

Talk:Satpal Ram

From Wikipedia, the free encyclopedia

This article must adhere to the policy on **biographies of living persons**. Controversial material of any kind that is unsourced or poorly sourced **must be removed immediately**, especially if potentially libelous. If such material is repeatedly inserted or there are other concerns relative to this policy, report it on the living persons biographies noticeboard.



This article is within the scope of *WikiProject Biography*. For more information, visit the project page.



???

This article has not yet **received a rating** on the Project's quality scale. Please rate the article and then leave a **short** summary here to explain the ratings and/or to identify the strengths and weaknesses of the article. [FAQ]

Cleanup

Completely rewrote this article and tried to NPOV it as well as make it a servicable wikipedia entry. Added sources, links and cats as well. If someone else could give it a lookover, I'd be quite appreciative. --Lendorien 14:57, 25 April 2007 (UTC)

This article is a tissue of lies, more so than the original lies that were posted here and which were removed after I pointed them out. I would refer you in particular to <http://www.geocities.com/satpalramisguilty/>

First though: Ram was not assaulted, attacked or even verbally abused by "six drunken caucasian men" - this is a total fiction. The altercation - such as it was - was purely between Ram and his unarmed victim, whose name you have misspelled.

Second: The Stanley knife is likewise a fiction; Ram's original claim, which he stands by, is that he used a pen knife. That being said, this claim too is a lie, and I would refer you to both the autopsy report and the extremely detailed 1995 Court of Appeal judgment; the murder weapon was a flick knife.

Third: Clarke Pearce did not refuse medical treatment; when he arrived at the hospital he was in no condition to make any such judgment; his sister signed the consent form for the operation, but his injuries were too severe and he died on the operating table.

I could go on but if the above isn't enough you are probably braindead. - A Baron —The preceding unsigned comment was added by 78.86.8.234 (talk • contribs) 13:28, 26 May 2007.

Seeing as you vandalized my user page, I cannot entirely assume good faith here. You should have done so with me. I have no agenda with this article. I don't live in the UK, nor do I care that much about the incident. The previous version that I edited was far worse than this as far as being a supporter of Satpal Ram. I simply edited it to be more neutral with what information was available. You'll note that certain words are used, "alleged," "claimed", etc.

Your webpage, while interesting, lacks verifiable sources. If you can provide them, you are welcome to present them in the article. Please do try to present a neutral point of view if you do so and maintain that both sides of the issue are presented. Your personal point of view would not be appropriate for an encyclopaedic article. --Lendorien 18:38, 29 May 2007 (UTC)

You are a total moron to make such an imbecilic claim; the website I set up about this callous murder - not a webpage - contains THE most important documents about the case, in particular the transcripts of both Court of Appeal judgments and the autopsy report. These are legal documents of unimpeachable integrity. The site also contains contemporaneous press articles as well as a deconstruction of Ram's lies. And the lies cretins like you parrot incessantly.

Read the site then come back and apologise. Either that or get a brain transplant. There is NOTHING controversial about Ram's conviction. NOTHING. This was a straightforward case of murder. There are not two sides to this case; as somebody once said, there is no middle ground between common sense and lunacy, or in this case easily verifiable facts and crass lies.

For the record, Ram has been back in prison for sometime. I notice the braindeads haven't been screaming for his release this time. - A Baron

Seriously. Chill out and calm down. You assume I have an agenda here. As I said before, I do not. I don't appreciate the attack, and frankly, it's misplaced anyhow. Wikipedia is a collaborative effort.

I edited the article in passing because it was written like a supporter page for the guy and I felt that was inappropriate. I simply made the tone more neutral based on what information was there. Again, I built on what was already there. My goal was to make it a good article. If it's inaccurate, I have as much interest as any good wikipedian to have it fixed. If you feel the article needs to be fixed due to inaccuracies, then fix them. You clearly know more about the case than I do. Just be sure to cite your sources and use non-inflammatory language. And please, for goodness sakes, try to assume good faith when you deal with people on talk pages and have a little decorum!--Lendorien 19:08, 29 May 2007 (UTC)

Are you for real? You've edited the page to make it even more biased in favour of Ram. You accuse me of using unverifiable sources; as stated, my sources - scans of what are on the site - are both legal and unimpeachable. What are your sources? The "Guadian" newspaper; the grandly styled National Civil Rights Movement, and a black propaganda outfit. You're the one who should chill out. Check out the scans of official documents on my site, then I will graciously accept your apology for championing the cause of a drunken thug who stabbed an innocent man in the back then spent years spitting on his corpse. - A Baron

For the third time, correct the article if you feel it has errors, just be sure to cite your sources and not use inflammatory language. --Lendorien 19:30, 29 May 2007 (UTC)

I really don't believe you Len Moron, asking me to cite my sources. Haven't you read the satpalramisguilty website? Obviously not, okay, just for you:

The "six drunken caucasian men" – where did they come from?

If you refer to the full judgment of Ram's 1995 Appeal, you will see at page 2 that the victim's party was made up of three white couples. There is no suggestion that any of them attacked Ram.

At pages 21-2 of the same judgment you will see that the Court of Appeal rejected Ram's claim that he had used a pen knife – not a Stanley knife – and gave cogent reasons for doing so.

The sick, twisted, evil lie that Clarke Pearce refused medical treatment and went home where he died – blaming the victim instead of the murderer – is refuted by several documents.

On the website you will find his death certificate, which gives the time and place of death as November 16 at Birmingham General Hospital. Clarke Pearce was attacked in the small hours of November 16.

The post mortem/autopsy report, which is also located on the site, gives the time of examination as 10.10am and states too that “he died before surgery could be undertaken”.

These are all legal documents; the facts contained therein are unimpeachable.

Now where are your sources Mr Brain Dead?

As to your claim that I “vandalised” your page, you should hang your head in shame for giving spurious credence to such easily demonstrable base lies.

A Baron May 30, 2007

Retrieved from "http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Talk:Satpal_Ram"

Categories: Biography articles of living people | Unassessed biography articles

-
- This page was last modified 19:30, 29 May 2007.
 - All text is available under the terms of the GNU Free Documentation License. (See **Copyrights** for details.)
Wikipedia® is a registered trademark of the Wikimedia Foundation, Inc., a US-registered 501(c)(3) tax-deductible nonprofit charity.