

**Giuliano Mignini's interview with Claudio Paglieri December 2009 in Il Secolo XIX.**

[http://ilsecoloxix.ilsole24ore.com/p/italia/2009/12/12/AMRnVHCD-preston\\_parla\\_risponde.shtml](http://ilsecoloxix.ilsole24ore.com/p/italia/2009/12/12/AMRnVHCD-preston_parla_risponde.shtml)

**[Claudio Paglieri] Your thoughts concerning Doug Preston?**

[Mr Mignini] I have been patient but now I've had it. This guy doesn't know what he is talking about. I saw him for two hours in all my life, but for years he has been spreading on the Internet his reconstruction of a story of which he hasn't understood a thing.

And now, perhaps to get even, he's calling from overseas in the Kercher trial, saying things that are not true.

**Giuliano Mignini, public prosecutor in the trial for the murder of Meredith Kercher, has gone in a few hours from accuser to accused. The Americans didn't like Amanda Knox's sentence, and the journalist and writer Douglas Preston is making precise accusations.**

**Let's start from the "pending issue" between the two of you. Preston who together with the journalist Mario Spezi was investigating the Monster of Florence, says that you interrogated them for two and a 1/2 hours . The next day he left Italy in order not to be arrested.**

He hasn't understood a thing. He is a writer but he doesn't know the judicial procedures. Reality is different: While I was hearing him out as a person informed of some facts in a proceeding I was involved in, some circumstances emerged that threw suspicion on Preston, ie lying to the public prosecutor.

According to Article 63 of the penal code I told him that he had to get a lawyer, and that I could not continue the interview. I added that for that crime (lying to the prosecutor), based on article 371 bis, I should have waited for the end of the proceeding during which such declarations had been rendered.

He told me he understood Italian well, but obviously it wasn't so. He claims that I told him to run to America and don't come back, otherwise I would have him arrested. This is absolutely not true..

**Surely Preston was shocked by the interrogation. He says you were quite hard on him**

Shocked? What can I say? This is how interrogations are conducted, their purpose is also to accuse.

**However, now it's Preston accusing the methods of the interrogation of Amanda. Is it true she was pressured? And why doesn't a recording exist?**

The first time Amanda was heard as person informed of facts [a witness]. In these cases, because of the urgency, we never record. Then we suspended the interrogation as suspicion of crime emerges. I explained to Amanda that based on article 374 of the penal code - the one on spontaneous declarations - she would have been able to render a declaration [as a witness].

A lawyer should have been present only if I had asked her questions of complicity and/or accused her. But I didn't asked a thing, practically I had only the function of a "notary public".

**You didn't record it?**

No. I usually do when for example I am in my office. I recorded the declarations of her roommates and of the witnesses. But that night, we were at the police station, there was agitation, and we had to go and arrest Lumumba, who had just been accused by Amanda. Lumumba was later cleared thanks to me

**Preston in an article on the Guardian says you are the ones who suggested Lumumba's name.**

It is not true. During the trial, the presiding judge asked her about this, and Amanda clearly answered no.

**During the first interrogation [as a witness] Amanda was without a lawyer and without an interpreter.**

Another falsity. The interpreter was there, Dr Donnino. I am adding that during the first interrogation in front of the GIP she invoked her right to remain silent. The interrogation that took place in jail, with three attorneys present was recorded.

**Let's talk about HIV. Amanda in jail was told that she was HIV-positive and was asked to make a list of all her ex-lovers in order to tell them. Then the positivity turns out to be a false positive sample. The suspicion of a trick arises.**

I never asked Amanda anything like that . We have the utmost respect for the suspect, and on top of it, what would have been the purpose of asking her?

**Because the list ended up on the newspapers and contributed to giving a negative image of the girl, of an "easy" woman.**

Nobody has depicted Amanda as an "easy girl". Why would I do it? She was totally unknown to the police and the procura. Her sexual life is totally irrelevant in order to describe her personality, though it helps to explain the tense relationships with the other roommates.

**Let's conclude with the other issues by Douglas Preston. The DNA evidence is not convincing.**

What can I say? The scientific police of the Ministry of the Interior have worked with it, that's the best we have in Italy. I trust them, I am not a biologist, and neither is Preston.

**What about the investigation on your abuse of office and wiretapping in Florence?**

I still have to understand what I am being accused of.

However, the investigation has now ended. During this time the Tribunal of Riesame in Florence followed by the Cassazione have annulled all the proceedings initiated by Prosecutor Luca Turco against Dr Giuttari [who investigated the Monster case], my codefendant, as no evidence of the crime of abuse of office exists.

**You will not appeal the sentence and the Court of Appeals will acquit the defendants, in America they seem sure of this i.e that the first degree sentence [sentence of the trial just concluded] serves the purpose of "saving face" in the Procura and "the truth will come out later?"**

I don't even want to comment on this. I will only say that a total of 18 judges among the Riesame, Cassazione, GUP and Assise courts have confirmed the prosecution's theory. Did I deceive them all? This is a sovereign state, and there is a sentence In the name of the Italian people that is in the name of all of us. Period.