

9.4.1. With this premise, with regards to Amanda Knox's position, it can now be observed that her presence in the house at the scene of the crime ~~was considered~~ ^{is} an established fact during the trial, ~~following~~ ^{in accord with} her own admissions, also contained in her signed memorial, in the part where she explains how, when she was in the kitchen, after the young Englishwoman and another person went into Kercher's room to have sex, she heard her friend's harrowing scream, to the lacerating and unbearable point that she slid down, squatting on the floor, holding her hands firmly on her ears, so as to hear no more of it. On this point, the reliability of the opinion of the judge *a quo* [of the trial from which this appeal is being heard] is certainly acceptable concerning this part of the accused's account, based on the plausible consideration that it was she who first mentioned a possible sexual motive for the murder and spoke about the victim's harrowing scream, when the investigators still did not have the results of an examination of the body or of the post-mortem, nor witness information taken later regarding the victim's scream and the time it was heard (statements from Capezzali Nara, Monacchia Antonella and others). In particular we refer to the appellant's declarations of 11/06/2007 (f, 96) in the police station. On the other hand the

<http://www.amandaknoxcase.com/>
<http://www.injusticeanywhere.org/>

actual text is stronger than "acceptable"; says one has to subscribe to it Page 48

actual text is "the assessment of reliability by the judge *a quo*"