

# The Depp/Heard Trials were Faked



*by Miles Mathis*

*First published March 1, 2025*

*This is how it looks to me*

Yes, I am getting to this late, but better late than never. As my readers may not be surprised to hear, I didn't follow the saga as it transpired in 2022. I was in the depths of depression after being forced to move due to Covid, and besides I don't have a TV. So I didn't actually know the specifics of it until . . . today.

Why today? Well, I was at *Babylon Bee* and one of [their old joke stories from 2022](#) being re-spun today was about Depp installing bird spikes in his bed to prevent Heard from pooping in it. So I just became aware of that as well. But this paper isn't about that. It is about all the red flags I saw ~~pooping~~ popping up as soon as I researched this story.

This is the last line in that article at the *Bee*:

Following the public trial, the jury found both movie stars guilty of inflicting incalculable psychological damage on the American people.

You may want to ask yourself if that was just a by-product of the event, or the intended consequence. I did.

To start with, Depp and Heard were only married for one year. 2015. So why would they be squabbling in court like this six years later? Even more important is that they admit Heard came out as gay in 2010. Hmmm. So why would Depp marry a lesbian five years after she came out? I think the answer to that is clear: they were the usual Hollywood co-beards. And if the marriage itself was a ruse that is indication the rest of this was a ruse as well. Plus, remind yourself of this: these people are actors. This is what they do. They create fiction and cram it down your throat.

You will say these trials hurt their careers. Not really, since their careers were basically over by 2018, when Heard's op-eds in appeared in the US and UK. This project was the best movie offer either one

had gotten in years. Not only were 2015's *Mortdecai* and *Black Mass* big bombs—with Depp playing Whitey Bulger in the latter\*—it didn't get any better after that. 2016's *Alice* was a flop, barely making back its costs, and *Pirates 5* was bludgeoned by the critics, scoring sub-40 at both Rotten Tomatoes and Metacritic. They probably faked its box office to hide the extent of the disaster. Since then he has had to resort to voicing a Puffin. And the reason for this is clear: Depp had skated on his looks for a long time, but by 2015 he was 52 and his looks were gone. He hadn't taken care of himself, being a drunk and drug fiend, and by that time he couldn't wear enough wigs, hats, scarves, and sunglasses to cover it.

As for Amber Heard, her “career” was even more in the tank by 2015, she appearing in the awful TV movie *The Prince*, with a rating of 1.5 at IMDB, and a supporting role in *I Do...Until I Don't*, with a 4.4. And it didn't pick up after that, see *Her Smell*, *London Fields*, and *Gully*. If not for *Aquaman*, she could have retired after *The Pineapple Express* and no one would have known the difference. All the movies Wikipedia toplists on her resume were big bombs, see for instance Bret Easton Ellis' megabomb *The Informers*, which made \$382,000. Couldn't happen to a nicer guy. Or Duchovny's *The Joneses*, which made less than 7 million on a 10 million budget, ditto.

[Added April 24, 2025: I was watching Ozzy Man videos on youtube when I caught his review of the Depp/Heard trials. So this is how I finally saw actual footage—instead of stills—almost two months after outing it as fake. Hard to believe, I know, but that's how it is. What did I see?



I saw that. Do you see it, or did you miss it the first thousand times? Why does everyone, including Depp on the stand, Heard in the gallery, and both attorneys, have a computer screen in front of them? When did that become standard courtroom apparatus? Answer: never, because it isn't. A person on the stand is supposed to be answering questions from his or her mind, not being prompted by a computer screen or Teleprompter. But obviously all these actors couldn't be bothered to learn a massive script, so this was the only way to do it. All these people have to be continuously prompted by their computer screens.

In that scene and act, Depp is being “questioned” by Heard's attorney, who is just reading stuff out of the newspaper about Depp being a drunk, etc., and not even asking Depp to comment on it beyond “did I read that right?” Rather than Depp's attorney or the judge interrupting that this is all completely out-of-bounds and absurd, Depp is forced to act that part himself, saying “this is all hearsay”. Of course it is, but the judge just sits there and watches it unfold. Someone, who again sounds like Heard's attorney, interrupts saying “I'll move to strike this as hearsay, your honor.” But again, the judge says nothing. And why would Heard's attorney tell us he will strike the whole line of questioning as hearsay

*before* he begins it, and then proceed to the questioning? And why would the judge allow it? In a real case, the judge would interrupt with two points: one, an attorney doesn't move to strike his own questioning before he begins it, and two, there is no point going through this charade if they are going to strike it. How about just skip it and ask Depp some real questions? Case closed and I could have skipped all the rest of this original analysis, since that blows the whole thing as a fake right there.

But wait, I missed another joke. Heard's attorney is named Rottenborn! And people bought this!? The other female attorney also has a joke name: Bredehoft. That's German for Broad Head. Think about it.]

[**Added April 30, 2025:** A reader just pointed out to me that expert psychological witness Dawn Hughes was also involved in the R. Kelly case, the NXIVM case, and is now set to testify in the Weinstein case and the Diddy case. Indicating she is yet another fake events actor hired by Langley as their go-to expert witness. I have already proved the [Kelly](#) and [NXIVM](#) and [Weinstein](#) cases were staged, and have suggested the same for Diddy. They may want to spread the parts around a little better in future, so that this isn't so obvious.]

Some of that was speculation, but what isn't speculation is that the US trial was in [Fairfax County, Virginia](#), and was [livestreamed](#). That tells us everything right there. As I have told you a hundred times, only CIA trials are televised, and doubling that clue is that Fairfax County is . . . [home of the CIA](#). So why would the trial be there? Neither Depp nor Heard were living in Fairfax County. They have homes in California and France, but not in the DC area. You will say it is because the *Washington Post* is there, the *Post* being where Depp was defamed by Heard, but that just leads us to ask why Heard was writing Men-are-Pigs op-eds for the *Post* in 2018. Shouldn't she have been writing op-eds for the *Los Angeles Times* or *San Francisco Chronicle* or something? Besides, the *Washington Post* ISN'T in Fairfax County, VA, obviously. It is in DC.

**The location was chosen on the basis that the online edition and the print edition of *The Washington Post* op-ed are published in the county.**[48]

That's from Wiki, but it is a lie. The address of the *Washington Post* is One Franklin Square, DC, and all of DC is east of the Potomac. Fairfax County is in Virginia, west of the Potomac. That's why they call it the *Washington Post* instead of the *Virginia Post*. Arlington and Alexandria are also not in Fairfax County. Fairfax County does however contain Herndon, Falls Church, McLean, and [Langley](#).

It is true the *Post* has some offices in Fairfax, but that is not the question. Any lawsuit against the *Post* would be directed at its editorial offices, which are in DC, not Virginia. Depp might as well have filed suit in St. Thomas, Virgin Islands, claiming they had jurisdiction because he was in *Pirates of the Caribbean*.

Here's something else that doesn't add up. We are told Heard was awarded \$7 million upon divorce, for one year of marriage, with no pre-nup and no children. But Heard has claimed she could have taken him for half of his income that year, which was \$65 million. Really? Depp made \$65 million in one year, that late in his career? Well, maybe, since he was in three films that year as well as being a spokesman for Dior. The films were all bombs, but that didn't matter to Depp since he got his salary regardless. But my point is, do you think if Depp had really been beating Heard up all year, she would have let him off the hook for that \$32.5 million? No, she and her lawyers would have taken him for everything they could. Far easier to get the money on a community property claim in 2017 than to wait five years and try to get it in a defamation suit. So that makes no sense.

This also doesn't add up: the divorce settlement allegedly included NDAs, by which **neither side could comment on the relationship**. In one way, that makes sense, since these Hollywood marriages require secrecy. Heard had already come out, but Depp hadn't, so he wouldn't want her telling the world he was gay (as had happened back in about 1993 when Mimi Rogers had gone on record with *Playboy*, implying Tom Cruise was gay). But my point is, that 2017 Non-Disclosure clause should have prevented Heard from blabbing to the *Post* in 2018. As soon as she did, she not only opened herself up to a libel suit, all the terms of the divorce settlement were out the window. Her \$7 million was tied to that NDA, which she had just trashed. So if Depp and his attorneys wanted money or retribution, that would have been the easy way to get it. They wouldn't even have to go to court for that. All it would take is going before a judge with a copy of the op-ed, for a summary judgment. Since that didn't happen, we can be pretty sure this is all fiction.

It is also worth mentioning that Heard claimed she was donating all \$7 million from the settlement to the ACLU and the LA Children's Hospital, but it turns out that wasn't true, either. As it turns out, those charities got only a fraction of that, if anything, and what they got may have come from Elon Musk, not Heard. Though we aren't told why Musk would be covering Heard's claims.

Same goes for the conclusion of the 2022 suits, where Depp allegedly had Heard on the hook for \$8 million, but let her off for \$1 million. That wouldn't have even covered his court and attorney costs. Plus, he had wasted a similar amount in the 2020 suit in London against the *Sun*. But after years of rancor, he just let her slide at the end? Not believable.

And I remind you again, she had taken him for \$7 million a few years earlier for basically nothing. At most she lived with him for a few months, maybe sleeping with him maybe not, but mostly just annoying the pants off him. So you don't think he was keen to get that money back, especially after the whole wife-beating hoax? But once the jury agreed with him that it was all a hoax and awarded him \$10 million, he decided he didn't want it? He would just let the "lying witch" off the hook?

Here's another problem: Depp's attorneys may have been working on a percentage, in which case he would not be allowed to let Heard slide for the other \$7 million. They would want their cut of that. He couldn't just resettle with Heard outside of court on a verbal promise, and if he did his own attorneys would sue him.

Plus, I circle that for you: **the jury agreed with him that it was all a hoax**. In order to win, **he proved that the whole story was fiction**. The wife-beating op-ed in the *Post* was fiction, which must mean the op-ed in the *Sun* was fiction as well. The whole Men-are-Pigs story was fake, and **the jury confirmed that**. Which, as you see, takes us halfway to proving my title, doesn't it?

And if the whole story of spousal abuse was faked, then we don't have to walk much further to propose the rest of it was fake, *including the trials themselves*. *And including the marriage*. Do you see how that works? It is called logic.

On the way out I will tell you some other things you should know in weighing the evidence here. In the London trial, Depp **had no jury**, the case being decided by judge Sir Andrew Lindsay Nicol in only three weeks. [Just three months after the Depp case, Nicol retired at age 70](#). At Wiki, we find Nicol's most famous case prior to Depp's case also looks fake, that being the trial of surgeon David Sellu, accused of manslaughter in the death of a patient. Nicol found him guilty and sentenced him to 30 months, but *after serving his sentence* Sellu appealed and won, the finding being struck down due to



malpractice by the judge. Strange that Sellu appealed only after serving his sentence. We have to wonder if he was compensated for the bad decision and his 15 months behind bars. Wiki doesn't tell us.

As you see, Nicol is also a Lindsay, and with him being a knight we may assume his Lindsays link him to the Stuarts. He is not listed in the peerage and Wiki fails to give us his parents, which is suspicious. A trip to [thepeerage.com](http://thepeerage.com) tells us these Nicols are not only Lindsays, they are **Drummond-Hays**, of the Earls of Kinnoull and the Viscounts Strathallan. This also links us to the Foleys, Harleys, Hayburtons, Auriols, Livingstons, Watts, Flemings, and the Comtes de Vismes.



With more digging, we find Nicol was involved in the 2014 ["first secret terror trial of Britain"](#).

The trial judge, Mr Justice Nicol, has ruled the case will be held in secret and the public will not even know the men's names for unknown 'national security' reasons.

That has been illegal since the time of the Magna Carta, so we can be sure this is fake as well. That wouldn't be a trial, it would be a Star Chamber.

This is also strange: [at LegalFutures.co.uk](http://LegalFutures.co.uk), we are told Nicol presided over libel claims by two Warwick University professors in the High Court. The problem? The press release is dated January 2022. But [we just saw that Nicol retired in 2021](#).

And finally, regarding the London case, we find that Depp and Heard testified in person, but none of their friends or family did. With only Depp and Heard testifying, how did Nicol decide on his own authority that Depp had committed 12 of the 14 offenses? He just took Heard's word for it? Remember, these things would have happened—had they happened—five years earlier, so there could be no forensic evidence of any kind. Heard never went to the police or to a doctor, so we have no records of any injuries. The photos we have seen were not taken by doctors or police, so they are inadmissible as evidence in court. Any attorney would argue the photos were faked with stage make-up, since we are dealing with actors here. So all we have is a he said/she said case. Again, on what basis did Nicol decide Heard was telling the truth and Depp was lying? We aren't told.

As their key evidence of a hoax, Depp's lawyers claimed that stylist Samantha McMillen, who dressed Heard for *The Late Late Show with James Corden*—filmed a day after an alleged violent incident in December 2015 (#12)—had not seen any injuries on her. They also alleged that following the May 2016 incident (#14), elevator CCTV footage from Heard and Depp's apartment building did not show her with injuries, and neither members of the apartment building staff nor the two LAPD officers who were called to Depp and Heard's apartment saw any physical injuries on Heard.[39]

NGN stated that the fact there were not many witnesses to the actual violence was because it had taken place behind closed doors, which is a common feature in domestic violence.[55]

Except that, of course, most victims of domestic violence are not top actresses known for their beauty, and who would be seen by hundreds of people in a normal day. I guess Judge Nicol forgot to take that into account.

Judge Nicol rejected Depp's contention that Heard was a "gold-digger", saying in his ruling: "Her donation of the seven million US dollars to charity is hardly the act one would expect of a gold-digger." [40]

Whoops! Looks like the judge forgot to check that, since they now admit it wasn't true. So this judge doesn't seem very competent, does he? He doesn't bother to verify even the most basic facts, though it would have been pretty easy to call up the ACLU and ask if they had any record of a \$7 million donation. They probably would have remembered that.

[In refusing the appeal] the appeals judges concluded he had a "full and fair" trial, and that "the judge based his conclusions on each of the incidents on his extremely detailed review of the evidence specific to each incident [...] in an approach of that kind there was little need or room for the judge to give weight to any general assessment of Ms. Heard's credibility." [43][44]

Really? Do you think the appeals judges really wrote that? Or did MI6 write it? Doesn't sound like something a real judge would say, does it? Since we have seen this was a he said/she said trial, the whole trial hinged on a general assessment of Ms. Heard's credibility. So how could any panel of judges put such a stupid statement down on paper? Plus, as we saw later with the livestreamed jury trial, Mrs. Heard's credibility was at the center of any possible trial. It was her lack of credibility that determined the outcome. So it is kind of strange that this US jury of his peers disagreed entirely with the panel of appeals judges in the UK, isn't it? Not just disagreed by a hair on some technical issues, but disagreed by 100% about the whole basis of the trial. Or, to say it another way, the UK judges assumed A, while the US trial proved not-A. You watched Heard destroy herself on the witness stand, so how did multiple professional judges miss that?

I will tell you. It is because the UK trial was scripted to fail for Depp, since it was pre-determined to be a Men-are-Pigs outcome. Depp had to lose no matter what. But after that smashing success, CIA/MI6 decided to re-run the trial in the US as a Women-are-Pigs trial, to get double duty out of it. So that script was rigged in the opposite direction. They hit both sides, getting the full-spectrum destruction of the heterosexual relationship out of it.

This is also strange: Depp and Heard were allegedly married on Depp's private island in the Bahamas. Married by whom? We are told it was a private and civil ceremony, so must have been a local magistrate. I think we are going to need to see that certificate. Did Depp boat the magistrate in from the main island? Because private islands don't have magistrates or court houses. So once again we are just taking their word for it that they were married at all.

This also makes no sense. When the *Post* lost the defamation trial in 2022, did it immediately take down the offending article? [No. It only added a note to it.](#) I'm not even kidding. But this reminds me of something I hadn't realized until now: [Depp never sued the \*Post\* for defamation.](#) Why? He sued the *Sun* in London for defamation in a very similar case. So why sue Heard and not the paper here? The *Post* had much deeper pockets than Heard, so this makes no sense. Plus, it gives us more ammo on my claims above. If Depp never sued the *Post*, we can ask again why this trial was in Fairfax. The *Post* wasn't a defendant, so it actually didn't matter where the *Post* was located, did it? Any libel suit between Heard and Depp should have been in the LA area, not in the DC area. Confirming once again that the only reason it was in Fairfax was to make it more convenient for the CIA to stage.

In fact, [Heard's oped is still up at the \*Post\* as of today.](#) I can't read it or the added note without paying them \$7, which I refuse to do. But I can say this just [proves the trial was a hoax](#), since there is no way a top newspaper would keep in print an article that had been found to be false and defamatory by a jury in a real court of law. Ask yourself why Depp would allow them to keep it up like that, despite having a court finding? He could sue them and win in a slamdunk overnight, taking them for millions for malice, so why hasn't that happened almost three years later? As of 2023 he and his attorneys no longer read the *Post*? OK, neither does anyone else\*\*, but still.

And when did the original article appear? This is why I looked it up to start with. December 18, 2018. Or, [12/18/18. Aces and eights twice.](#) Are you satisfied?

[\\*I have shown top-ten-most-wanted Bulger was actually an FBI actor from a rich Boston family.](#)

\*\*According to mainstream reports, the *Post* has lost at least 350,000 subscribers in two rounds of cancellations in the past few months, the first due to Bezos refusing to endorse Harris and the second due to Bezos supporting Trump, as reported just yesterday. This after [already losing 500,000](#) in the period 2021-2023. This would mean the *Post* has lost almost a million subscribers since 2020, in the post-Covid period, or around 1/3 of its audience over just five years. Not so good for the CIA's paper of record. And the real numbers are probably much worse. Those are just self-reported numbers, which are pretty much meaningless. The *Post* now has a print run of only about 100,000, which is pathetic for a metropolitan area of 6.5 million. That number is the only confirmable one, since online numbers are so easy to fake. Just so you know, the *LA Times* has a similar print run, indicating almost no one is reading these papers, or any others. *The New York Times* claims a total readership of [10.8](#) million (aces and eights, of course), but their actual print run is under 300,000. Again, awful for a metropolitan area of over 20 million. As a comparison, the *New York Times* peaked in the 1980s with a print run of about one million papers, 1.5 million for the Sunday edition.