

---

## Richard Holland's Statement Dated 22 December 1992

---

On 22 December 1992 the by then retired former Superintendent Holland drafted an eight page statement, in his words as 'an attempt to tabulate in chronological order the events so far as is consistent with memory and passage of time'. He wrote:

'I would like to make it clear that if Kiszko was wrongly convicted, as opposed to the conviction being unsafe in view of the further evidence and therefore entitled to an acquittal, then words cannot express the sorrow of a man serving so long in prison for something he has not done, and the obvious mental impairment it has produced in him'.

This was written by a man who knew the entire truth, from first to last, about this case. Are these genuine words of remorse, or those of a cynical hypocrite?

At the outset of his statement, he criticised officers from the former Bradford City, Leeds City and Greater Manchester Police (GMP) for not being used to taking statements in the format required by the Criminal Justice Act. He said that 'many had to be returned to the officers to retake as signed CJ Act statements'. This is startling because he is dealing with the murder inquiry in 1975 and the relevant Criminal Justice Act had come into law in 1967. Is it really the fact that after some eight years some police officers were simply unable to record evidence in its proper form?

Like others in the case Holland seemed to think that Stefan had been arrested by the police at the outset of the enquiry. He said so at page 7 of his statement. He knew more about this case than anyone else, yet he still got that point wrong. It was one of considerable importance in deciding whether Stefan was afforded his rights to due process and fair treatment whilst at the police station, or simply denied them in the

rush to judgment by an overzealous officer whose object was to secure a conviction at any cost.

He goes on to relate that there were various aspects of the enquiry — initially the police had set out to trace a white vehicle seen in the lay-by adjacent to where the body was found. One wonders whether the defence was told this and realised its significance? The defence witness Mrs Emma Tong, it will be remembered, had told the police, as indeed she told the jury, that she had seen a little girl that she was convinced was Lesley Molseed sitting in a white or cream car near her home. And here it was being admitted that at the very outset of the enquiry the police were looking for a car similar in colour to the one described by Mrs Tong.

Holland also relates that in the beginning all briefings were done by Detective Chief Superintendent Dibb and 'It was put to us that we were looking for a suspect who was sterile'. He explained that by saying 'confusion may have arisen because sometimes a person with a low sperm count and who is unlikely to father a child is referred to as "sterile" as opposed to the correct use — that of a male with no spermatozoa in his semen'. He added that 'briefing notes will be found to the effect that we were searching for someone who may have had a vasectomy — not very common in 1975 — unlike today'.

He claims that he was under the impression that the killer was 'sterile' within what he describes as the '... normal meaning of that word ... following Kiszko's arrest every effort was made to be more than fair to ... ensure that his semen was tested ...' That claim is disputed, especially when he adds that having dealt with many murderers this was his only case in which the suspect had been asked to provide a sample of semen. There was no provision in law in 1975 for the taking of an intimate sample, that was introduced in the Police and Criminal Evidence Act 1984, and it was Dr Tierney's decision, not that of any police officer, to seek the sample for the purpose of establishing guilt or innocence. If Stefan had refused to supply it, nothing could have been done. At that time the police would not even have asked for it. When faced with the evidence that the samples did not match, Mr Holland decided to conceal that evidence.

One is bound to ask whether Mr Holland was looking at this point with 20/20 hindsight. Of course in preparing the profile of the murderer the police would record every relevant fact about the crime, its method of commission and the characteristics of the killer, but if it was a matter of some importance at the outset why was there simply no mention at all in the police records of the result of the comparative tests of the semen samples? They were only noted in the laboratory records and would never have seen the light of day if Detective Superintendent Wilkinson had not realised their significance when he went to the laboratory, in showing that Stefan Kiszko could not have killed Lesley Molseed.

At page 7 of his statement, Richard Holland said 'I have never received a report or statement to the effect that the semen on Molseed's knickers did not match the ejaculation of Kiszko, or he would not have been charged'. That conflicts with a later statement made by the scientist in the case, Ronald Outteridge. Were not the police faced with this question on 22 December 1975? Does the sample provided on that day match the results of the tests on the clothing known on 9 October 1975? If yes, then the provider was the killer, if no, then because of Stefan's medical condition, that proved him to be innocent? It may be that the police would not countenance that.

Holland recites (at page 3) that Stefan Kiszko was brought to the attention of the police by police women of the GMP who were investigating the indecent exposure allegations at the youth club. He notes that the complaints made by the three girls regarding that incident were not dealt with by the murder team. Why had they changed their account after 16 years, he wanted to know. The answer is easy. They had decided to tell the truth.

No attempt is made in this 8 page document to explain how Stefan Kiszko could have known about the marks on the child's thigh, as photographed in Exhibit 17, how he could have known about the seminal staining on the child's clothing, and how he was able to demonstrate how he had caused the neck injury to the deceased little girl, and included all that information in his confession statement.

Holland was unable to face up to the truth. All that information had come from him.



At the conclusion of Stefan Kiszko's trial, Mr Justice Park commended the investigating police officers. 'Their hard work and tenacity,' he said, 'has brought Kiszko to justice for the terrible crime he has committed'. How worthless those words sound now. The Chief Constable of West Yorkshire Police, Sir Ronald Gregory, also commended Superintendent Holland and his officers in similar terms.

Richard Holland retired in 1983 and took up a post as head of security at four hospitals in the Huddersfield area. He was charged by way of a summons that he, with Ronald Outteridge, did acts intending to pervert the course of justice. The court stayed the proceedings against both but that was not an acquittal and as a matter of law the prosecution could have proceeded against either or both men again if they had chosen to do so.

In 2005, in spite of being diagnosed with a serious illness, Richard Holland continued his studies. He was awarded an honours degree in agricultural studies by the University of Leeds in the summer of that year. He died on 17 February 2007, still maintaining his innocence of any wrongdoing in the prosecution statements he had prepared and the confession evidence he had obtained in the case of Stefan Kiszko. How much he knew about the case against Ronald Castree (who was charged with Lesley's murder on 6 November 2006) at the time of his death at the age of 74 is not known. He never expressed any regret for his part in a case where the appeal court, most unusually, was prepared not merely to quash the conviction but to declare that Stefan Kiszko was innocent.