

Alleged Kirklees grooming victim denies lying about abuse

I would never use that phrase 'alleged victim' when I was in court, and I encouraged my colleagues to also used the description 'complainant'. I accept that until there is a conviction of crime it isn't confirmed that the complainant is the victim of crime. But no one speaks of the alleged victim of an pick-pocketing, or a burglary, both of which crimes have been known to be faked as an insurance scam. But I digress. We now know that the [trial which restarted last week](#) continues and is being reported.

From the [BBC](#)

An alleged grooming victim has denied claims she lied about being repeatedly raped as a 12-year-old girl.

Khurum Raziq is accused of attacking the witness on numerous occasions between 2003 and 2004 in the Kirklees area of West Yorkshire.

However, Mr Raziq's barrister, Ian Brook, told Leeds Crown Court on Monday the witness was "simply lying".

Mr Raziq, 40, of Hill Top Estate, Heckmondwike, denies eight counts of rape.

He is on trial alongside Nasar Hussain, 44, of Brunswick Street, Dewsbury, who denies three counts of raping the same girl between January 2005 and January 2006, and a third man, who cannot be named, who faces two counts of rape.

On behalf of Mr Raziq, Mr Brook told the witnesses: "I'm going to suggest to you that he's never kissed you at all [and] he's never had sex with you."

The witness replied: "That's incorrect."

Mr Brook said claims Mr Raziq had given her drink and drugs were also untrue. He told the witness: "You are simply lying to this jury about ever having had a relationship or sexual intercourse with him."

She replied: "I'm not lying."

Under cross-examination, Anastasis Tasou, on behalf of Mr Hussain, said his client was not aware of the alleged victim's age and that she had "made an effort" to keep it from him because she wanted to be in a relationship with him. The witness said at the time she had wanted to be in a relationship with him, but he knew she was at school at the time of the alleged offences.

The jury has previously heard the third defendant was not fit to stand trial and therefore they did not have to decide if he was guilty or not, but whether he did the alleged act.

The trial continues.