

Russell Brand Arrives at Court Accused of Rape

by Miles Mathis

November 11, 2026

Some don't understand why I think the Brand case was faked, as I claimed near the end of my paper of November 3. Many women will no doubt chime in again (as they did after my Amish rape paper or my paper on the Glen Ridge rape) to say I am condoning rape, though that has nothing to do with this. What I don't condone is fakes, lies, or Phoenician frauds.

I have already published several papers on Brand, as you see from the URL tag this is number 4, the most recent being from April 2025, when these trials started. I said the same thing there, though I didn't have all the specific examples from the trials that I now have, which I got from mainstream reports. I also did his genealogy in 2023, telling you exactly why I didn't trust him. I first outed him as a probable agent back in 2014 in a paper about Graham Hancock. And then we have the tattoos that give him away, including the 33 on his left wrist, always displayed prominently. Also the all-seeing eye, of course, and other required Phoenician imagery. Now that he has allegedly converted to Christianity (from what?) he says the 33 is about Jesus, but he had it long before the fake conversion. So if you wondered why I was not prone to believe any of this current nonsense, now you know. Read those before reading this.

To be clear, I am telling you this was not a kangaroo court, but a dummy court and a totally manufactured case, created to further split the sexes. Brand, like Harvey Weinstein and many others before him, is just an actor playing a part, and not doing it well. In fact, doing it piss-poor on purpose, as above, just to grind us idiot Gentiles. You don't think that looks staged? Who arrives at court for rape with his shirt buttoned down to his navel, wearing a crucifix and carrying a Bible? You don't think that looks like a big joke? Why not arrive with his dick hanging out and carrying the Kama Sutra?

Here's another clue, straight from *The Guardian*:

Brand's barrister, Ian Winter KC, ripped into the complainants with a steely determination. The judge, Mr Justice Bennathan, had to interrupt him during one uncomfortable exchange about consent, saying: "Shush please. I'm the judge, you have to let me talk."

Reminds us of some of the ridiculous scripted badinage during the Depp/Heard fake trial, doesn't it, as they read from computer screens in court. Real judges in real cases don't have lines like that. Any attorney interrupting a judge over and over wouldn't be told to "shush, please". He would be sternly warned and probably pulled into chambers and dressed down.

Here's another clue:

Brand had stored her name in his phone alongside a series of letters and symbols. The court heard the letter "T" stood for "tart", while "AP" denoted anal play, and two asterisks meant: "Never, ever forget this individual, this is a memorable encounter."

How would they know that unless Brand told them what it meant? And why would he do that when he has the right to remain silent? Why was he testifying against himself all along? It makes no legal sense.

And you know what else is a joke? That word "tart". Brand has probably never used that word in his life. No one from his generation calls anyone a tart, not even a tart.

Rather than remain silent, Brand spent hours on the stand incriminating himself and all men, saying things like

But there were tense moments during cross-examination in which Brand stared at the prosecutor, Riel Karmy-Jones KC, in silence for several seconds. Occasionally he could be seen moving his lips before speaking out loud. The prosecutor probed him about alleged inconsistencies in his previous statements and what he has told the jury with regards to the woman who accused him of anal rape. Brand said: "Ms Karmy-Jones, I completely agree. Since these events occurred there's been escalating recollection.

"It's been a deeply traumatic episode of my life I've focused on at the expense of my marriage, my children and health. I ask your forgiveness, well, not your forgiveness. I recognise that this recollection includes small details that are inconsistent and I acknowledge that."

He has no reason to say any of that—other than that it is in his script—and a huge reason not to. He doesn't have to explain any inconsistencies, or explain anything. All he has to say is he is innocent and it didn't happen like that. The prosecution then has to prove it did. That's how it really works. So all this yakking is just the usual longwinded grandstanding by Phoenician actors.

Also this:

Russell Brand has told a court that he was wrong to have used his fame and success to "facilitate" sexual activity with women.

The 51-year-old comedian said he had "misused" his position "very selfishly" and dedicated his

life to "reckless philandering and idiocy".

And when asked if the young fan was "just another sexual conquest" in his attempt to sleep with 5,000 women, Brand told the court: "I really don't know the number, but it's difficult to dispute that's how I conducted myself in the pursuit of willing sexual partners." As he came to the end of his cross-examination, Karmy-Jones challenged Brand on what he had done to upset the woman so much. "I think I was in a position of fame, a successful person who was admired and I misused that commodity very selfishly," he said.

"You were in a position of power in respect of each of these women," the prosecutor continued, to which Brand replied: "As I became more successful and famous I was very comfortable allowing that to facilitate sexual access, which I agree with you was wrong."

None of that is against the law or pertains to rape or assault, so again there is no reason to say any of that, other than to make himself look bad, incriminate himself, and continue the destruction of the heterosexual relationship. Brand basically convicted himself. He was the best witness for the prosecution.

Plus, I again have to point out how scripted that all was. The prosecutor only has to prompt Brand and he dutifully repeats all the current Men-are-Pigs talking points. This reads like it came out of some joint production of the Bennington College sexual politics and drama departments.

Brand was allegedly convicted of one count of rape and three counts of assault, the rape being in his home in 2009, almost 18 years ago. How could this take 17 years to prosecute? I guess because Brand had other things to do in his career and didn't need the part until now. This is his biggest gig in decades. No one was really buying his bit as the next Alex Jones or David Icke, so this was all that was left for him.

The Guardian says two dozen witnesses testified to the rape. How could they, when they weren't there? There weren't 24 people in the room while they were having sex: in fact there weren't *any* other Brand and the girl, and I don't believe she was there, either, since Brand is gay. The only reason she would be there is if she was cleaning his house. Not one of the witnesses was a doctor or policeman, who could have at least confirmed the penetration claimed. To prove a rape the girl has to go to the doctor and police immediately and get and file reports, as any real lawyer who works in the field will tell you. If you don't believe me, ask them. Otherwise this is all just a story with no evidence one way or the other (unless Brand admits to it, and he didn't plead guilty). So the two dozen "witnesses" were witnesses to nothing. They shouldn't even have been allowed on the stand.

Here's another clue from that story:

Days later [after an encounter in his dressing room], Brand sent a chauffeur to drive the woman to his three-storey Victorian townhouse in Hampstead, north-west London, where he forced her

to shower and brush her teeth before they had consensual sex.

How do you force someone to shower and brush her teeth? The language here is a giveaway, since the lady writer (Emine Sinmaz) is obviously writing in a true-crime fiction mode of maximum emotion, hamhandedly trying to force your response. And she tacks the "consensual sex" thing on at the end, hoping I guess you will miss it after hearing about the horror of being forced to brush ones teeth. But if the sex was consensual, it wasn't rape, by definition. We are told the rape charge was for anal sex the girl didn't want, but again, a court should require some evidence of that. A 17-year-old raw claim from someone who goes around blowing movie stars in their dressing rooms for fun isn't worth a lot where I come from. Even if this had been true and not just some Hollywood fiction, we can't know for sure whether she wanted it or not, or enjoyed it or not, but at least some evidence *it happened* should be presented to the court and jury, and that would be easy to do with a doctor's report. Any doctor would be able to say for certain whether it happened or not, for obvious reasons, and according to *The Guardian* story Brand left incriminating and incontrovertible evidence there, which would have made this a slamdunk, proving it was him and not some other guy a few hours earlier. But not one of the 24 "witnesses" had anything to say about that.

So, this rape conviction was made without a jot of real evidence, which isn't the way courts work, in the US or UK or anywhere else. Proving this was another dummy court of high-voltage Phoenician actors.

Compare to a second "victim" described by Sinmaz:

She invited him back to her hotel to continue their conversation, but "froze" when she returned from the toilet to find Brand partly naked. She told police he then raped her but on the evidence presented in court, the jury found him not guilty of that offence. "I remember him on me, very heavy. I know I said no. I kind of drifted out of my head. I couldn't get out of the situation – 'Do I shout, do I scream?'" she told the court.

If Brand was innocent of that, why are we having to hear about it as if he were guilty? Aren't his rights being violated here by Sinmaz, describing the encounter in terms of rape while reporting he was found not guilty of rape by a jury? Being on someone during sex and being heavy are not crimes and are not evidence of rape, so why are we hearing about it in breathless tones? Most women like that, or I would assume, since that is what sex is for a woman. Plus, I have been told that outright by several women: they like it. I know because I said I would not like it, having someone bigger than me on top of me, and they said they *did* like it. All fine and dandy, since I am me and they are them.

My point being that Sinmaz is trying very hard to spin her report, but she is still failing completely to explain how or why Brand was convicted. How could the jury find there was even less evidence to convict in this second case, when there was none in the first? According to what Sinmaz has reported, there was no evidence in either case, just a contradictory story with a lot of manufactured emotion but absolutely nothing beyond the statement. I also note that there is no report of the cross examination of the girls by Brand's attorney. We learn nothing about them here, leaving us to assume they are lily white, though we can be sure any real attorney would find a lot to tell a jury beyond the fact they didn't scream or punch or kick. He didn't meet them in Bible class, you know, even according to the fake story. Although I don't believe they were Brand's groupies—since Brand's groupies would be boys or men—they admit these girls and women were groupies, chasing famous Phoenician creeps for their jollies. In other words, *not nice people*. And of course it helps immensely that they remain anonymous, since we can't look them up to see what vice-riddled lying reprobates they turned out to be

15 or 20 years later on. Or would be if they weren't just lying actors. We get lots of pictures of Brand and his bodyguards, playing it up and looking as slimy as possible, but no pictures of the accusers, so readers of *The Guardian* will—cued by the violins of Sinmaz—imagine them as cherry-cheeked girl scouts and naive college girls, just looking for pointers in their comedy routines.

Here's another clue from that article:

He said he had achieved "staggering fame" after marrying the US pop star Katy Perry in 2010 but that now nobody would "touch him with a bargepole".

You have to laugh. First of all, it isn't true, since he still has tons of fans all over the world. He has tens of thousands of subscribers and followers, despite being mainly a failure as a gadfly. They admit that in the article. You can be sure lots of people of both sexes are still throwing themselves at him, since he remains very attractive (in his own way). But he is saying this to try to explain to you why he would need to rape anyone. Or, *he* is not saying it, the scriptwriters are saying it and he is just reading from the Teleprompter. But I guess that is the point, since, as I have said before, he has no reason to rape anyone. He has his choice of tens of thousands of people, some of them no doubt very attractive. But they need you to think he is now so lonely and cursed he can't get sex except by resorting to rape. Can't even get a hug or a kiss without assaulting some poor innocent child.

And yet . . . that is contradicted in the same sentence. He wasn't convicted for recent events. The fake rape was from 2009, the height of his fame, during his sold-out comedy tours, just before marrying Katy Perry in that dual-beard fake marriage. Compare to Depp/Heard. So why would this guy who could land top-tier hotties like Katy Perry 2009 be raping and groping nobody shopgirls? We are supposed to believe he is only attracted to the ones who aren't attracted to him, I guess. What a demon!

Except that the truth is very easy to find, and that isn't it. Go watch a couple of his old comedy specials on Youtube, and you will see he is always flirting with big hairy bearded guys in the audience wearing plaid shirts. So Brand isn't just gay, he is a bottom. The farthest thing away from what he is portraying in the current vaudeville, which is why they all find it such a hoot. He has no desire to rough up some pretty young girl, he wants to be manhandled by Paul Bunyan. Look it up.

They even admit this, but bury it in the article, as they love to do.

The first alleged rape victim has told the court she believed Brand was gay when they first met at a Labour party conference fringe event, which led to her agreeing for him to come to her hotel room.

Why would she think that, when the media was assuring he was straight? When he was married to Katy Perry? Well, because he IS gay and acts gay. It isn't a difficult equation. Not rocket science.



They even showed that picture in court from his 2007 book, *My Booky Wook* [the gayest title ever titled], where he is already vamping at age 7, and in which Brand admitted he was "acting gay". But they continue to spin it in court as he spun it in the book, claiming he acted gay to get girls. No, you act gay to get BOYS. Look up the definition of gay. Does he look like he is trying to get girls there?

Here's another clue this was all fake:

He also said he had failed to persuade a single person with relevant information to give evidence on his behalf at his criminal trial.

I guess they have never heard of subpoenas in the UK. But maybe no one gave evidence for him because they didn't want to be part of a fake trial. Or maybe they weren't offered a large enough payment for the job. We can be sure Brand is being paid a mint for this role, since he was dragged through the mud here and will have to stay out of the limelight for a couple of years while pretending to be in jail. Unless he is fake pardoned or wins a fake appeal. But these bad guy roles are often the best for actors, and they can always be rehabilitated later. Think Mel Gibson. Or they can retire to their private islands, whatever they prefer.