

eel, near  
ton, and  
l, where  
st. I put  
was not

ing that  
Monday.  
ong' was  
ood and  
ad been

referred  
in who  
It was  
r. This  
ick did  
he is  
i; that  
mem-  
asked

the shop, would certainly be true if the shop had been at the time.  
Finally, if Mr Swanwick's view of what happened was accurate,  
the alibi was, in fact, completely worthless. For the sweet-shop  
incident, Mr Swanwick insisted, took place on the Monday. It  
was therefore useless as an alibi. Yet Hanratty, according to Mr  
Swanwick, was prepared to pay good money for an 'alibi' in a  
sweet shop which could almost certainly not be stood up, and, if it  
was stood up, would be proved to be false. The standard response  
of any prosecution presented in court with a cast-iron alibi is to  
make the charge: 'It was bought.' In the case of James Hanratty  
and Mrs Dinwoodie the charge was rather less credible than  
usual.

Even in the scrupulously fair summing up of Mr Justice Gorman,  
there was a note of incredulity about Mr Swanwick's submission:

It is suggested that this is an invented or bought enquiry. You  
have to consider the position and you have to determine what  
view you form, because the prosecution has not hesitated to say  
— and I make no comment; I make no complaint — that this  
alibi at Liverpool was the result of a journey made to Liverpool  
at some time by this man, seeking to buy an alibi with the £250  
which he is supposed to have told Dixie that he had in the