**In Defence of Macavity the Mystery Cat (from Cats the Musical)**

**An extract from my one-man show, cleverly called “Cats the Musical”**

Esteemed members of the jury,

Over the course of the last few days some very emotional language has been deployed by my friend, the learned prosecutor. You’ve heard my client called, amongst other things, a mystery-cat, a cat of great deceitfulness and suavity, a cat with sunken eyes and a coat dusty from neglect. My learned friend would have you believe my client, Macavity, has broken every human law, even the law of gravity, and is no less than a fiend in feline shape, a monster of depravity.

Certainly you’ll agree that these are grand accusations. But, even taking the prosecution case at it’s highest, I fail to see what evidence substantiates these outrageous claims. That is my main job here today as my client’s legal representation; I am here to remind you that your job as the jury is to pay no regard to what are, in my respectful submission, inadmissible zealous squabblings, and instead focus on the evidence.

As such, I’d implore you to think back on the evidence, or lack-thereof, that has been lead over the course of the last few days.

It seems to me that the Crown’s case rests upon a simple idea, a motif they’ve repeated again and again; when the police reach the scene of the crime, Macavity my client, is not there. It seems to me the internal logic of the entire police conspiracy against the defendant is as such: the flying squad are called to a crime, Macavity is not present, there is no evidence Macavity was ever present, Macavity is naturally suspect number one. By such a threshold some other comparably culpable suspects might be Abraham Lincoln, Her Honour the Judge, or even any member of your jury, ladies and gentlemen.

The Crown’s onus is to particularise the charges against my client, and this indictment, containing violations of all human laws, does not do so. I’d ask my friend to in their closing draw us to the evidence that my client has gone armed in public as to cause fear, or instigated a riot within a youth detention centre, or has dishonestly obtained benefit to the amount of $30,000. Such evidence has not been lead, so on all counts and countless other, I submit my client must be acquitted.

I do hate to take any more of your valuable time ladies and gentlemen, but if we might quickly turn to my client’s antecedents. By the Crown’s own admissions Macavity is outwardly respectable, and his pawprints are not found in any files at Scotland Yard. I would further submit that is outward respectability is merely a symptom of inward respectability. The Crown also claims the alibi evidence we have lead is just a further example of my client’s wickedness and deceit. The mere act of my client defending his name, the Crown would have you think, is an offence against public order.

In summary, as her Honour has reminded you, the proof to which the prosecution case must rise is beyond reasonable doubt.  My client was not present at any of the crime scenes investigated by the police, he has no criminal history, and has provided alibi evidence explaining he could not have committed the relevant offending. It seems that if these were the qualifiers for a finding of guilt, ever person in this Courtroom would be guilty.

If you believe my client is innocent, you must return a verdict of not guilty. If you believe it is likely my client is not innocent, that is not sufficient, you must still return a verdict of not guilty. If you believe my client is guilty, but cannot prove this using the evidence lead in this Courtroom, you must return a verdict of not guilty

Also, yes, I am aware my client is a cat.