missing. The inference was that he had disposed of it when, in fact, he had handed his hammer to police in the early part of the investigation. It had been determined that this hammer had *not* been the murder weapon. These facts, however, were not put before the jury at trial.

Credible evidence was also presented that Leanne had been sighted *after* the time she was alleged to have been killed. Graham’s alibis for all times other than between 10 am and 1.20 pm and 3-4.30 pm on the Monday (when he was alleged to have killed Leanne) were corroborated. In other words, it was a narrow window and, if it could be proven he didn’t do it then, it followed that under the scenario presented by police and prosecutors, he couldn’t have done it at all.

Most certainly he couldn’t have done it in the way it was alleged and, that being the case, he should never have been charged.

In 2008, Graham’s lawyers presented a Petition for Pardon to the Governor, which was referred to the Queensland Court of Appeal for review. It re-examined all the evidence and **unanimously** determined to quash (set aside) the conviction.

Justice Patrick Keane, now a Justice on the High Court of Australia, wrote the decision favouring a quashing of the conviction and an order for retrial. He argued that, although several elements of the prosecution’s scenario now looked so unlikely as to render the verdict unsafe, it might still be open for a jury to convict

That appears to be a curious proposition, given the certainty with which the prosecution had advocated the circumstances of the crime. If they could be so wrong about something of which they had been so certain, what else might be incorrect and how could any reasonable jury be likely to accept some alternate scenario that might be presented at a new trial?

Graham's lawyers had argued that, (referencing the famous case in Western Australia of *Mallard v The Queen),* the lack of procedural fairness led to a miscarriage of justice. Justice Keane agreed with that reasoning.

Key to what he then said, and central to so many concerns about the case, was this: "The evidence which has subsequently emerged shows that the jury should not have been invited to regard certain aspects of that scenario as fairly open on the evidence." In other words, given the new information, the jury should not have been presented with the prosecution's scenario.

The scenario to which Justice Keane referred was related to the circumstances of Leanne's death and how it was possible for Graham to have committed the crime at the time and place (and in the manner) the Crown had argued. He went on: "The prosecutor's obligation is to put the case against the accused fairly. It is inconceivable that the scenario would have been advocated to the jury by the Crown Prosecutor, or presented by the learned trial Judge as a view of the facts which was open to the jury, if the new evidence had been led at trial."

Justice Keane, in light of the new evidence, said the prosecution could not possibly have argued that scenario and that the trial judge could not have instructed the jury as he did. In a circumstantial case each strand of the evidence relies on other strands and, if they start to collapse, the entire pack of cards is in peril. Justice Keane further said that "..the jury were misled in a material way as to the case that could be fairly made by the Crown."

Justice Catherine Holmes, who is now the widely respected Chief Justice of the Queensland Supreme Court also sat on that Court of Appeal in 2008. She actually went a step further than her two colleagues. Her belief was that Stafford should be *acquitted* and that any jury properly directed might just as easily find him "not guilty" as "guilty". She determined that a jury presented with the Crown case argued before the Court of Appeal would have a reasonable doubt as to Graham's guilt. She ruled, therefore, that a retrial should not be ordered.

In 2010, 20 years after Graham's conviction, one of Queensland's most experienced Crown prosecutors, Vishal Laksman revealed that he had declined to prosecute the case because he didn't believe Graham had committed the offence. He had never previously refused a case.

Over the course of many years I visited the sites of the alleged crime and the spot where Leanne's body was discovered to acquaint myself with details I would be talking about publicly and about which there was wide public interest. I talked regularly with Graham's delightful mother Jean who, like her

son, was quiet and self-contained. I met Graham some time later and liked him.

Below average height with an easy-going, reserved and pleasant nature. We only met personally a few times and, consistent with my approach to most people about whom I spoke and interviewed, I had no desire to build a close relationship. That can skew your thinking. Although I had played a prominent role in advocating for a retrial, I didn't attend the celebration organised by supporters on the afternoon of the decision to quash the verdict. Graham did ring me, however, to offer hls thanks and we spoke for a few minutes about his future.

Justice Holmes, in arguing for his acquittal, raised several points that had always concerned me. "The absence of motive for the killing" she outlined in her judgement "and Mr Stafford's previous good character are circumstances which are cause for disquiet as to the likelihood that Mr Stafford committed this heinous crime."

Paul Wilson, with a vast professional knowledge of this type of crime and the people who commit them, shared that thinking. But then Justice Holmes made another point that, in all the talk about this case, is rarely mentioned. And, to me, it was extremely powerful.

She said this: "Mr Stafford also showed extraordinary competence in managing a brutal murder without leaving evidence of it on his clothing or shoes, which were seized by the police. Mr Freney (forensic scientist) and Dr Ashby (pathologist) said that there would be impact splatter from the blows to the girl's head. Mr Freney described it as 'massive splashing'. Melissa Holland's evidence, consistent with Mr Stafford's, is that he was wearing Broncos shorts when she left for work that morning and was wearing them still when she arrived home in the evening. There was no obvious staining on them, nor on the Reebok shoes that Mr Stafford wore. No human blood was found in the interior of Mr Stafford's vehicle, particularly the driver's seat or the steering wheel. The evidence was that Mr Stafford had always had a normal and affable relationship with Leanne. The sudden killing of the girl, with indicia of sadism, with no clue to be found in Mr Stafford's previous blameless and unremarkable history and no suggested motive seems, although not impossible, unlikely....In my view, a jury presented with the crown case as it now stands would experience a reasonable doubt as to Mr Stafford's guilt. I would enter a verdict of acquittal."

They are measured words from a highly regarded Judge but, to a layman, perhaps even more scepticism should be allowed. For there to be enough blood to leave traces of the kind described, yet for none of it to end up on Graham or in the car on which he was working that day, defies any logical

answer. The only one would be that the murder didn't happen as described, in which case Graham, on supported evidence, could not have done it.

That, at least, was some of my (and the judge's) thinking.

That opinion is further supported by a statement from Dr Anthony Ansford at the time of the petition for pardon in 1997. At the time, Dr Ansford was Director of the John Tonge Centre for Forensic Sciences. He was also clinical Associate Professor at the University of Queensland and Adjunct Professor at Griffith University. He was asked by lawyers representing Stafford at the Appeal for his view on the evidence given by Pathologist, Dr Rosemary Ashby. In particular, her answer to the question: "If a body such as this had been kept in a confined space, say a car boot, for a couple of days, perhaps in the September time of year, would you expect any odour?"

Dr Ashby responded: "You might have some odour, but this would be more likely from an adult. Young persons don't seem to smell quite so bad..as adults and if the body was well wrapped you might not notice any smell at all."

In his Statutory Declaration Dr Ansford had a very different opinion: *"I do not agree with the opinion given by Dr. Ashby. It is my opinion that there is no difference in the odours given off by a decomposing body on the basis of the age of the person at the time of death."* (italics the author's).

Keep in mind that Leanne was supposed to have been in the boot of Graham's car from the Monday afternoon to the Wednesday morning and the temperature on Tuesday had been around 30 degrees, yet *no* odour had been detected up to and including the time when the boot was finally opened and "carefully examined by scientific police" on the Wednesday afternoon.

Dr Ansford had been quite clear: "It is my opinion that the decomposition of the body of a deceased 12 year old person or a person of any age would be accelerated under such circumstances so that there would be a detectable odour associated with the body by at least the morning of Wednesday 25th September 1991, which detectable odour would have remained and certainly would not have disappeared by 1.30 pm Wednesday September 25th September 1991." How then could Graham have kept the body in the boot, as originally alleged, for some 36 hours?

In the lead up to the appeal, the case garnered increasing media publicity and I talked with more people involved in one way or another. At one point I was contacted by a woman who believed her father had killed Leanne. She claimed he had admitted his crime to her and that what he had done to Leanne bore close comparison to what he had also done to her. He had served time for the incest of his daughter. She also claimed he had been close to detectives on the case and had photographs of the crime scene.

After much discussion with trusted colleagues, management and company lawyers it was decided to put her to air with a changed name and no reference to her father's name. She was considered credible and her personal experience checked out.

A Juror Speaks

Then, one day a call came to the program from a listener called Peter who introduced himself as the foreman of the jury in the original Stafford trial. He had heard much from others about what the jury might've done and he wanted to explain what their thinking *actually* was, why they voted as they did and what they *would've* done had they been armed with the information now in the public square. Peter felt let down by the system and believed, too, that he might've been part of a miscarriage of justice. Remember, this was *before* the Court of Appeal quashed the verdict, in large part for the very reasons the foreman of the jury was so distressed.

Finding a way for Peter to say what he wanted aired became the next challenge. The laws related to jurors speaking publicly are strict and the sentences harsh for breaking them: nobody is allowed to ask for a juror to come forward to detail the inner workings of a jury. And no juror is allowed to speculate publicly on what other jurors might have done. John Laws had once been found guilty of doing just that and drew a suspended sentence.So I took a cautious approach, thanked him for his call, explained the complexities and said I would ring him off the air. Which I did.

I also spoke at length with our company lawyers who advised a very narrow range of questions, which I then ran past a very senior member of the government to get his thinking. He thought it was OK, which led me to interviewing Peter on the program. It created a lot of news and gave momentum to the case. Peter (Bluey) became a good friend and he would sometimes drive his magnificent truck to the studios for a coffee and a chat. Later, when impacted by illness, we talked most weeks about football and all kinds of things. He was on good terms with Graham Stafford and felt badly when he believed he was misled and taken out of context by a documentary on the case aired by Channel 7. His anger was palpable.

I had assured him from day one that, regardless of Graham's guilt or innocence, he had played a noble and courageous role both during and after the trial. On both occasions he did what he believed to be correct. He displayed the same qualities (mixed with unflinching humour) in his last, difficult months. When Bluey died in 2018, Graham was still in the limbo created by a quashed verdict, an unreleased "independent" police review and his desire for there to be what the Appeals Court recommended: a new trial.

That, of course, was never going to happen. The decision rested in the hands of the Attorney General who would need to see a public interest in going through it all again. Given that Graham had already served his sentence, that was always going to be unlikely. But, whilst there was no compelling *public* interest, it was most certainly important to Stafford.

Selective leaking of the latest police review to Channel 7 was not a shining moment for the Queensland Police Service (QPS). Graham applied to the Information Commissioner (IC) for a copy of the report shortly after its completion. The QPS, to this point, has refused. Any reasonable observer could only wonder why.

Nothing about this case has been transparent and it is highly unlikely that there will be a definitive outcome. Graham continues to live his life quietly. He has worked hard and regularly in a variety of jobs and has always been well-liked by employers and fellow workers.

As investigator Graeme Crowley points out: "Contrary to Queensland legislation, there has never been an inquest held into Leanne's murder. Application by a number of people, including Graham Stafford, to the Queensland Attorney General to hold an Inquest have been refused. I am hopeful that, eventually, an Inquest will be held which will clear Graham Stafford completely and may identify the real offender."

I had coffee with Graham, his partner Jacqui and his mother Jean in the course of writing this book and all appeared content to leave the past behind. "I have my family around me" he said "and whilst we'll never be as we once were, we at least have the opportunity to rebuild our lives."

His interests include Rugby League (a Broncos fan) and music (Phil Collins has lately made way for Amy Winehouse). There remains, however, a residual and understandable anger at all he and his family have endured; and he speaks gently and with respect about Leanne.

He told me that he had learned in prison the cognitive skills that allowed him to focus on the present. His mother, Jean, never believed for a moment that Graham had done what was alleged, but did at one point sit down and study the timeline and the other evidence. It hardened her view and she became a tireless and passionate advocate on his behalf: "I know my son" she says quietly.

To an objective observer this was a contented family going about their business with no indication of what they had all experienced. Graham still wants a Coronial Inquiry and has challenged police in court to release their latest review, something they promised but, to this point, have refused to do.

It's worth wondering why, particularly given that it had already "mysteriously" leaked to a friendly media outlet. Graham says he was seriously misrepresented by recent documentaries and points to many errors of commission and omission.

He was invited to attend the International Justice Conference where he had the opportunity to listen to Ruben "Hurricane" Carter and Lindy Chamberlain and to meet with former Scotland Yard Detective, Robin Napper, who had been a strong supporter for many years.

There are those convinced Graham is guilty as charged, whilst others are just as certain of his innocence. Those who are so "certain" of his guilt should show some humility and re-examine the evidence and the words of the Court of Appeal. None of his accusers can be certain and, more than that, no jury properly instructed would now find Graham guilty. Indeed, he wouldn't even be charged.

I am certain of this: his trial *was* unfair and the Court of Appeal was correct in ruling that way.

"This is a court of law, young man. Not a court of justice."

- Oliver Wendell Holmes (US Supreme Court Justice)

I also talked a great deal about the murder of **Deidre Kennedy** and the issues surrounding it, including the question of *double jeopardy* related to her accused murderer, Raymond John Carroll.

Deidre was only 17 months old in April of 1973 when her 5 year old sister, Stephanie, told their mother Faye that "Dee Dee was not in her cot." She was found soon after on the roof of a public toilet at Limestone Park Ipswich. She had been raped and strangled. There were bite marks on her left thigh, which would later prove to be both significant and controversial. I interviewed Faye on various occasions and found her to be a woman of immense courage, dignity and quiet resilience. She desperately wanted justice for her murdered daughter.

At the time of Deidre's death Carroll was an RAAF electrician. He was found guilty of her murder in 1985, largely on the evidence of the bite marks which various Odontological experts testified matched the teeth of Carroll. It was also argued that his alibi didn't hold up and that his former wife testified that

he had bitten his own daughter's thigh as well. The Court of Appeals overturned the jury's verdict on the basis that Carroll's alibi had not been totally discredited, that the evidence concerning his own daughter should never have been allowed by the presiding Judge, Angelo Vasta, and that the jury should have had a "reasonable doubt" about the odontological evidence. The "problem" was that, although the experts had reached the same conclusion, they had done so using different methodology.

The case brought me into renewed contact with former Supreme Court Justice Vasta, who I had first met through Con Sciacca. I liked Angelo very much and, leaving aside his removal from the Supreme Court which itself was more complicated than publicly portrayed, could never understand the criticisms of him. I found him pleasant, highly intelligent, gentle and more prepared than most of his colleagues to talk about the law in a way that informed and educated laypeople.

Angelo was always available to explain judicial rulings, sentencing and the various complexities involved. He did a profound public good. Other senior legal figures looked down at the media and felt no need to engage in a way that would shed light on important judicial matters. The media, after all, is simply the conduit to the public that the judiciary serves. Perhaps they thought they should stay above the fray, but their absence from public discussion did nothing towards reducing any perceived or real media (and, therefore, public) ignorance.

They were happier for the Law to exist as the secret enclave of its practitioners, which was at least part the reason the community viewed it with occasional disdain. The Daily Telegraph reported in 2004 that 92% of 7,000 readers believed the judicial system unfair and that probably mirrored the general feeling of my audience as well. The initial response from many who were part of that system was to sneer at the newspaper and its readers, but a smarter approach might've been to ask why that was the case - and consider what could be done to reverse it.

Of course, non-lawyers don't (and can't) know as much about the Law as those who are trained in it, but it might also be that they don't know as much about the community the Law is seeking to serve. Obviously that's not their job, but there is a connection between the two that builds a vital link in an important societal institution. The Law can only work as intended if the people understand and trust it. I have many respected friends in the legal profession who agree with those sentiments.

It's also true that there are always some in the media prepared to do the work to understand complex issues in order to better serve their listeners, readers and viewers. And, if you like, justice. I once made similar comments at a conference of senior Legal figures at the invitation of famous Defence lawyer

and Civil Libertarian, Terry O'Gorman. I spoke at length about the need for the public to be better informed about how the law worked and that those present shouldn't shy away from their responsibilities to make that happen.

Terry O'Gorman had been a regular guest on my show and we had many friendly debates about different issues. Terry knew he was unlikely to find majority support amongst my listeners but he was always available and helped us all better understand the law.

Judge Vasta believed that the Carroll case "was one of those.. where the law has been overly technical." He was bitterly disappointed with the angle the appellate judges had taken and that "the tentacles of justice" couldn't reach Carroll.

This decision created immense trauma for Faye and the family and outrage amongst the police and across the community, which in turn led to a second trial in 2000 - this time for perjury. The allegation was that Carroll had lied to the Court in the first trial when denying he had killed Deidre. It was always going to be dangerous territory. The prosecution argued that new evidence supported the original odontological testimony that the teeth marks were indeed Carroll's. Further, that his alibi had now been destroyed and he had admitted his crime to others. He was again found guilty.

And, again, it was overturned. In 2002 the High Court ruled that Carroll's second conviction (for perjury) was an abuse of process because of the rule against double jeopardy, which says that you can't be tried twice for the same crime. In the words of Justice Michael McHugh: "The long-established policy of the law is that an acquittal is not to be contradicted or undermined by a subsequent charge that raises the same ultimate issue or issues as was or were involved in the acquittal."

It is a highly contentious principle.

Proponents of changing the Double Jeopardy law argue that, if it's now possible to release those wrongly convicted, then it should also be possible to retry those wrongly acquitted. I don't necessarily agree with that logic but it's true that, since 1992, DNA testing had exonerated 238 people in the US, more than 20 of whom had been on death row. I knew one of them.

Nicholas Yarris was convicted of a horrendous murder in 1982 after an investigation and trial that were (at best) a disgrace to the US system. Mostly as a result of his own hard work and that of The Innocence Project (and against the residual inertia of the authorities),he was released in 2000 after spending several years awaiting an execution date.
.

Nick's case also cast a terrible shadow over the concept of capital punishment.

There was a time I believed in the death penalty but several things changed that view. Mainly it was the fact that innocent people were being executed on a regular basis, but it was also true that the person being executed was not always the same person who had committed the crime. They had changed.

That was never more apparent than in the case of Karla Faye Tucker who, as a drug addicted teenager, had been an accomplice with her boyfriend in a robbery that turned into a murder in Texas in 1983. She was 23 at the time but wasn't executed until 1998. In that time she had straightened out, studied, turned to Christianity and been a well liked model prisoner. That wasn't enough, however, for the Governor of Texas at the time, George W Bush.

The argument is sometimes made that you only execute people if you *know* they're guilty, but they were all *known* to be guilty until we *knew* that, like Nick Yarris, they weren't. The innocent are convicted in all kinds of ways: wrong place/wrong time, they looked like the actual killer, an expert witness turned out not to be as expert as the jury presumed, their lawyer had fallen asleep at a crucial time of the trial (it happened!), their lawyer was incompetent or inexperienced (that happens regularly), the police were incompetent (or worse), or the jury reflected its own prejudices.

The reasons are many and varied and, always, there is the disproportionate weight and resources of the State lined up against usually poor individuals. Not many rich ones are convicted and, when they are, few are sentenced to death.

When confronted by horrifying crimes - and we think straight away of people like Sian Kingi, Daniel Morcombe and Anita Cobby - there are few people who wouldn't entertain the idea that their killer deserved an equally dreadful end. But the problem doesn't reside with the obvious ones. Rather, it's those who look guilty at the time, and may have already been convicted, only later to learn that they were innocent after all.

As early as 1999 the Chicago Tribune published research that said Nick Yarris was one of 12 prisoners out of 285 on Illinois' death row who had been wrongly convicted. And that was only since 1977.

4.2%!

Between 1930 and 1972, 3,859 people were executed in the US which means, at a minimum, more than 100 innocent people were killed. Throughout the US, 381 convictions had been 'thrown out because prosecutors concealed evidence suggesting innocence (exculpatory

evidence) or knowingly used false evidence.' This practise is not uncommon in Australia either. Interestingly a majority of the states in America that once had the death penalty have either placed a moratorium on it or abandoned it altogether.

Anyone with even a passing acquaintance with the legal system will understand the stresses (emotional and financial) that accompany it. The State has awesome power and it should be its responsibility to use that power wisely and well, rather than presenting a case in the full knowledge that they can always come back for another crack.

I fully supported Faye in her quest to find Carroll accountable and spoke with Peter Dutton, who was supporting and advocating for her, regularly. Double jeopardy is a very big stick and it is right that legislative constraints should make it a high bar to hurdle. In law, "Fresh evidence" (as was the case with the Stafford appeal) is evidence that could not have been available at the first trial. It can't be just "new evidence" that was available but was either not found or not used at the time. That's where DNA comes in and the need for the use of double jeopardy would, because of its availability, be rare.

The rivers of justice are murky and flow relentlessly and expensively over everything in their way, leading to destinations often unplanned and consequences largely unforeseen. The problem isn't so much that justice is blind but rather that, at times, it chooses not to see.