
From: Julie Bindel

Sent: Tuesday, May 19, 2026 8:34 AM

To: Alexander Economou

Subject: Re: Economou vs de Freitas

Go fuck yourself, you sadistic monster.

Mobile: 44777[REDACTED]

Substack:

<https://juliebindel.substack.com>

Twitter: bindelj

On Monday, 18 May 2026 at 21:02:55 BST, Alexander Economou wrote:

Dear Ms Bindel,

I write in connection with the press release titled "CPS incompetent delay leaves Eleanor de Freitas's bereaved parents facing loss of their home after 12-year fight for justice", which has been issued through Se7en Marketing and amplified by you through your social media accounts.

You have a long-standing record of writing on the Eleanor de Freitas case, in The Guardian, in The Critic, and on your social media accounts, over a number of years.

I therefore need to put the following matters of public record to you in writing, so that any further amplification of the release on your part proceeds in knowledge of them. Each point is documented, with the underlying sources linked below. The complete record is at www.economou.legal.

1. The threatened loss of the de Freitas family home.

The release attributes this to "CPS incompetent delay" and the lack of compensation flowing from the prosecution of Eleanor de Freitas. That is not correct. The threat to the family home arises from David de Freitas's own long-standing unpaid tax liabilities.

On 4 August 2022, sitting at the High Court, Judge Passfield ordered Mr de Freitas to pay £130,812.26 in unpaid taxes since 1998, and penalties: see the [judgment in *HMRC v de Freitas* \[2022\] EWHC 1946 \(Ch\) on Bailii](#). At paragraph 7 of that judgment, the court records that Mr de Freitas had carried on business as a financial planner on a self-employed basis since at least the 1998/99 tax year. The tax was not paid, and Mr de Freitas was duly declared bankrupt at the High Court in May 2023: see the [bankruptcy notice in *The Gazette*](#). This is a matter wholly separate from the CPS case.

2. The claim, in the Notes to Editors, that "the police did not support Eleanor's prosecution".

That statement is misleading in two respects.

First, the point was directly addressed by the Director of Public Prosecutions in her [public statement of 9 December 2014](#):

"There has been speculation that the police did not agree with the prosecution for various reasons. However, the police never undertook an investigation into the alleged perverting the course of justice nor did they consider all the material provided to us by the private prosecution. They were therefore not in a position to form a view on whether there was sufficient evidence to prosecute."

Second, in February 2019 the Metropolitan Police Service paid me £10,000 in compensation in respect of the misconduct of the very officers who had handled the original rape investigation, including their refusal to consider the CCTV and text message evidence and their refusal to investigate Ms de Freitas for perverting the course of justice: see the [Metropolitan Police compensation order](#). The officer in charge of that investigation, Detective Inspector Julian King, was subsequently found "proven" on misconduct allegations and left the force: see the [misconduct outcome](#).

3. The suggestion that the CPS approach in Eleanor's case was "fundamentally wrong".

The decision to prosecute Ms de Freitas was reviewed at every level by authorities independent of the CPS itself, and was upheld at each.

The Director of Public Prosecutions, in the [public statement of 9 December 2014](#) referred to above, said:

"... evidence including text messages and CCTV footage that directly contradicted the account Ms de Freitas gave to the police. This was not assumption based on her behaviour or actions which fall into myths and stereotypes about how alleged rape victims should behave. It was on this basis that we concluded that there was a realistic prospect of proving that the rape allegation made by Ms de Freitas was false ..."

HM Coroner declined to go behind the rape allegations at the inquest. In his [defence submission of July 2015](#) in the judicial review proceedings brought by Mr de Freitas, at [paragraph 23 \(page 13\)](#), and referring to a letter from the DPP, the Coroner recorded:

"As regards the evidential stage, there were some 10 pieces of evidence which supported the prosecution case either (a) in that they contradicted Ms de Freitas's account of the assault or (b) in that they amounted to apologies by her for making the allegations. As regards the public interest stage, prosecutors had reviewed a very full assessment of her fitness to stand trial, which suggested that she was fit."

Refusing permission for judicial review on 9 March 2016, Mr Justice Holroyde, sitting in the High Court, stated at paragraph 5 of [his judgment](#):

"The CPS here had medical evidence, including that which was relied on by those representing the deceased, which did not identify any real or immediate risk to her life. No representations were made to the CPS, in the days immediately preceding her death, to the effect that her condition was worsening and that the prosecution was endangering life."

And in his [public statement of 26 June 2018](#), the Attorney General said:

"I recognise that this was a difficult case with a tragic outcome and I extend my deepest sympathies to Mr De Freitas and his family. However, I have carefully considered the concerns raised by Mr De Freitas and I am satisfied that this case has already been subject to extensive scrutiny within the CPS, and that it was right for the prosecution to go ahead."

The release does not refer to any of the above.

4. The framing around Ms de Freitas's mental health.

The release implies that the CPS failed to take adequate account of Ms de Freitas's bipolar disorder. That picture is not consistent with the contemporaneous record.

The CPS held a full [psychiatric report](#), which had been provided through Ms de Freitas's own representatives, and which concluded that she was fit to stand trial. As HM Coroner observed in his JR defence submission at [paragraph 44\(b\) \(page 27\)](#):

"At no time after that did any of her treating clinicians say that she was unfit to stand trial, or at immediate risk of suicide."

The Coroner also recorded, at [paragraph 39\(d\) \(page 23\)](#), that Ms de Freitas's own medical records, including Dr Bench's records of 31 December 2012, 24 September 2013, 14 October 2013 and 27 March 2014 (the latter being one week before her death), recorded that family issues were having an effect on her mental condition.

In March 2014, Ms de Freitas's own lawyers approached the CPS to ask whether she could plead guilty to the lesser offence of wasting police time. The CPS did not accept that plea, and the case proceeded on the original charge of perverting the course of justice. That fact was confirmed in writing in May 2024 by Simon Spence KC, who was the CPS prosecuting counsel on the case: see his [email of 20 May 2024](#).

5. In summary.

The overall picture the release presents, namely a CPS pressing on with a prosecution that has now quietly been admitted to be wrong, against police opposition, with the consequence that the family is now losing their home, is not supported by any of the public record. Each of the principal factual building blocks is either incorrect or seriously misleading, as set out above.

The full narrative, with all sources and supporting documents, is published at www.economou.legal. I would respectfully ask that you, and anyone to whom you have provided this release, review that material before any further circulation.

I would be grateful for your acknowledgement of this email, and for confirmation of what steps you propose to take.

Yours sincerely,

Alexander Economou

www.economou.legal