Miscarriages of JusticeUK (MOJUK)
22 Berners St, Birmingham B19 2DR
Tele: 0121- 507 0844 Email: mojuk@mojuk.org.uk Web: www.mojuk.org.uk

MOJUK: Newsletter 'Inside Out' No 615 (22/12/2016) - Cost £1

How Far Can Someone Go to Investigate a Potential Miscarriage of Justice!

A 61-year-old mother who got classified information from a police computer in an attempt to assist her jailed son has been cleared of misconduct charges. Diana Lank wanted to find the identity of an anonymous witness whose evidence helped to convict her son of murder. Ms Lank was formally acquitted at the Old Bailey on Tuesday 13th December, after a jury at her re-trial could not reach a verdict. Two police staff who obtained the information for her were found guilty of misconduct earlier this year.

Diana Lank, who ran a clothes shop in Chelsea, west London, admitted she had received information about a protected female witness, who had testified from behind a screen at the trial of her son Rupert Ross. The details were held on a confidential police database - but she argued her actions were justified, claiming he had been wrongfully convicted. Ross, 35, was jailed for life in 2011 alongside Leon de St Aubin, 39, for the killing of Darcy Austin-Bruce outside Wandsworth prison on 1 May 2009. In Ms Lank's trial, prosecutor Mark Heywood QC, said she wanted to uncover details about a young female witness who said she had seen ex-Dulwich College pupil Ross travelling towards Wandsworth Bridge in a car with two other men on the afternoon of the murder. Mr Heywood said that the following year Ms Lank orchestrated a "persistent, determined and ultimately successful attempt" to "penetrate the digital criminal intelligence system" of the Metropolitan Police to uncover details that would identify the witness. Following consideration by the Crown, prosecutor Mark Heywood QC announced it would not seek a second retrial, a move normally reserved for the most serious cases.

Analysis: By Danny Shaw, BBC Home Affairs Correspondent

The question at the heart of this case was how far someone can go to investigate a potential miscarriage of justice. Diana Lank risked going to prison. She found out the identity of a murder trial witness whose anonymity was protected by court order and whose details were held on a confidential database - security breaches police, prosecutors and judges took extremely seriously, and for which the two civilian police staff now face long jail terms. But Ms Lank walked free, having argued that her son's fight for justice hinged on unmasking the witness's identity and therefore being able to research their background. Her actions highlight the difficult balance between protecting witnesses who give evidence anonymously and giving those they are accusing enough information to mount a defence. Above all, they remind us of an old saying: "A boy's best friend is his mother."

The jury spent eight days considering whether her actions had been justified or not but was ultimately unable even to agree a majority verdict. Ms Lank was acquitted of conspiracy to commit misconduct in a public office. A jury at Ms Lank's first trial had also failed to come to a verdict. Two police detention officers, Lydia Lauro, 33, the girlfriend of St Aubin, and former police community support officer Hayden Cheremeh, 36, were found guilty of conspiracy to commit misconduct in public office. They will be sentenced on 20 January.

Ms Lank's trial was told that the killing her son was involved in was a "brutal execution" involving "rival drug dealers". After the trial, Ms Lank's lawyer Greg Stewart said the case threw up "really serious considerations about how we deal with anonymous witnesses. If there is material that suggests that they were not independent and they're being put forward as independent witnesses, the defence has to engage with those issues," he said. It creates real problems for lawyers, appellants when trying to suggest to the appeal court there may have been something wrong with the original process." The Court of Appeal has turned down a legal challenge by Ross and St Aubin against their convictions. Ms Lank said her son would apply to the Criminal Cases Review Commission to have his case re-examined after fresh information emerged during her court proceedings. Danny Shaw, BBC News

Terry Smith Fails in Legal Appeal in Which he Claimed Police 'Stitched Him Up

Matthew Porter, Echo News: An author jailed for his involvement in a string of armed robberies has lost a crucial legal battle as he tried to prove the police framed him. Crime writer Terry Smith, 57, of Point Road, Canvey, is serving a 12-year prison sentence after being found guilty at trial in 2010 of a string of offences - including being part of the shooting of a commuter at Rayleigh train station. Smith, who insists he was framed, last month November 2016, failed in a court appeal to force Essex Police to release number plate recognition information he claims will prove his innocence.

The author insists one of the activities which led to his arrest, following a cash transit van, was actually research for a book he was writing. On February 28, 2008, Smith was driving a Vauxhall Vectra which followed a van along the A127. Smith and his passenger were stopped and arrested by police near Brentwood on suspicion of conspiracy to rob. At trial, Smith alleged the force tampered with evidence by changing the details of the van he was following. He believes CCTV footage and number plate recognition data will support his version of events.

Essex Police refused Smith's request to release the data and refused to confirm or deny whether it even still held the information - citing "data protection" reasons. A tribunal in 2014 ruled the force's decision was lawful, leading Smith to lodge an appeal which was heard by an upper tribunal judge. In her judgement, Gwynneth Knowles QC said: "The submissions made by Mr Smith centre on his bluntly expressed belief that Essex Police have behaved wrongfully by 'fitting him up.' I express no view on that allegation and nor am I in a position to make findings on it. I have come to the clear conclusion that this ground of appeal has no merit and accordingly I dismiss it." Smith was a career criminal who later became a successful writer and a consultant to Hollywood producers. His 2010 conviction included armed robberies at Barclays branches in Basildon and Pitsea in 2007, which saw a combined £50,000 stolen.

Terry Smith A8672AQ, HMP Highpoint, Stradishall, Newmarket, CB8 9YG

Jong Yoon Rhee - 'And An Expert Who Was No Expert At All'

Bob Woffinden: In April 1998 Jong Yoon Rhee was put on trial for the murder of his wife Natalie in a guest-house fire in Snowdonia. In constructing their case, however, the prosecutors had a thorny problem: there was no evidence of arson – so, to get a conviction, they needed to call in an "expert" who was no expert at all. Deported to a foreign country. On 28 May 2015, Jong Yoon Rhee was taken from his cell at Gartree prison, near Market Harborough, to Heathrow airport where he was put on a Korean Air flight to Incheon airport, Seoul. Although this received no publicity, it was unprecedented; it was the first time someone was deported from the UK to South Korea. Rhee had served eighteen years' imprisonment for the murder of his wife, Natalie, who died in a fire at a guest-house in North Wales. The UK Borders Act 2007 brought in the mandatory deportation of all non-EEA citizens sentenced to a prison term of twelve months or longer.

The Rhee family had arrived in the UK in 1971, when Jong Yoon was seven years old, and

had never returned. As a result, their understanding of life in South Korea now, more than forty years later, is non-existent. Rhee was being catapulted from long-term incarceration in his home country into the unknown of an entirely new country. His chances of even surviving on a day-to-day basis, let alone finding employment or making a living, would be seriously compromised because he had no family or any contacts there. Nor could he speak or read the Korean language. He had no passport; the police had confiscated it in 1997 and never returned it. What would happen to him on his arrival there? There was no guarantee of what his status would be. There was even a possibility that he could be re-imprisoned. The UK authorities were, however, heedless of Rhee's circumstances. In deporting him straight away, they were complying with both the 2007 Act and the strident demands of the tabloid press. Should life now be difficult for him, well, that was exactly what he deserved for having committed such a dreadful crime. Such a crude analysis, however, overlooks some significant considerations: the case has been widely regarded as wrongful conviction from the outset; and no reputable fire expert anywhere in the world believes that the fire in which Natalie died was started deliberately.

Jong Yoon Rhee was born in Seoul in 1963, one of four siblings in a relatively well-to-do family. In those years, it was virtually unknown for citizens to leave South Korea but during the '60s the country began to engage with the world beyond. In 1971 their father was appointed commercial diplomat at the UN. As this involved work in New York and Geneva, the family decided to base themselves in England, and have lived in the UK ever since. Twenty years later, Rhee met his wife Natalie, the daughter of a high-ranking RAF officer, at a Soho nightclub. They were married in 1994 in a morning-dress ceremony in Oxfordshire. Over the weekend of 12-13 April 1997, they went to Snowdonia for a weekend break to celebrate the fact that Natalie, who worked at the Royal Bank of Scotland, had just been promoted. They had such an enjoyable time that they made the fateful decision to stay for a third night. They were awoken by a fire in the guest-house. It was the middle of the night on a Welsh mountain, and the only escape was through the bedroom window. Not knowing exactly how far from the ground they were, Natalie was hesitant. Rhee said he'd go first so that he could catch her. He jumped and survived; she tragically died in the fire. When North Wales police subsequently began to investigate the circumstances, it would quickly have come to their attention that Rhee had already stood trial for murder at the Old Bailey.

This bare fact would have seemed suggestive to local police, though it should not have done. Rhee, as a 17-year-old, had a casual job working for a Chinese businessman in London. Entering the premises one evening, he stumbled upon the bloodied body of his boss. Too scared to report what had happened, he fled. When police saw him, he had bloodspots on his shoes and clothing. The trial, however, was quickly over. Defence lawyers explained that the businessman was connected to Triad gangs and the jury delivered a not guilty verdict in less than fifteen minutes. That prosecution, a shocking blunder in itself, now led directly to another shocking blunder.

North Wales police developed a theory that Rhee murdered Natalie in order to pick up a substantial life insurance pay-out. They asked Dr Stuart Crosby, one of the most highly respected fire investigators in the country, to examine the cause of fire. He reported that there was no evidence of arson. This should not have been a surprise because Arwel Hughes, the station fire officer who attended the fire on the night, had similarly reported that the fire was not multi-seated and had not been started deliberately. Similarly, there was no evidence that Natalie was either attacked or forcibly restrained. All this presented a problem for the prosecutors who, as so often, needed someone to tell them what they wanted to hear. The problem was quickly overcome.

Having been frustrated once, they commissioned an alternative report. They turned to Patrick

Sheen, an electrical engineer whose expertise in this particular field of forensic science was not immediately obvious (though, of course, that may have been what recommended him to them). Sheen reported that there were two seats of fire, so it had been started deliberately.

Meanwhile, one of Hughes' colleagues at the fire station helpfully altered the scene-of-fire report so that, albeit contradicting the original findings, it now chimed with the prosecution case. In April 1998, Rhee was put on trial at Chester Crown Court. Ideally, a criminal trial should be conducted to the standards of a scientific experiment, so that every time the test is performed the same result is achieved. In this case, as the outcome was artificially induced, it could only have been obtained on this one occasion. Referring to the doctored fire station report, the judge, the Hon Mrs Justice Nina Ebsworth, told the jury, 'that is a very unsatisfactory document, however you look at it'. She quoted the defence QC, seemingly approvingly, who said that, 'somebody who is so cavalier about how he records causes of fire is not to be treated as a reliable witness'.

The other bits of the case were nailed on to this jerry-built foundation. The cottage owner, who was hospitalised after the fire and suffered post-traumatic stress, gave evidence against Rhee. However, her account was riddled with inconsistencies and implausibilities. She originally said she smelt petrol but withdrew this when it became clear that no accelerant was used. (If it had been, the fire would have been an inferno from which no one could have escaped.) She gave contradictory accounts of what she had seen and where she had been when she witnessed it. She said that she had called the emergency services herself after Rhee declined to do so but, on being given a mobile phone in court, clearly had no idea how to use one. She said that Rhee had made no attempt to rescue his wife even though he had the opportunity to do so (which raised the question of why, in that case, she had not rescued her herself). Her original statement, astonishingly, was made thirteen days after the fire. However, even in that, she said: 'I put my arm round his shoulder to comfort him' – which seems inexplicable behaviour on her part if she thought that Rhee had just deliberately burned down her home and business. Prior to taking her statement, the police had several conversations with her during which, they said, no notes were taken. It subsequently emerged that this was untrue. Notes were indeed taken. So could the court see them, asked the defence QC? Oh sorry, the police said, we've lost them.

They also claimed that Rhee made a number of bizarre remarks: 'I never liked white girls and now I am burying one'; 'I used to joke with her that she was that pure, that if I was a pimp, I'd make her a good prostitute'; 'she always wanted to be cremated'. Watching from the public gallery, the Rhee family were appalled when these comments, which certainly had a devastating impact on the course of the trial, were read out. All we know for certain about them is, firstly, that it is incredible that Rhee would ever have said anything of that kind and, secondly, that the police could provide no information about them. There was no reference to any of the remarks in contemporaneous police documents, nor any context in which they might have been said. The police, disregarding the absence of corroborative evidence, simply asserted that they were made. The prosecution also asserted that Rhee deliberately chose the guest-house because it was remote and was not fitted with smoke alarms. This was reported as fact in several newspapers but it was nonsense. The cottage wasn't that remote (remarkably, the fire brigade attended in just eleven minutes) and it had been booked for Rhee and Natalie by staff at a tourist information centre. Obviously, Rhee could have known nothing of the adequacy or otherwise of its fire precautions.

It is certainly true that Rhee was a high-stakes gambler. So newspapers began reporting that he needed the insurance money to pay off his gambling debts. Again, this wasn't true. He had indeed won and lost a lot of money; but he was still in credit, just. He didn't have any

debts. Sadly, the judge died in 2002. The Guardian obituary commented that, 'she cared deeply about the law, but even more deeply about justice'. It seems to me beyond doubt that she summed up for an acquittal; but the jurors failed to pick up on the judicial nods and winks and so convicted Rhee. Had she lived, I believe, she may well have found some means of discreetly communicating her concerns about the conviction.

In the years since, highly qualified fire experts have been unanimous in condemning the prosecution analysis given at the trial. Dr Roger Berrett, of Forensic Alliance, concluded that Sheen (who has since died) 'leaned over backwards' to support the prosecution case; that his conclusions were 'simply wrong'; and that he was 'dangerous in the criminal courts'. He added that the North Wales investigation contained multiple breaches of Home Office guidelines for the investigations of fires.

Professor David Purser is one of the world's leading fire experts. His particular expertise is the interaction of fires with people (he has additional qualifications in pathology and neurophysiology). He pointed out straight away that from his own experience he knew of several instances in which 'two people were together in a fire from which one escaped and the other did not'. Natalie Rhee died from smoke inhalation. Purser commented, 'the time between Mr Rhee escaping and Mrs Rhee becoming incapacitated could have been a matter of seconds and certainly less than a minute'. The family managed to raise funding for Purser to carry out a complete computer modelling of the fire. This confirmed that there was only one seat of fire, that Natalie's death was accidental, and that the dense smoke in the building would have prevented any putative rescue attempt (which, in any event, would have been futile).

The case bears intriguing similarities to a notorious case in Texas, US. Cameron Willingham, a 23-year-old car mechanic, was the only survivor of a fire that killed his three young children. He was put on trial for murder and executed in 2004. Throughout, he protested his complete innocence. Afterwards, Dr Craig Beyler, of Baltimore, produced a report that was scathing of the failings of the State's so-called fire experts, and the New York Times uncovered evidence that a jailhouse snitch who gave evidence against Willingham had struck a deal with the authorities. In the Willingham case, as in the Rhee case, prosecutors had argued that the fire was multi-seated, and had also called witnesses to testify that he had refused to rescue the children, even though he had the opportunity to do so. On each occasion, this evidence was false. Despite the circumstances and the overwhelming evidence that this was not a case of arson, and despite a series of strong submissions from Hugh Southey QC and others, the Criminal Cases Review Commission has so far refused to refer the Rhee case to appeal. Accordingly, it is now one of the cases that is draining its credibility.

Yung Joo and Jong Ho, Jong Yoon's sister and brother, were keenly aware that this was the first-ever deportation of someone from the UK to South Korea. There might be unforeseen difficulties, as well as the foreseeable ones. Their immediate concerns were two-fold: would Rhee be allowed into the country at all (or, stateless as he was, would he, like Tom Hanks in The Terminal, have to eke out an existence in the airport itself)? And would he be re-arrested? With the deportation about to happen, they were so concerned for their brother's well-being that they dashed to the airport and booked themselves on the same flight. In the event, he did get through without difficulty. There was still the problem of obtaining a passport. They'd been warned that this might take months, or even years. In the event, the new passport arrived five days later. They then managed to find a contact in Seoul who helped them to find somewhere for Jong Yoon to live. 'Everyone went out of their way to help us', Yung Joo said. 'Whenever a problem cropped up, someone found a solution for us. They all want to help you, that's the nature of the people, we found that everywhere.'

It is only through a bureaucratic quirk that Rhee never became a UK citizen. When the family first arrived in the country, they were welcomed. 'Indefinite leave to stay' was stamped on their passports. It was explained to them that this was an absolute guarantee of their freedom to live and work in the UK and that further accreditation was unnecessary. If it had been, family members would have applied – and would certainly have been granted it. So the fact that the UK authorities considered him a 'foreigner' was a kind of betrayal of Rhee. In fact, in their dealings with him, they betrayed him over and over. Having convicted him of a crime that never happened, they then turned a blind eye to his case, despite the overwhelming evidence that the conviction was wrongful, and then – the final betrayal – abandoned him. Because of the humanity of the Korean people, however, Rhee may well now be given the opportunity to regain his mental strength. Certainly, the courteousness and efficiency of the authorities in Seoul could not have been in sharper contrast to the treatment he received, over an eighteen-year period, from the authorities in the UK.

This bogus case has already cost the UK several million pounds. But obviously the Rhee family must maintain their fight to quash the conviction. They all live in the UK, where Rhee has lived almost his whole life. Unless the conviction is overturned, Jong Yoon and his mother will never see each other again. He cannot now re-enter the country and health reasons prevent her leaving the UK. 'I will always maintain my innocence because I am innocent', Jong Yoon wrote to me from Seoul. 'As soon as I have rebuilt my mental strength, I will resume my fight. This will be my aim for the rest of my life.'

N. Ireland: PSNI Processes Contributing To Legacy Inquest Delays

An independent inspection of arrangements in place to support legacy inquests in Northern Ireland has found PSNI existing processes to be complex, convoluted and contributing to delay. A new inspection report published by Criminal Justice Inspection Northern Ireland (CJI) looks at the efficiency and effectiveness of the PSNI's arrangements to manage and disclose information to the Coroners Service for Northern Ireland in support of legacy inquests. Brendan McGuigan, chief inspector of criminal justice in Northern Ireland (pictured), said the inspection found the PSNI was fulfilling its statutory responsibility to disclose material to the Coroners Service to support legacy inquests, but a number of factors were causing delays around case progression. He added: "Legacy inquest proceedings have through time become adversarial rather than inquisitorial in nature. "As a result, the processes to support the disclosure of sensitive and non-sensitive material in legacy inquests have become complex, convoluted and risk averse. Inspectors consider that if the Coroners legal representatives were to become more involved early on, they could help streamline the disclosure process by carrying out an early independent assessment of the information available to determine its relevance to the inquest. This could be done before material was redacted or released by the PSNI's Legacy Support Unit. This approach would ensure irrelevant material was excluded from the process therefore reducing the volume of information sent to the Crown Solicitors Office for review and on to the Coroners Service." The report recommends the PSNI review its approach to the redaction and security classification applied to historical information which had become public knowledge in the intervening years, through unofficial routes such as books or the media. Mr McGuigan also indicated he would welcome a review of the legislation underpinning the work of the Coroners Service. He said: "While there is a need for legacy inquests to be appropriately resourced, providing additional resources for one link in the legacy inquest chain will only serve to create a bottleneck elsewhere. Processes need to become more straightforward and efficient if the protracted delays experienced by families are to be reduced. "I am concerned that unless the political will to resolve the current situation becomes explicit through a combination of legislative reform, investment in IT solutions and targeted resourcing in terms of finance and staffing, the likelihood of change occurring is limited."

Failure of HMP Pentonville to Act Over Previous Deaths Led to Death of Tedros Kahssay

A jury at the inquest into the death of Tedros Kahssay this week concluded that the failure by HMP Pentonville to act over previous deaths contributed to the circumstances surrounding the 28-year-old taking his own life. The jury also found serious errors by police, prison and Care UK healthcare staff, including the failure of police and prison officers to record or share essential information relevant to his level of risk. Tedros, 28, was found hanging in his cell on 19 January 2016. The coroner described scenes of "chaos" as staff employed by Care UK – the private company providing healthcare at the prison – attempted to revive him. Two days earlier, Tedros had told staff he did not feel safe on the wing and banged on his cell door with a chair, saying he needed to get out.

The jury concluded that: • Tedros' person escort record (PER) – a document designed to ensure that all staff have information about a prisoner's risks or vulnerabilities – did not flag the appropriate suicide risk; • The record was not passed to healthcare staff by prison staff, contrary to the requirements of the system that was in place at the time, which meant that staff were unaware of his history of depression; • No holistic overview was taken of Tedros' risk factors and the risk assessment process was compromised; • HMP Pentonville did not comply with recommendations made by the Prisons and Probation Ombudsman following a previous death at the prison - that of Carl Foot in December 2014. This failure impacted on the adequacy of the mental health assessment.

Tedros was an Eritrean national who had been granted asylum after fleeing his home country. The inquest heard that he had been a victim of torture. He was the fifth man since April 2013 to take his own life at HMP Pentonville. Like the others, he died within the first month of his incarceration. The Prison and Probation Ombudsman (PPO) have made an almost identical recommendation in each of the five cases concerning the assessment of the risk of suicide and self-harm in the early days of custody. The inquest heard that both the prison and the head of healthcare had accepted a PPO recommendation requiring the sharing of information with healthcare. This recommendation followed the death of Satheeskumar Mahathevan in January 2014 and was repeated after the death of Carl Foot in December 2014. Neither the prison governor nor the deputy head of healthcare were able to explain why this had not been implemented. A further two self-inflicted deaths have occurred at the prison since January.

The family's solicitor Jo Eggleton said: "This is yet another example of previous recommendations for improvement not being taken seriously and acted upon. It's incomprehensible that something as fundamental as the PER is not seen by healthcare staff on reception. The governor and Care UK need to act immediately to ensure that it is always seen by reception healthcare staff."

Deborah Coles, director of INQUEST, said: "Care UK is the biggest private provider of healthcare to the UK's prison service. They have been seriously criticised in several recent prison deaths. It is truly disturbing to hear of their chaotic response in this case and their apparent inability to even perform effective CPR. We need to know how these failures being reflected in the granting of such significant public contracts and how is it that Pentonville were able to ignore the implementation of significant recommended changes following previous deaths at the prison."

INQUEST has been working with Tedros's family since immediately after his death in January. Tedros's family are represented by Inquest Lawyers' Group members Jo Eggleton, of Deighton Pierce Glynn, and Jesse Nicholls, of Doughty Street Chambers.

Waking up to the UK's Investigatory Powers Act *Phoebe Braithwaite, Open Democracy*

The myth of 'this is a liberal democracy, these things don't happen here' is shattered. And now we have created an infrastructure for really serious social and political control..On 29 November 2016, Her Majesty gave the royal assent to the most encompassing surveillance powers the United Kingdom has ever seen. The Investigatory Powers Act 2016 (IPA) – or 'Snoopers' Charter' – will pass into law before the year is up, three and a half years since Edward Snowden began making revelations about the extent of extra-legal mass surveillance by the NSA and GCHQ under the secretive Five Eyes intelligence alliance. The act of curtailing what might once have been thought basic political freedoms – to anonymously read what you want in your living room, say – has passed by with astonishingly little public debate. Why has the threat of these Investigatory Powers failed to galvanise both the parliamentary and the popular imagination, and what should we be doing now?

"If our current arrangements, about liberal democracy, and the rule of law, and restraint on official power – if all those assumptions turn out to be wrong, then we have created an infrastructure for really serious social and political control," cautioned professor John Naughton, speaking to openDemocracy at an event in Cambridge which assessed the act's implications. Until Brexit and Trump, these arrangements seemed more invulnerable than they do today. Back then, Naughton says, those in government told him "'oh my dear boy, this is a liberal democracy. These things don't happen'…Well, the day after Brexit, we lost our government – the whole bloody lot – and for three or four days, it looked as though we would have a lunatic in charge. And in the case of the United States, it really happened."

The UK government is now legally authorised to do much of what it has been doing anyway for 17 years, since the IP Act incorporates on a clean sheet of legislation the most sweeping surveillance powers ever seen, not just in the UK, but in any western European nation or in the United States. Many regard the codification itself as good news – the powers of the secret state are above board for the first time in 500 years, and some oversight mechanisms are in place. But this is paltry consolation. Here we have the consolidation of spying powers for which no evidentiary security-enhancing basis has been provided. For the first time, the UK government has the legal authority to hack citizens' devices in bulk, even when they are overseas, in what it calls "equipment interference". Internet service providers are now required by law to collect and retain details of every website user's visit over the course of a year, and to cooperate noiselessly with the government upon request. 48 agencies including the Food Standards Agency, Ofcom, and various police bodies can access these records. The IP Bill was rushed through according to an incredibly ambitious timeline in order to replace DRIPA, which has a 31 December sunset clause – but that is only one small part of the legislation we have ended up with, and there's no sunset clause on any of that.

IPA attempts to enshrine legal provisions for internet capabilities which are constantly evolving, which partly explains their extraordinary breadth. This mass surveillance is gaining a legal basis at a time when hacks and data leaks are commonplace and enormous – such as the hack Talk Talk suffered last year after a 17-year-old boy stole the data of 157,000 customers. It also ploughs the furrow for a newly emboldened technocratic elite, as demonstrated by The Intercept's recent revelations about major tech companies' apparently near-uniform willingness to cooperate with the Trump administration in building a Muslim registry.

Still, there are some protections: if, for instance, you wish to intercept the communica-

tions of an MP, you have to get more than just the home secretary's permission – the prime minister also has to agree. An important check and balance, if the current prime minister doesn't happen to be the former home secretary who drafted the legislation in the first place, or Boris Johnson. It's not just members of parliament we need to be worried about: it's anyone who takes drugs; it's anyone who opposes government – or might do in future – from whistleblowers to investigative journalists to members of radical political groups; it's people who legally challenge unfair treatment or unfair laws; it's all Muslims; it's people who aren't white or aren't British. An important check and balance, if the current prime minister doesn't happen to be the former home secretary who drafted the legislation in the first place…

The panel was largely silent about the ways in which surveillance is embedded in the politics of empire, and how contemporary surveillance practices expand powers that were always already trained on 'the enemy' – targeting not individual suspects, but entire communities, on the basis of race, religion and ideological affiliation. An effective propaganda campaign painted the IP Bill as counter-terrorism legislation, when in fact only 1% of interceptions in 2015 under its predecessor RIPA were used for counter-terrorism, and, in the US, the only Five Eyes nation where expert panels have inspected the necessity of such powers, no "bulk data sets" contributed to a single counter-terrorism investigation.

Theoretical grounds for surveillance laws are threefold: the protection of national security; the prosecution of serious crime; and safeguarding the economic well-being of the nation. "Given that we live in a very divided society, with great inequalities, it seems strange that we might be compromising the privacy of many citizens in order to ensure the prosperity of a few," urged Naughton. There is also the distinct possibility, already present, that the right to privacy will more and more become something you can buy – in the form of encryption, or certain service providers – which would mean sacrificing only the privacy of many poorer citizens at the diktat of a prosperous few.

The state was also able to acquire these powers because debating digital freedoms and freedom of speech is often seen as the lofty pastime of people who don't have any more pressing concerns: "E.M. Forster said many years ago that freedom of speech is regarded by most people as a hobby of those who have enough to eat, and I think there's a kind of truth in that... those of us who fret about this stuff are effectively announcing that we are part of the liberal elite," Naughton told me. Abstract public image notwithstanding, it is incontrovertible that the freedoms at stake in the Investigatory Powers Act – though its impunities will no doubt be felt unevenly – affect everybody, and cut to the heart of questions about what kind of society we want to inhabit.

These ideas also drive at the political importance of how legal concepts are framed. The commonplace 'zero sum' formulation of an inevitable trade-off between security and privacy is, the panelists in Cambridge argued, a false dichotomy. "There's this assumption that the only way of getting more security is to give up privacy, and that's just wrong," Liberal Democrat Julian Huppert argued: there are many things you can do in the name of security that jeopardise privacy and security, such as breaking encryption, and many things you can do to strengthen both. Huppert deplored the chaos in Labour, which combined with the chaos of Brexit to ensure the bill didn't receive a fair hearing. In the final analysis, the Labour Party displayed a "consistent authoritarianism" – eventually voting the bill in because they received assurances about protections for trade unionists. "Of course you protect people who are in trade unions from suspicion-less, unwarranted surveillance – but you do that for everybody else," Huppert said.

Professor David Vincent described the final act as "rather an odd document" for the way

it sets out at its outset a robust notion of privacy, only in effect to override it going forward: "what's completely unclear," he argued, "is how in practice we're going to articulate those segments in the privacy section, [along] with the rest of the powers that the government now has. There is a requirement for proportionality that if the authority you're seeking is so insignificant that privacy overrides that, then you shouldn't seek it." This reflects what panelists described as the act's subjection to various reports and consultations, and a final incorporation of these recommendations in tweaks, perhaps, but not in spirit.

While there are things people can now do to protect themselves – from signing this parliamentary petition to repeal the act, to enacting end-to-end encryption, downloading the Tor browser, and getting your own virtual private network – these measures are not a likely match for the brawn of the state, which will try to catch up with the methods of people acting in clandestine ways. What's more, a technological response fails to confront what's at the heart of state surveillance, which is the arrogation of power, an appetite that feeds off itself.

The government squirrelled this invasive series of powers into law by drumming up racialised fears which enabled the white majority to feel they would not bear its brunt. Whether or not Muslims will disproportionately experience the force of IPA's invasions, as should be expected, it is clear that until we have a broad-based politics that repudiates the liberal construction of Muslims as the ultimate enemy, and the racist, dualistic view of the world as a fight between us and them, we will not achieve a solidarity muscular enough to reject the politics of fear.

Youth Justice *House of Commons, 12 December 2016, Volume 618*

The Lord Chancellor and Secretary of State for Justice (Elizabeth Truss): This Government are determined to improve standards in youth justice so that we not only punish crime but also intervene earlier to prevent crime and reform offenders to stop further crimes being committed — protecting victims and building better lives. Youth offending has fallen sharply over the past decade, as has the number of children and young people in custody. However, once those children and young people are in custody, the outcomes are not good enough. Levels of violence and self-harm are too great and reoffending rates are unacceptably high, with 69% of those sentenced to custody going on to commit further offences within a year of their release.

When children and young people commit crime, it is right that they face the consequences of their actions and that the justice system delivers reparation for victims. But we must also do more to reform them. The 900 young offenders now in custody represent some of the most complex and damaged children and young people within society. Broken homes, drug and alcohol misuse, generational joblessness, abusive relationships, childhoods spent in care, mental illness, gang membership and educational failure are common in the backgrounds of many offenders. Youth custody needs to be more than just containment where children are exposed to yet more violence and given little hope that things may ever change. We must make sure it is a safe and secure environment that can equip young offenders with the skills they need to lead law-abiding lives. The system should provide discipline, purpose, supervision and someone who cares—elements that have all too often been missing from these young lives.

The Prison Safety and Reform White Paper published last month outlined how we will improve adult prisons by giving greater powers to governors and boosting the safety, transparency and accountability of regimes. We will apply the same principles to the way the justice system deals with children and young people who commit crimes. Last year, the experienced school head and child behaviour expert Charlie Taylor was commissioned by the

Government to look at how this country deals overall with children and young people who break the law. Today, I am publishing the report of Charlie Taylor's Review of the Youth Justice System and the Government's response. The Taylor Review makes a compelling case for change and we will be implementing his key recommendations.

The Government's response sets out how, informed by Mr Taylor's findings, we will put in place the right framework for improvement, tackle offending by children and young people and put education at the heart of youth custody to better address the factors that increase the risk of young people committing crimes. We will start by bringing greater clarity and accountability to the youth justice system so that at each stage we are driving to reduce reoffending and turn lives around. We want to see an effective system — both in the community and in custody with high standards of performance. To tackle violence in custody we will clarify commissioning functions and create a single head of youth custodial operations, who can keep a firm grip on the performance of the estate and ensure that we reduce violence so that the estate becomes a place of safety and reform. We will strengthen inspection arrangements and create a new mechanism for the inspectorate to trigger intervention. Where there are failing institutions the Secretary of State will be obliged to act.

Youth custody must be a safe, secure environment where children and young people can learn and turn their lives around and to ensure this we will boost the number of frontline staff by 20%. We will also introduce a new professional Youth Justice Officer role to ensure that more staff are specifically trained to reform with young people. To ensure the right level of support each young person will now have a dedicated officer responsible for challenging and supporting them to reach agreed goals. Each officer will be responsible for four children or young people, so that each person gets the level of attention they need to turn their life around.

To ensure that more children and young people make progress in maths and English we will give governors the responsibility for education and hold them to account for the progress made in these crucial subjects while young people are in custody. We will also better prepare children and young people for a life after their sentence with a youth custody apprenticeship scheme being developed, ensuring that all young people are earning or learning on release. Alongside these improvements to the existing estate, we will go further to more comprehensively transform youth custody by developing two new secure schools in line with the approach recommended by Mr Taylor in his ground-breaking report. Of course we need to do more and we will. Intervening early is crucial in reducing youth crime, and we will be looking at how to improve services locally and improve the court system for young people. Together with the urgent action required to transform youth custody into places of discipline and purpose, these changes will improve the outcomes for young people who end up in the criminal justice system, helping them take a better path and improving outcomes for society as a whole by reducing crime.

Sentencing Council Should be Doing More to Tackle the Crisis in our Prisons

Rob Allen, The Justice Gap: It's almost ten years since the idea of a permanent Sentencing Commission was first proposed as a way of helping to ease the seemingly perpetual prisons crisis in England and Wales. A new report from Transform Justice argues that what became the Sentencing Council for England and Wales has done much less than it should have to control prison numbers and needs urgent reform. Prisons in England and Wales are currently of course under enormous pressure. Last month the Lord Chief Justice described them as overstretched and the head of NOMS revealed that a quarter of prisoners are held in accommodation that was designed for fewer people than are in it—a situation that won't be solved in this parliament or the next.

Back in 2007, new Labour's policy trouble-shooter Lord Carter of Coles proposed that an efficient and sustainable use of custody requires a way of keeping the demand for prison places in line with their supply. Judges and Parliament were alarmed that over prescriptive guidelines might threaten judicial discretion, particularly if they were produced in order to keep prison numbers in check. So, by the time the Council started work in 2010, its remit had been limited to promoting greater transparency and consistency in sentencing, whilst maintaining the independence of the judiciary. Still, the Council has been required to take the cost and effectiveness of different sentences into account when setting the going rate for different offences, so there was hope that its guidelines might curb the unnecessary and unproductive use of prison.

Guidelines require courts to take a step by step approach to sentencing, starting at the same point, and taking into account the same kinds of factors in assessing the seriousness of a particular offence. Despite initial reluctance on the part of judges and magistrates, guidelines are now widely accepted –unsurprisingly given the considerable range of discretion that still exists, and the courts' ability to sentence outside the guidelines if it is in the interest of justice to do so. But what about their impact on prison? Some have suggested that guidelines have contributed to sentence inflation by restricting chances for serious offenders to undertake community penalties and by reducing the weight attached to personal mitigation. In fact, prison numbers overall have been fairly stable over the last six years, but this is mainly due to large falls in the numbers appearing in court. Those that do are more likely to go to prison, and to stay there longer. Since 2010, 25% fewer people have been sentenced by the courts for serious offences. The proportion of these offenders imprisoned rose from 22.5% to 27.2%. The average length of their sentences went up too, from 16.2 months to 19 months. Sentences have got longer for violent, sexual, theft and drug offences on all of which the Council has produced guidelines.

Guidelines have almost always sought to reflect the existing practice of the courts, rather than reset sentencing levels based on cost effectiveness. However, in the case of assaults and burglary (the guidelines whose impact the Council has evaluated) lengths of prison terms have risen a good deal more than anticipated. This may not have been solely a result of the guidelines, but the key question remains: has the Council done enough to challenge increasing lengths of prison sentences, or to give explicit assistance to courts in deciding when offences are so serious that only prison will do? The Transform Justice report finds that while the Council may have helped to make sentencing more transparent, consistent and proportionate, it has neglected its potential to curb the ineffective use of imprisonment, adopting too narrow a focus to its work. The report recommends that both the membership of the Council, and its range of responsibilities, are widened.

On the one hand, it could use its current remit to issue guidelines on a wider range of common issues facing sentencers, such as the weight to be attached to previous convictions, and the challenges involved in sentencing women, young adults or people with mental health problems. On the other, its mandate could be extended so that it advises more broadly on sentencing policy, projects prison numbers, and uses its guidelines to keep them in line with available prison places. In the late 2000's the government backtracked on explicitly linking sentencing levels with available resources, but now could be the time to revisit the issue. Prisons are in crisis now as then, and the increasing length of sentences is one of the causes. As Lord Woolf told the House of Lords last week: 'With the situation in our prisons today, we cannot afford to have further sentencing inflation.' The Sentencing Council could play a much greater role in ensuring we don't.

"Mannequin Challenge"

Prisoners at a San Diego jail are facing a major crackdown after they managed to take part in the viral Internet "Mannequin Challenge" phenomenon, despite a ban on mobile phones in prison. Participants in the video trend pose mid-action - like mannequins - while someone roams the scene and records it on their camera. The result is similar to the "Bullet Time" effect in the Matrix movies. But prison officials are baffled as to how prisoners took part. The video shows a mock fight, a number of prisoners with mobile phones and a group of prisoners huddled over contraband. The California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation confirmed to NBC News that the footage was shot inside the Richard J. Donovan Correctional Facility in Otay Mesa, California.

Mohammed Abboud who Claimed Judge 'Linked him to Paris Terrorist' Loses' Appeal

A man found guilty of murdering his ex-partner who claimed that the trial judge showed a "lack of impartiality" by using the word "assassin" in giving an example of a deliberate intention to kill has failed in an appeal against his conviction. Mohammed Abboud, 57, who was sentenced to life imprisonment with a punishment part of 20 years after being convicted of the murder of 27-year-old Agnieszka Szefler, also argued that his trial was "unfair" because the judge used the terrorist attacks in Paris to illustrate his example.

However, the Criminal Appeal Court rejected the appeal against conviction and sentence as "fanciful". Justices Clerk, Dorrian, Menzies and Clark, heard that the appellant was found guilty following a seven-day trial at the High Court in Edinburgh in December 2015. At the sentencing diet in January the trial judge Lord Uist described the killing at Abboud's home in Bridge of Earn as a "savage and brutal murder" of a woman who was "unable to defend herself," adding that he showed her "no mercy". In his directions to the jury the trial judge explained that an example of a deliberate intention to kill was "the hired assassin who goes with a loaded shotgun and deliberately shoots at someone to kill them". He added that the terrorists in Paris who had shot people in the streets and in restaurants, the suspected ringleader of which was called Abdelhamid Abaaoud, clearly had a "deliberate intention to kill".

The grounds of appeal stated that the word "assassin" originally referred to a member of an 11th century Islamic sect, known for murdering political and religious adversaries. The appellant, a bearded man of Iraqi extraction, argued that the use of the word "assassin" and the similarity in name with the suspected ringleader in the terrorist attacks which took place only a few weeks earlier provided a "linking" which was likely to remind the jury of his racial background in a "potentially negative way". It was submitted that it was unnecessary for the judge to give any kind of example and that notwithstanding that there was a "strong evidential case" against the appellant, the examples given by the trial judge were suggestive of "bias". The appeal judges observed that the trial judge was explaining to the jury the difference between murder arising from a wickedly deliberate intention to kill and murder arising from wicked recklessness and that it was the one instance of the judge using an example to illustrate his meaning. But they added that the circumstances were "far removed" from the actual circumstances of the case.

Delivering the opinion of the court, the Lord Justice Clerk said: "There is nothing wrong with a trial judge using examples to illustrate his directions, and whether to do so, or the extent to do so, is a matter for the trial judge. "This case was one of a domestic killing in rural Perthshire. It involved the murder by stabbing of the former domestic partner of the appellant. In our view it cannot be said that the words used by the trial judge were such as would be likely to create in the minds of reasonable individuals the suspicion that the trial judge might not be impartial.

The word assassin no doubt had its origins in the alleged hashish-taking activities of an 11th century Middle Eastern sect, but its modern usage, and the resonance it would be likely to have for the jury, relates to a hired killer, which was clearly the context in which the trial judge was using it.The events in Paris were simply a recent, well-known example of circumstances showing a clear intention to kill, and thus a suitable example for illustrative purposes."

Lady Dorrian added: "The trial judge gave the jury very clear directions against the danger of speculation, warned them that their verdict required to be based on the evidence only, and gave them an entirely balanced charge, in respect of which there is no other complaint made.

The trial judge firmly advised the jury that the assessment of the evidence, and the drawing of inferences therefrom was entirely for them; that they were not allowed to speculate; that it was no part of his function to suggest that the jury should take any particular view of the evidence; and that it was accordingly their recollection, not his or anyone else's, which must prevail. There is no other aspect of the charge which is complained of, and in our view the argument that the jury might have been influenced in the way suggested is fanciful."

EHRC Calls on UK Government to Set a Time Limit of 28 Days for Immigration Detention

Scottish Legal News: A greater effort is needed to protect Britain's position as a global leader in human rights as the development of a new British Bill of Rights, a rise in hate crime in recent years and changes to social security provide an uncertain future for society's most vulnerable and marginalised, according to human rights chiefs. The warning follows the publication of a report to the United Nations, where the Equality and Human Rights Commission (EHRC) gives a "worrying assessment" of human rights protections across Britain. After carrying out an analysis of available data, the commission has outlined 12 priority areas where more work needs to be done. These range from the most essential everyday worries around equal access to healthcare and a proper education, to better protection for child migrants when they come to Britain.

The report acknowledges important progress made in some areas. The UK government's Modern Slavery Act and the Scottish government's Human Trafficking and Exploitation Act have "done much" to tackle the spread of sexual exploitation and forced labour. A reduction in the use of stop and search in England and Wales is another area "for cautious optimism". However, a black person is still five times more likely to be stopped and searched than a white person, the EHRC said. The report calls on the UK government, along with the Scottish and Welsh governments where issues are devolved, to immediately implement 30 recommendations, which can help address some of these complex issues. Important actions include: • ensuring that a new British Bill of Rights does not weaken the legal protections people currently enjoy through the Human Rights Act • using new research to tackle hate crime and encourage the police and the courts to work together to stop it • carrying out detailed analysis of spending decisions to look at the overall impact on groups such as disabled people and children • ensuring that all unaccompanied and separated children entering the UK are assigned an independent guardian to help protect their interests • setting a time limit of 28 days for immigration detention and put an end to the detention of pregnant women • ensuring that in the youth justice system restraint is only used as a last resort, to prevent injuries and not used deliberately to inflict pain.

The report has been produced as part of the UN Human Rights Council's Universal Periodic Review (UPR) process. The UPR places a country's human rights record under the international microscope every five years. The UK government is due to be examined next spring and the commission's report will be used to inform the process. Commissioner Lorna McGregor said: "These are uncertain times and we find ourselves at a crossroads, with decisions taken now deciding if we

will still be seen as a global leader in human rights in decades to come. This report shows a worrying lack of progress, with society's most vulnerable and marginalised in danger of being left behind. Our report is solutions-focused and we have made 30 recommendations that we hope the UN will accept and all governments in the UK will act on." Stephen Bowen, director of the British Institute of Human Rights, said: "The Institute's report shows that over the past four years little progress has been made to fulfil the United Nations' previous recommendations to the United Kingdom. It is disappointing to see that human rights issues, such as ensuring the right to an adequate standard of living and access to justice, have become more prevalent. The voice of civil society is clear – repealing the Human Rights Act stands only to make these matters worse, not better. We hope the government will move swiftly to address these concerns, including dropping their plans to scrap the Human Rights Act."

Early Day Motion 801: Operation Report Hate

House of Commons: That this House supports the Operation Report Hate campaign to raise awareness of hate crimes within the Gypsy, Traveller and Roma communities and the need to report them; notes that hate crimes towards the Gypsy, Traveller and Roma communities are currently severely underreported; calls on the Government and devolved administrations to help improve reporting rates by instructing police forces and all criminal justice agencies to use Gypsy and Traveller ethnic categories; and urges the Government, devolved administrations and local authorities to work with the organisations involved in Operation Report Hate to ensure hate crimes against Gypsies, Travellers and Roma are reported, recorded and resolved.

HMP & YOI Cardiff – A Mixed Picture - Less Safe - Physical Environment had Declined

Committed staff at HMP & YOI Cardiff had maintained stability in the prison during challenging times, but now needed to focus on longer-term improvement, said Peter Clarke, Chief Inspector of Prisons. As he published the report of an unannounced inspection of the category B local training prison. HMP & YOI Cardiff held around 770 men at the time of its inspection. The prison had become less safe and the physical environment had declined since a previous inspection in 2013. Work to help prisoners resettle back into the community on release had improved and was reasonably good. Overall, inspectors found a mixed picture of progress in a local prison that had faced the same challenges as many other local prisons. Challenges included staff shortages and an increased availability and use of new psychoactive substances (NPS), leading to an increase in unpredictable and violent behaviour. The prison had implemented a smoking ban that was unpopular with some. Cardiff also had a high level of reported mental health problems. Despite these challenges, it did not feel unstable and staff-prisoner relationships had been maintained.

Inspectors were concerned to find that: • 23 recommendations from the last inspection had not been achieved and10 only partly achieved • more needed to be done to address the supply of illegal drugs into the prison; • there were rising levels of violence and weak management of key areas such as the use of force; • some cells were in a poor state and there was a lack of basic facilities, such as bedding; • prisoners spent too much time locked in their cells. • inspectors made 53 recommendations

Peter Clarke said: "HMP & YOI Cardiff relied very heavily on a decent, hard-working staff group who had maintained good relationships with the men in their care, and had done well to keep the prison stable through some challenging times. However, for the future, the prison needs to reduce its reliance on key individuals and embed sound working practices and processes into the operation of the establishment, thereby ensuring long-term safety and stability."

Prisoner Jailed For 45 Years Over Letters Threatening to Kill People

Matthew Taylor, Guardian: A prison inmate who wrote a series of letters from his cell threatening to kill 10 people, including prison staff and police officers, and then have sex with their corpses has been jailed for 45 years. Richard Ford, 38, was given one of the longest ever non-life sentences for someone who has not killed or caused serious injury after the judge said he represented a grave danger to the public. Ford wrote a series of letters from his cell at Nottingham prison in which he identified people – including prison officers, a fellow inmate, a district judge, a police officer and a former partner – he wanted to kill and then have sex with their dead bodies. At the time Ford was serving a 30-month jail sentence for possession of a knife in a public place.

Ford, 38, of no fixed address, admitted 10 charges of making a threat to kill on different dates in January 2015 and asked to be kept in prison for the rest of his life. The court was told he had been assessed by a number of psychiatrists but there was no recommendation he receive hospital treatment. The judge Michael Heath, passing sentence at Lincoln crown, described the long jail term as highly unusual and said the case had caused him "very considerable anxiety". He said Ford was "plainly dangerous" and had told psychiatrists that he still wanted to harm people. "You say you don't want to be released from prison because you don't feel that you can stop yourself from acting upon your sadistic urges. Those urges are to kill and have sexual intercourse with the corpses of those whom you kill. You have made it clear to me that you do not wish to be released from prison. If you are released you think you will get drunk, obtain a weapon and kill." Heath said the maximum sentence for an offence of making a threat to kill was 10 years' imprisonment. "I cannot impose a sentence of imprisonment for life, although you have been anxious to let me know that you don't want to be released. There is no medical recommendation before me for a medical disposal, so I cannot legally make a hospital order." The judge said he was trying to balance the need to protect and the need to ensure that the sentence was not "wholly disproportionate to your criminality. Achieving both of these aims in this case is impossible. I realise that the overall length of the sentences I am going to pass is highly unusual and may be controversial, but I pass them because I deem them to be the only adequate way to protect the public in your case."

The judge imposed five consecutive nine-year jail terms with a further five sentences of nine years to run concurrently, making a total of 45 years. Jonathan Straw, prosecuting, said that in January last year Ford handed a letter to a prison officer saying he wanted to have sex with a fellow prisoner and kill him and wanted to have sex with a prison officer and beat him up. A few days later Ford handed over four further notes to prison staff giving details of people he wanted to kill. The court was told that Ford had convictions in 2002 and 2003 for indecency offences. He was then convicted in 2011, 2013 and 2014 for offences of possession of a knife in a public place. Isabelle Wilson, in mitigation, said Ford had spent most of the last 14 years in prison.

Hostages: Andrew Malkinson, Michael Ross, Mark Alexander, Anis Sardar, Jamie Green, Dan Payne, Zoran Dresic, Scott Birtwistle, Jon Beere, Chedwyn Evans, Darren Waterhouse, David Norris, Brendan McConville, John Paul Wooton, John Keelan, Mohammed Niaz Khan, Abid Ashiq Hussain, Sharaz Yaqub, David Ferguson, Anthony Parsons, James Cullinene, Stephen Marsh, Graham Coutts, Royston Moore, Duane King, Leon Chapman, Tony Marshall, Anthony Jackson, David Kent, Norman Grant, Ricardo Morrison, Alex Silva,Terry Smith, Hyrone Hart, Glen Cameron,Warren Slaney, Melvyn 'Adie' McLellan, Lyndon Coles, Robert Bradley, John Twomey, Thomas G. Bourke, David E. Ferguson, Lee Mockble, George Coleman, Neil Hurley, Jaslyn Ricardo Smith, James Dowsett, Kevan & Miran Thakrar, Jordan Towers, Patrick Docherty, Brendan Dixon, Paul Bush, Alex Black, Nicholas Rose, Kevin Nunn, Peter Carine, Paul Higginson, Thomas Petch, Vincent and Sean Bradish, John Allen, Jeremy Bamber, Kevin Lane, Michael Brown, Robert Knapp, William Kenealy, Glyn Razzell, Willie Gage, Kate Keaveney, Michael Stone, Michael Attwooll, John Roden, Nick Tucker, Karl Watson, Terry Allen, Richard Southern, Jamil Chowdhary, Jake Mawhinney, Peter Hannigan, Ihsan Ulhaque, Richard Allan, Carl Kenute Gowe, Eddie Hampton, Tony Hyland, Ray Gilbert, Ishtiaq Ahmed.