generally effective resettlement activity. Practical resettlement support was good, and services to help men maintain contact with their families and children, a weakness at the last inspection, had improved. Despite some setbacks, the prison had persevered with the release of prisoners on temporary licence, and there was a dedicated wing for men who went out to work daily with local enterprises or charities. Prisoners told us this had helped them prepare for release or transfer to open conditions, and in some cases had led to the offer of a job on release. Public protection arrangements were also good. However, prisoners had too little contact with over-stretched offender supervisors who should have motivated them to achieve their targets, as well as managing and monitoring their risk.

Overall, HMP Blundeston had made good progress since the last inspection. It was a safer place, staffprisoner relationships had improved and practical resettlement services were better. Further improvements are still required and some of these the prison itself needs to address. It can and should do more to address the causes of bullying and support victims, and its offender management needs to be strengthened. However, the night sanitation arrangements and poor health care are largely outside its direct control. The National Offender Management Service and health care commissioner need to work closely with the prison to resolve or at least mitigate these concerns. *Nick Hardwick / HM Chief Inspector of Prisons / July 2013*

Jails are Being 'Used as Holding Pens' For Foreign Ex-Offenders

Ministers have been accused of using jails as "holding pens" for foreign ex-offenders after it emerged that on a single day last month nearly 1,000 foreign nationals were behind bars despite completing their prison sentences. The Independent has seen new Home Office figures from three weeks ago which show that in late August, jails in England and Wales were holding 937 people awaiting deportation – an increase of two-thirds in less than a year. As a result the prisoners are denied the legal advice and contact with family to which they are entitled. Pentonville Prison in north London is holding 56 foreign nationals awaiting deportation, more than any other prison. Wandsworth in south-west London has 53, followed by Elmley in Kent (43) and Thameside in south-east London (42). Foreign nationals who have served their terms are still behind bars at nearly two-thirds of the country's jails.Critics said foreign ex-offenders are left in a legal "no-man's land" where they struggle to get the help they need to fight their deportation or prepare for their transfer overseas.

Juliet Lyon, director of the Prison Reform Trust, said: "Prison is a punishment of last resort, not a holding pen for people caught up in a bureaucratic, sometimes chaotic, immigration system. This amounts to misuse of custody. Prison places should be reserved for serious and violent offenders and certainly not block-booked for people held beyond their tariff."

Hostages: 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, Sam Hallam, John Twomey, Thomas G. Bourke, David E. Ferguson, Lee Mockble, George Romero Coleman, Neil Hurley, Jaslyn Ricardo Smith, James Dowsett, Kevan Thakrar, Miran Thakrar,Jordan Towers, Patrick Docherty, Brendan Dixon, Paul Bush, Frank Wilkinson, 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 Roy Allan, Sam Cole, Carl Kenute Gowe, Eddie Hampton, Tony Hyland, Ray Gilbert, Ishtiaq Ahmed.

Miscarriages of JusticeUK (MOJUK)
22 Berners St, Birmingham B19 2DR
Tele: 0121- 507 0844 Fax: 087 2023 1623

MOJUK: Newsletter 'Inside Out' No 443 (19/09/2013)

Work To Rehabilitate Life Sentence Prisoners Could Improve

HM Inspectorate of Probation and HM Inspectorate of Prisons report published 12/09/13

Most life sentence prisoners did not reoffend and were able to lead productive lives on release, said Liz Calderbank, Chief Inspector of Probation, and Nick Hardwick, Chief Inspector of Prisons, publishing the report of a joint inspection into life sentence prisoners. However, they added that the work done with life sentence prisoners at key points in their sentence could be improved.

Although life sentenced prisoners have committed the most serious crimes, most will be released at some point. The public have a right to expect that this will not happen unless they can be safely managed within the community and effectively supervised and monitored.

Being sentenced to an indeterminate period of imprisonment brings a unique dimension to incarceration, since it removes the certainty of release on a given date in the future. One of the key transitional phases in the life sentence is the move from a closed prison to the relative freedom of open conditions. This inspection focused on that period along with the equally significant release on life licence to see how well life sentence prisoners were supported in preparing for release, reducing risk of harm and likelihood of reoffending, maintaining family and community links and resettling into society.

Most life sentence prisoners, once released, are successfully integrated back into the community. However, inspectors also found that improvements could be made in the work carried out with these prisoners, and in particular, that:

- assumptions were often made that life sentence prisoners knew all about 'the system' which led to an underestimation of the amount of advice and help they needed;
- they were treated much the same as other prisoners, with little attention being given to their particular circumstances and as a result, some were able to serve their sentence with relatively little challenge to their attitudes and behaviour;
- once in open conditions, preparation for release relied heavily upon release on temporary licence (ROTL) and planning for this needed to be improved;
- the quality of offender assessments, particularly those completed in custody, left room for improvement and confusion abounded about who was responsible for completing these assessments at key times in the sentence; and
- sentence planning was weak and probation staff struggled to design meaningful objectives for those who appeared to have done all required work in custody.

The chief inspectors made nine recommendations for improvement for the National Offender Management Service, prisons and probation trusts.

Summary of Findings Context: The number of prisoners sentenced to an indeterminate sentence of imprisonment has increased dramatically over recent years, as part of the significant expansion of the general prisoner population. Such prisoners now make up 16% of the prison population (as at 31 March 2013), compared with only 9% in 1995. While the introduction of the (now abolished) indeterminate sentence for public protection accounts for part of this increase, the numbers serving life sentences (for murder and other serious offences) have also increased. Life sentence prison-

ers are also now serving longer in prison, with judges imposing a longer 'tariff', or period of punishment to be served before the prisoner can be considered for release.

Once released, however, the vast majority of life sentence prisoners are successfully integrated back into the community, with only 2.2% of those sentenced to a mandatory life sentence and 4.8% of those serving other life sentences reoffending in any way, compared to 46.9% of the overall prison population'.

This inspection was agreed by Criminal Justice Chief Inspectors' Group and formed part of the Joint Inspection Business Plan 2012-20142..It focused on those sentenced to life imprisonment, specifically excluding those serving an indeterminate sentence for public protection, although the impact of the introduction of the indeterminate sentence for public protection could not be ignored. Rather than considering the whole of the life sentence, we concentrated on the later transitional phases in a life sentence, that is, on transfer into open prison and from there into the community. These phases were chosen so as to enable us to explore the quality of work by both custodial and community based staff during this critical time in the reintegration of life sentence prisoners. We were particularly interested in the support given to life sentence prisoners to prepare them for release, to reduce their risk of harm to others and their likelihood of reoffending, to maintain links with their home area and family as appropriate, and to resettle into the community upon release. In the light of the Government's new strategy of reform, Transforming Rehabilitation 3, our focus on work to prepare such prisoners for release is timely, particularly since this work will remain the remit of the new National Probation Service.

Fieldwork for the inspection took place during September to November 2012 and incorporated visits to six prisons (two for women, four for men), six Probation Trusts, and seven approved premises (one for women, six for men). This enabled us to judge the quality of practice through meetings with prison and probation managers and staff, examining case records and conducting semi-structured interviews with life sentence prisoners, both in custody and in the community. Nearly three-quarters of the cases inspected involved mandatory life sentences for murder.

Overall findings: Despite the time it took to reach the point of transfer to open prison, life sentence prisoners were not well prepared for this significant transition. Once in open conditions, preparation for release relied heavily on the use of release on temporary licence, rather than on other interventions such as courses designed to develop life skills. Although a crucial part of release preparation, release on temporary licence was not always well planned or underpinned by robust risk assessment. Furthermore, the quality of assessments and plans to manage both the sentence and the risk of harm the prisoner posed left considerable room for improvement and stifled progress during the custodial phase of the life sentence. Assessments completed after release were of a higher standard, although community sentence plans often lacked imagination.

Approved premises were overused as release accommodation for those whose levels of risk of harm to others did not warrant such restrictions. Released life sentence prisoners were normally compliant and usually made good progress in the community, aided by supportive offender managers.

Specific findings: T*he custodial phase of the life sentence:* Life sentence prisoners had generally completed various offending behaviour courses prior to their arrival in category C prisons (and their female equivalent), although the demand for interventions often exceeded supply and there were some obvious gaps in provision, particularly for sexual offenders. As a result, some prisoners

victimised by other prisoners.

Canteen debt and divertible medicines were significant but avoidable factors in much of the bullying that occurred. Support for victims was poor and too many were placed in segregation and then shipped out without the underlying issues being addressed. With the exception of the blind spot on divertible medication, efforts to reduce the supply of drugs into the prison and reduce demand were generally good. It was commendable that prisoners were encouraged into abstinence-based recovery, but prescribing regimes were not sufficiently flexible and did not follow national guidelines.

The prison was blighted by the poor quality of some of its accommodation, and many prisoners were in cells with night sanitation. The system involved prisoners joining an electronic queuing system to be let out of their cells one at a time to use the toilet. Inevitably, there were long waits and some prisoners were forced to use a bucket. Some did not even have a bucket so used a bottle, and urine was sometimes tipped down into the yard below the cells. For those who did have to use a receptacle in their cell, there was nowhere to wash their hands.

The prison was trying hard to mitigate the worst effects of the system. It was developing gated spurs where enhanced-status prisoners would have unrestricted access to toilets at night, and installing toilets into existing cells - all of which would reduce demand on the night sanitation system. Nevertheless, the system remained undignified, degrading and unhygienic.

The health care provided by East Coast Community Health Care was very poor. Prisoners' health was seriously compromised, and there was a lack of urgency in addressing the problems. Prescribing practice was a major concern and affected the overall safety of the prison. Large numbers of prisoners were prescribed opiates and other divertible medicines in possession; this was often in the absence of a clear clinical rationale or risk assessment. Most prisoners had nowhere to keep their medicines safe, and it was a significant cause of the high levels of bullying in the prison. There was no system for gaining access to the health care waiting area other than rattling the gate or shouting. Support for prisoners with lifelong conditions was poor and almost no primary mental health care was available, despite a high level of need. Immediately after the inspection we raised these concerns with NHS England, which from April 2013 took over responsibility for commissioning offender health. The Care Quality Commission (CQC), who accompany us on our inspections, also issued the provider with three enforcement warning notices stating that it was failing to comply with relevant requirements of the Health and Social Care Act 2008 (Regulated Activities) Regulations 20 I 0 (the Regulated Activities Regulations 20 I 0). In line with the requirements CQC, accompanied by ourselves, made a return unannounced visit to the prison health services department; we found that there was some improvement.

In view of the poor standards of accommodation and health care, it was just as well that the frustrations that inevitably arose were offset to some extent by good staff-prisoner relationships, improved management of equality and diversity issues, and good levels of prisoner confidence in the complaints system.

There was enough activity for about 80% of the population, and those prisoners had good amounts of time out of their cell and were generally employed in good quality activities that equipped them well for gaining employment after they were released. The prison had detailed plans to increase the amount of activity available but, at the time of the inspection, prisoners who were unemployed spent most of the day locked behind their doors.

Good work to help prisoners find a job or training place on release was one aspect of

and have settled well after serving equally long periods of detention. They and the rest of us, 'the general public' or 'society' as politicians like to call us, have been well served by a competent probation service and they live orderly, productive and responsible family lives. In their cases, justice was well done and in my view, seen to be done, even though not in full view. There is sadness in my conclusion, that this may not be possible in the case of Jon Venables — both from a personal perspective and for what it says about certain aspects of justice in the UK.

Report on an Unannounced Inspection of HMP Blundeston

Inspection 15–26 April 2013 by HMCIP, report compiled July 2013, published 12/09/13

HMP Blundeston was safer and there was more for prisoners to do, but bullying was an issue and health care was poor, said Nick Hardwick, Chief Inspector of Prisons, publishing the report of an unannounced inspection of the Suffolk training prison.

HMP Blundeston was last inspected in 2011 when inspectors found the prison was going backwards. This inspection found that the decline had been halted and in most areas outcomes for prisoners were improving. However, in some significant areas, largely outside the prison's direct control, outcomes were not acceptable. A week ago, the government announced that HMP Blundeston would close, possibly by the end of the year.

Inspectors were concerned to find that:

- the level of reported bullying incidents was double what was usually seen at comparable prisons, much of it caused by canteen debt and divertible medicines;
- support for victims was poor and too many were placed in segregation and then transferred without the underlying issues being addressed;
- The prison was blighted by the poor quality of some of its accommodation,
- many prisoners were in cells with night sanitation, which involved joining an electronic queuing system to be let out of their cells to use the toilet;
- some prisoners were forced to use a bucket. Some did not even have a bucket so used a bottle, and urine was sometimes tipped down into the yard below the cells. For those who did have to use a receptacle in their cell, there was nowhere to wash their hands.
- the health care provided by East Coast Community Health Care was very poor and prisoners' health was seriously compromised, although HMI Prisons and CQC inspectors found some improvements when they made an unannounced return visit;
- large numbers of prisoners were prescribed opiates and other divertible medicines in possession, often in the absence of a clear clinical rationale or risk assessment; and
- support for prisoners with lifelong conditions was poor and almost no primary mental health care was available despite a high level of need.
- Inspectors made 93 Recommendations

Introduction from the report: HMP Blundeston is a category C training prison near Lowestoft in Suffolk which holds about 500 men. At our last inspection in 20 I I we found that the prison was going backwards. This inspection found that that decline had been halted and in most areas outcomes for prisoners were improving. However, in some significant areas, largely outside the prison's direct control, outcomes were not acceptable.

Most prisoners told us they felt safe, and the small number at risk of suicide or self-harm were well cared for. Reception, discipline and security processes usually worked well. However, the level of reported bullying incidents was double what we usually see at comparable establishments, and significantly more prisoners than elsewhere told us they had been

were able to drift through their sentence without being challenged. Those serving indeterminate sentences for public protection tended to be given priority for scarce places on programmes due to their (often short) tariffs having expired. Offending behaviour work done in closed prisons was not always consolidated on arrival in open conditions.

Transfer from closed to open conditions was a key transitional phase of the life sentence, but prisoners were often poorly prepared for this move; as a result, many suffered a 'culture shock' on their arrival in open prison. Recent attempts to reduce the numbers of those waiting to move to open prison had virtually cleared the backlog, but had exacerbated the problems associated with a lack of preparation for transfer.

The quality of assessments and plans completed in prison to manage risk of harm to others was insufficient, with many lacking thorough analysis of the motivation and triggers for the original offending. Sentence plans did not always fully reflect the work planned or done with the prisoner and were not appropriately reviewed, particularly when circumstances changed. This potentially stifled an individual's progress through the custodial phase of their life sentence. There was a lack of clarity about the purpose of offender assessments (OASys) in custody and confusion over whether the prison or probation service should complete the required assessments at key stages in the life sentence.

Familiarisation with the outside world: Although town visits from closed prisons were undersubscribed, release on temporary licence from open prisons was well used and was the primary and essential means of preparing life sentence prisoners for their eventual return to society. Assessments for release on temporary licence lacked sufficient supporting input from offender managers in the community. Understandably, planning tended to focus on how any potential risk posed by the prisoner would be managed. However, as a result, the experience of being released on temporary licence was not always as meaningful for life sentence prisoners as it might otherwise have been. Insufficient attention was given to training in independent living skills, which life sentence prisoners often needed given the duration of their incarceration.

The community phase of the life sentence: Community OASys assessments were of a higher quality than their custodial equivalents, although sentence planning was weak overall. Offender managers acknowledged that they often struggled to creatively plan and deliver interventions to those who appeared to have done all the work required of them over the lengthy custodial period.

Despite weak planning, the actual work delivered with offenders released on life licence was reasonably effective, with offender managers generally taking offenders' diverse needs into account and trying hard to reinforce learning from the custodial period. The standard of work with victims was mixed; victims' safety was prioritised in most cases but communication between offender managers and victim liaison officers, essential for keeping victims informed, left room for improvement.

Both in custody and in the community, the family, or partner in the prisoner's life, was not always fully utilised by those working with life sentence prisoners. Families were a good source of information about the offender's progress, as well as a potentially protective and positive influence on the offender. Their input into the management of the offender, such as through sentence planning, was underdeveloped.

Approved premises, normally reserved for those posing a high risk of harm to others, were often used as the default position at the point of release on life licence, despite the majority of life sentence prisoners posing only a medium risk of harm to others at this stage. This was an unnecessary use of an expensive resource and, often, an unwanted restriction for offenders.

Where approved premises were used for releases on temporary licence, the information flow between prison and approved premises was often problematic. This was worrying since it impacted on both the level of support the prisoner could expect to receive from approved premises staff and on their ability to safely manage the prisoner's risk of harm to others.

The offender's progress on life licence: The quality of the input by the offender manager was more important than ensuring the same person consistently supervised the offender. Those offender managers who actively built relationships prior to release and effectively planned for continued support and interventions after release, made a real difference to offenders' lives and the chances of their successful reintegration and desistance from future offending. Those on life licence appreciated the support of their offender managers and were compliant. Resettlement outcomes, including gaining employment, stable accommodation and community links, were good for the offenders in our sample, especially given the stigma associated with a life sentence. Recall to prison was used sparingly but where necessary and creative alternatives to recall, through imposing additional restrictions such as curfew or residence in approved premises, were often successful.

Strategic management of life sentences: At a national level, work with life sentence prisoners lacked direction and local strategies for managing life sentence prisoners were underdeveloped both in custody and the community. Where needs analyses had been undertaken, these did not inform service provision sufficiently well. Probation staff training tended to focus on process, such as that relating to parole, rather than on creative ways to plan and deliver work with those serving life sentences. Nonetheless, prison and probation staff felt confident in dealing with this group of offenders.

Conclusion: Despite the particular indeterminate nature of the life sentence, with its associated lengthy periods of incarceration and uncertainty over release dates, those subject to life sentences were treated largely the same as other types of offenders both in custody and in the community. As a consequence, there was little specific focus on their particular needs, as distinct from those of the general offender population. This was short-sighted, given that there is no doubt that the longer the period of incarceration, the greater the possibility of the individual becoming institutionalised and therefore less able to cope on their return to society.

The regime in open prison sought to reduce this institutionalisation through a gradual reintroduction into society via release on temporary licence. This was a valuable element of release preparation, but the opportunity such temporary release presented was not always maximised. Regimes in open prisons offered insufficient opportunities for prisoners to address their offending behaviour and other resettlement needs at this key stage in their journey through custody.

Nonetheless, released life sentence prisoners complied well with their life licences and were well supported towards reintegration by offender managers. The opportunity now emerges, via the new Transforming Rehabilitation strategy, for the management of this group of offenders to come into sharper focus within the new National Probation Service.

Recommendations - National Offender Management Service should:

- use the opportunity offered by the Transforming Rehabilitation strategy to reassess how life sentence prisoners are managed in both custody and the community, with a view to providing a clearer strategic focus on this group of offenders and ensuring that they have access to a wide range of services designed to promote rehabilitation;
- issue guidance stating the purpose of OASys assessments and stressing the importance of analysing the underlying motivation and triggers for the original offence in order to

Let's hope all is not lost. Otherwise Venables will become an inevitable member of the 'revolving-door club' to which the present Justice Secretary, Chris Grayling, refers in his commitment to reducing the number of prisoners who return to prison time after time. Grayling's vision is to see every prisoner on release having a mentor, a wise friend (not the Home Secretary then), employment and somewhere to live. He calls for a 'Rehabilitation Revolution'.

He is right of course and apart from sending daily reports to the Home Secretary on every case, even Blunkett might agree with that! But I doubt very much if that alone will be sufficient in the case of Jon Venables. During the previous Home Secretary-led supervision regime, his supervisor failed to address: - a long term relationship with a 30 year old woman, the mother of a young child - trips to Liverpool - alcohol abuse - financial mismanagement - drug and alcohol related offending - unapproved foreign travel - feelings of loneliness/isolation - a growing interest in pornography (not to mention the substance of the child pornography charges)

Not all of these are easy to detect and the 2013 Parole Board will have received the assurance of a comprehensive Release Plan from the National Offender Management Service (as the Probation Service is now called), combining equal measures of support and surveillance together with a clear multi-agency model for delivery, governance and enforcement.

But there are two other matters of great significance to be addressed. One was revealed by the Omand Report itself and the other is contained within the detail of the child pornography charges for which he was imprisoned for two years in 2010. Firstly, the continuity of regular clinical supervision sessions with a named psychiatrist. This was fundamental and, for me, a primary condition of his first Parole Licence. It was the continuation of what had been set up in November 1993. Venables was familiar with it and it was perfectly logical (as it is now) for that to continue after release in the community. For administrative reasons (nothing whatsoever to do with Venables) these either stopped or simply fizzled out. This was extraordinary and quite why Omand failed to criticise successive Home Secretaries for failing to recognise that or allowing that dereliction of duty to continue remains equally mystifying.

Secondly, and linked to the point about clinical continuity, is the sexual interest Venables reveals about himself, in email dialogue with a distributor of child pornography (and a known paedophile). Therein, Venables pretends to be a woman with a young daughter and offers her (the daughter) in exchange for receiving material relating to parents sexually abusing their children. This is new and important information. If these are his interests, as he says they are, they may be relevant not just to those child pornography offences, but to the index offence itself - the tragic murder of Jamie back in February 1993 – and a potential clinical breakthrough. Understanding behaviour is critical to being able to treat it and to the best of my knowledge, this is the first indication of anything like this – the potential indication of pre-existing, early life trauma. Hereto his background prior to 1993 has always been regarded as being remarkable only in that it was unremarkable for someone guilty of such extreme acts violence.

I sincerely hope that this fresh intelligence has been thoroughly assessed and actioned during his recent imprisonment and that the Parole Board has ensured that suitable arrangements are in place for continuing such psychiatric oversight and support back in the community together with a supervising officer whose attention is focussed on Jon Venables rather than a Secretary of State. Only time will tell whether any of that will ever be sufficient for him to survive an insatiable media racing to 'out' him, or to counter the web of lies and new 'identities' upon which his life is now based.

I know of plenty of similar cases where youngsters have committed equally serious offences

victed of grave crimes (murder etc) and those detained during Her Majesty's Pleasure.

He was responsible for the cases of Venables and Thompson for the first five years of their detention – precisely where they were to be detained, levels of security, arrangements for education, health, and the detail of therapeutic and psychiatric supervision. His evidence (for the Government) was considered by the various courts of Appeal, including the House of Lords and the European Court of Human Rights, in Strasburg.

From his extensive personal knowledge and professional background, Stevens argues that there are many lessons to be learnt from the woeful manner in which Venables's first release on parole was planned and supervised from 2000 till 2010. These lessons, says Stevens, have never been publically considered (in the context of a Serious Case Review for instance) but are as wholly necessary now in 2013 as they were in 2001 to ensure equal measures of support, supervision and surveillance to assure rehabilitation and public protection.

Here's Malcolm Stevens: The Bulger case is back in the news again. This time because 31 year old Jon Venables is reported to have been released from prison on parole and once again under the supervision of a probation officer. The last time this happened was back in 2001. The then Home Secretary, David Blunkett, just as other Home Secretaries before him, and since, seized the opportunity to be 'tough'. All politicians like to be 'tough' on something or other. Blunkett reassured the country that he would take personal responsibility to ensure Venables was supervised properly! He called for daily reports. By so doing he distorted the focus of the probation officer's supervision task, from the surveillance and support of a then 21 year old who last saw normal everyday life through the eyes of a 10 year old, to the bureaucratic back-watching of writing and sending daily reports from a probation office in Lancashire to a red box in Westminster. Presumably Blunkett thought that the depth of his political talent outweighed that of a Probation Service with a 100 years or so previous experience in handling serious cases like that. Either way, that and the trial Judge's decision to allow publication of the two boys' names were two dreadful decisions, which caused and will continue to cause immeasurable difficulties for the process of rehabilitation.

Even Sir David Omand, a former senior civil servant and the government's eminent security services' adviser (but arguably with even less experience in criminal justice than Blunkett) recognised that, in his 'Review of the post release supervision arrangements of Jon Venables'. His Review was set up after Venables had been sent to prison for child pornography offences which, along with a whole range of other serious breaches of his parole licence, were seemingly committed right under the nose of his supervising officer (and by inference, under the Home Secretary's nose too).

Sir David's otherwise unreadable, civil service-speak report concluded that no one was really to blame for failing to notice Venables' descent into poverty, loneliness and despair, least of all Blunkett or any of the other subsequent Home Secretaries. And with that obfuscation, the opportunity to learn key lessons about child protection, employment, and public accountability arising from his changed (but false) identity (passport application, employers criminal record checks, Schedule One Offender notification to social services, foreign travel etc) was compromised and lost. For me, this was most unfortunate because the case has always been plagued, from the outset, by polarised ill-informed opinions and a media hungry for stories and half stories. The Omand Report should and would have been an excellent opportunity to inspire the sort rational debate and reflection that has never really taken place. Not least for the purpose of reviewing precisely what works in resettling young offenders after long term detention and equally those for whom their identities have been officially 'changed'.

improve the quality of assessment of risk of harm to others; such guidance should also clarify who is responsible for assessments at key stages of the prisoner's progress through the custodial part of the sentence;

- ensure that approved premises are used for those individuals who pose the greatest risk of harm to others.

Prisons should: - ensure release on temporary licence is structured, fully risk assessed and well planned so as to maximise the chances of it contributing to the prisoner's successful future rehabilitation;

- prepare prisoners for open conditions so as to minimise the impact of the significant change in environment and review the prisoner's OASys assessment after the move has taken place.

Probation Trusts should: - ensure offender managers exert more influence over the release on temporary licence decision-making process within prisons, including sharing information about release on temporary licence with MultiAgency Public Protection agencies where necessary, so as to ensure that release on temporary licence is used effectively to prepare life sentence prisoners for release;

- offer training to offender managers on how to plan and deliver work which enthuses and engages those on life licence, thereby maintaining the offender's engagement over the protracted licence period.

Prisons and Probation Trusts should: - improve the quality of sentence planning and plans to manage the risk of harm to others so as to effectively direct work with life sentence prisoners, thereby increasing the possibility of successful outcomes;

- involve the life sentence prisoner's family or partner, where appropriate to do so, in the planning, delivery and review of work designed to address the risk of harm to others and the likelihood of reoffending, with a view to maximising the family's positive influence on the life sentence prisoner.

Note: Under the Government's Transforming Rehabilitation strategy, Probation Trusts are due to be replaced by the National Probation Service. Recommendations addressed to probation trusts should be followed up by whoever delivers probation services in the future, including both the National Probation Service and private providers.

Prison Van Used to Escort Sick Guinea Pig *Police Oracle*

Prison officials have been slammed for sending a sick guinea pig called Reggie Kray to a vet in a prisoner escort vehicle. Reggie Kray was whisked to the vets after he fell ill with an ear infection, reports the Gloucestershire Echo. Following treatment he was returned to HMP Eastwood Park, at Wotton-under-Edge, to be reunited with his brother Ronnie, but within two hours he had died. An unnamed prison nurse, from Gloucester, criticised the jail, claiming Reggie was accompanied to the vet by a prison officer in the prison escort vehicle. And she says two vets were subsequently called to the prison to certify Reggie's death, which was later logged on the prison computer as a death in custody. "I think it is such a joke that a guinea pig was taken to the vets by prison service car. It took an officer off duty and we are already short staffed," she said. "Two vets arrived at 7.45pm to confirm that the guinea pig was dead. In my opinion, this is such a scandalous waste of public funds." The Ministry of Justice confirmed that Reggie the guinea pig was taken to see a vet in a prison vehicle, although he was otherwise unaccompanied. A spokeswoman said that a subsequent visit to the prison by the vet later the same day, when death was certified, was made on his way home, and for no fee. An MoJ statement added: "A small number of donated animals are kept at HMP Eastwood Park to help with the rehabilitation of prisoners."

Detective Superintendent Steve Fulcher case to Answer for gross misconduct

The Independent Police Complaints Commission investigation into complaints made against Detective Superintendent Stephen Fulcher has found a case to answer for gross misconduct for breaches of the Police and Criminal Evidence Act and for ignoring force orders. Three separate matters were investigated by the IPCC. The first followed a complaint from John Godden that Detective Superintendent Fulcher's actions led to the charge against Halliwell for the unlawful killing of his daughter Rebecca being dropped. The second and third were matters referred to the IPCC concerning Detective Superintendent Fulcher's release of information to the media and his contact with members of the media in connection with Operation Mayan.

IPCC Deputy Chair Rachel Cerfontyne said: "This is a difficult time for all concerned with this case and especially the families and friends of Sian and Becky, especially after all they have already had to endure. This investigation has been a highly unusual one, as the majority of facts, in particular in relation to Mr Godden's complaint, are undisputed and already in the public domain. "We will never know what may have happened if the PACE Codes had been followed. However, Detective Superintendent Fulcher's actions were in deliberate breach of PACE and we find that he has a case to answer for gross misconduct. Also, Detective Superintendent Fulcher, despite no longer having responsibility for Operation Mayan, and against express orders, went ahead with meetings about the case with journalists from both the BBC and ITV. This behaviour is even more extraordinary when set in the context that the trial Judge had already considered whether force press conferences given by Detective Superintendent Fulcher were prejudicial to the case against Halliwell. We find that he has a case for gross misconduct for this as well and it will now be for Wiltshire Police to decide what action to take and I await their proposals."

Sian O'callaghan Murder: How Taxi Driver's Confession Was Secured

DS Steve Fulcher accused of using '70s style of policing' in ignoring rules on how Christopher Halliwell should be questioned. DS Fulcher was under huge pressure. He had just ordered the arrest of taxi driver Christopher Halliwell, his prime suspect in the kidnapping of Sian O'Callaghan in Swindon five days earlier. But Halliwell was refusing to talk and Fulcher tried something desperate. He instructed Halliwell to be driven to an isolated hilltop for a one-to-one chat. Working on the premise that O'Callaghan could still be alive, Fulcher wanted one last chance to look Halliwell in the eye and demand to know where she was. By his own admission, Fulcher ignored the law governing how suspects should be treated – there was no solicitor present and the suspect was not read his rights – but to some extent it worked. Halliwell led the officer to the young woman's mutilated body.

What happened next was even more dramatic. Out of the blue, Halliwell guided Fulcher to another spot where the remains of a second woman, Becky Godden-Edwards, had been buried years before, and told the detective he had killed her. In October last year Halliwell pleaded guilty to the murder of O'Callaghan and will serve a minimum of 25 years in prison. But he did not face trial over the death of Godden-Edwards because a judge ruled that the potential evidence gleaned during the four hours the murderer and detective spent together was inadmissible.

During prolonged preliminary legal arguments in October, Fulcher was accused of ignoring important rights brought in to prevent miscarriages of justice and of having gone back to a "70s style of policing". As Halliwell was heading to prison for O'Callaghan's murder, it emerged that Fulcher had been suspended and his actions were being investigated by the police watch-

Lithuania, which now holds the Presidency of the Council of the European Union, has done much less. In 2011 the Prosecutor general closed a year-long criminal inquiry, without pressing any charges. Despite additional information provided by international human rights NGOs and a 2012 Resolution of the European Parliament calling Lithuania to reopen the criminal investigation into its involvement in the CIA programme, nothing has happened so far. Concerns about the promptness, comprehensiveness and thoroughness of the investigations were also expressed by the Committee for the Prevention of Torture in a report of 2011, in which it also pointed out that Lithuania had not provided the specific information requested to determine whether the Prosecutor had conducted the investigation in an effective manner.

In Romania, both the government and parliament (which has conducted only a superficial inquiry) have constantly denied the existence of any secret detention, in spite of reliable material provided in particular by Dick Marty's 2007 report and the Memorandum sent by my predecessor, Thomas Hammarberg, to the Prosecutor General of Romania in March 2012.

Other countries, including Austria, Azerbaijan, Belgium, Bosnia, Croatia, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Georgia, Greece, Iceland, Ireland, Portugal, Spain, Turkey and the United Kingdom still have to fully account for their co-operation with the unlawful US programme, in particular as concerns the use of their airspace and airports for suspected rendition flights, capture and transfer of individuals to U.S. custody and participation in interrogation, as well as knowledge of the secret detention and extraordinary rendition operations.

Ensuring accountability: It is imperative to take urgent political and judicial initiatives in member States to lift the veil of secrecy Governments have drawn over their responsibilities. In particular, Poland has to complete the investigations, make its findings public and try those responsible, even if this implicates high-level State officials. Lithuania, Romania and the other countries that have yet to clarify their role, should ensure serious, independent and effective investigations. Germany should pursue its requests for extradition made in 2007, while the United Kingdom should clarify its role, including by publishing Sir Peter Gibson's report on the country's involvement in rendition and torture operations.

European countries should not be left alone. The European Union must put its weight behind them and persuade the US to fully cooperate in the investigations, including by ensuring that relevant investigative and judicial authorities in Europe can hear Al Nashiri and Abu Zubaydah. Finally, all Council of Europe member states must ensure that security agencies operate under independent scrutiny and judicial review.

The CIA programme of rendition and secret detention is not simply a grave political mistake: it is above all a serious violation of fundamental human rights. The continued impunity breeds contempt for democracy and the rule of law, as well as disrespect for the victims and values in whose name the fight against terrorism was carried out. It is high time to set the record straight.

Institutional Vengeance Against Children Who Kill? *Malcolm Stevens, OurKingdom, 09/09/13*

A former British Government senior adviser reflects on the treatment meted out to the boys who killed James Bulger. As 10 year olds in 1993, Jon Venables and Robert Thompson were convicted of the murder of 2 year old James Bulger in Bootle, Liverpool. An extraordinary case by any standard and one which has captured the nation's sympathy and wrath ever since.

Malcolm Stevens was the Government's lead professional civil servant at the time, responsible for disordered adolescents, secure children's homes and Youth Treatment Centres. For eleven years he was the Home Secretary's professional adviser for young offenders con-

Time for Accountability in CIA Torture Cases *Nils Muiznieks, Commissioner for Human Rights,*

Twelve years ago, almost three thousand people were killed by the terrorist attacks in New York and Washington. Commemorative events provide an occasion to pay respects to the innocent victims, but also to reflect on the anti-terrorist response adopted by the USA and Europe. By allowing unlawful detentions and interrogation techniques amounting to torture, this response caused further suffering and violated human rights law. To date, governments have been unwilling to establish the truth and ensure accountability for their complicity in the unlawful programme of "extraordinary renditions" – involving abduction, detention and ill-treatment of suspected terrorists – carried out by the CIA in Europe between 2002 and 2006. In many cases, an abuse of the state secrets privilege hampered judiciary and parliamentary initiatives to determine responsibility. Though secrecy is sometimes necessary to protect the State, it should never serve as an excuse to conceal serious human rights violations

Legal challenges: On 13 December 2012 the European Court of Human Rights shook this secret world. In its judgment El-Masri v. "the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia", the first concerning the conduct of a member State in the sordid CIA programme, the Court not only held this country responsible for the torture of the applicant performed by a CIA rendition team in the presence of Macedonian officials and for inhuman and degrading treatment during his arbitrary detention. It also found that the State had failed to comply with its obligation to carry out an effective investigation into the allegations of ill-treatment and arbitrary detention, as well as to provide an effective remedy to the complainant. In the near future the Court could further expose the lawlessness that has characterised the CIA programme if it decides to examine the complaints lodged by Abu Zubaydah against Poland and Lithuania, and by Al Nashiri against Poland and Romania. The two suspected terrorists, now held in Guantanamo, complain that these countries have failed to conduct effective investigations into the circumstances surrounding their ill-treatment, detention and transfer to the USA.

A thick veil of secrecy, leading to impunity: A detailed report published by the Open Society Justice Initiative in February 2013 reminds us that 25 European countries have co-operated with the US agency. So far, the only country to have handed down sentences against people involved in the CIA programme is Italy, where in 2009 a criminal court convicted in absentia, twenty-three US citizens, all but one CIA agents, as well as five Italian secret service agents for the kidnapping and rendition to Egypt of a Muslim cleric, Hassan Mustafa Osama Nasr, also known as Abu Omar, from the streets of Milan in 2003. The judiciary has also performed well in Germany and the United Kingdom. In the first case, Munich prosecutors in 2007 issued arrest warrants against thirteen CIA agents and transmitted them to Interpol. However, the German Government, pressed by its US ally, has so far refused to demand extradition. In the UK, judges have compelled the Government to award very costly compensation to sixteen people who accused the British security forces of facilitating their transfer abroad, where they had been subjected to torture. The UK Government has so far denied any liability. Sweden too decided to pay compensation for its involvement in the extraordinary rendition of two Egyptian asylum seekers.

In all other countries, little has been achieved or even initiated. In Poland the investigations only started a full three years after credible information emerged and have been dragging on for five years, mainly because of undue political interference in the work of the prosecutors and the unwillingness of the US to co-operate with the investigations. Concerns about the effectiveness of the investigations have been expressed on several occasions, including by the third Dick Marty report on the CIA detention and rendition programme adopted by the Council of Europe Parliamentary Assembly in 2011.

dog, the Independent Police Complaints Commission.

The saga of the arrest, the unconventional interview and the discovery of the two bodies makes the Halliwell case one of the most unusual in recent times. O'Callaghan, a 22-year-old administrator, vanished in the early hours of Saturday 19 March 2011 after leaving a nightclub in Swindon, Wiltshire. Her disappearance became a huge story, with thousands of people joining the search. By 22 March, the police investigation was focused on father-of-three Halliwell, after CCTV footage seemed to show O'Callaghan getting into his taxi.

Operating on the premise that she could still be alive, Fulcher ordered Halliwell to be watched 24 hours a day; 12 surveillance vehicles tracked his every move. Fulcher let Halliwell "run", hoping he would lead police to the missing woman. "My fear was, she could be dead; I hoped she was alive," Fulcher said during the legal argument about the case at Bristol crown court. "My duty was clear: to work to find and protect Sian if I could. It's what any parent would have wanted a police officer to do for Sian."

Fulcher increased the pressure on Halliwell with a number of cryptic press releases and only pounced on 24 March when the suspect was spotted buying an "overdose quantity" of pills. Two detectives carried out an "urgent" interview in a police car without a solicitor being present, which is lawful when it is thought any delay could lead to a victim's death. Halliwell refused to co-operate and demanded to see a lawyer. At this point Fulcher ordered his officers to take Halliwell not to the police station but to Barbury castle, an iron age fort on the outskirts of Swindon, where he would meet the suspect. Fulcher explained later at the preliminary hearing that he had still been working on the basis that O'Callaghan could be alive and had wanted a one-to-one chat with Halliwell. The detective said he had wanted to "look him in the eye" and ask Halliwell to take him to O'Callaghan. He accepted he had put to one side the strictures of the Police and Criminal Evidence Act (Pace), which spells out how suspects should be treated, including the need to tell them they have the right to remain silent.

Fulcher told the hearing "On the one hand, I was cognisant of Mr Halliwell's rights. But my primary duty was to save Sian's life. My view was, there was an equation to balance between Mr Halliwell's right to silence and Sian O'Callaghan's right to life. My view was that Sian's right to life took a prior claim." So, without cautioning him, Fulcher asked Halliwell to do the "right thing". He told him he would be "vilified" if he did not help. Halliwell told Fulcher: "You think I did it." Fulcher replied: "I know you did it." After a few minutes, Halliwell gave in and said: "Have you got a car? We'll go." Fulcher said it had been a "rare moment in life" as they drove to a spot near the Uffington white horse, in Oxfordshire, where O'Callaghan's body was found down a steep bank. She had been stabbed in the head, strangled, beaten and sexually assaulted. The detective said he was about to order that Halliwell be taken to a police station when the suspect said: "You and me need to have a chat." The pair sat down, smoked, and Halliwell asked: "Do you want another one?" Again, under the law, Fulcher should have cautioned Halliwell. But Fulcher said they had achieved a "rapport", and reading Halliwell his rights might have made him stop speaking.

They got back into the car and Halliwell gave directions. Fulcher said during the legal argument that Halliwell said he had murdered a girl in about 2004. He had not known her, but had taken her from Swindon. The pair ended up in a 16-hectare (40-acre) field in Gloucestershire. Halliwell paced out the spot where he said he had buried the body, the pretrial legal argument hearing was told. A body later identified as that of Becky Godden-Edwards was found. She had run away from home some nine years before.

Halliwell was taken to a police station and Fulcher announced on live television that a

47-year-old man had been arrested for kidnap and two murders. "The location of two bodies has been identified to me by this individual," Fulcher said. But once he had access to a lawyer, Halliwell clammed up. Fulcher told the preliminary hearing it seemed "utterly ridiculous" that a person who had taken him to two bodies could find some "loophole that would get him away from the fact that he is a multiple murderer".

Halliwell's barrister, Richard Latham QC, was hugely critical of Fulcher's tactics. Describing the situation as "unique", Latham said Fulcher had shown an "amazing contempt of all the recognised codes, rules and sub judice principles". The lawyer said the Pace rules were not a "loophole" but a "fundamental right", suggesting Fulcher had "gone back to the 70s" style of policing. Mrs Justice Cox, who heard the legal arguments, agreed the details gleaned in the interview could not be admitted as evidence in court. She called Fulcher's actions "wholesale and irrefutable breaches of Pace". It had been a "deliberate decision" by Fulcher to carry out "significant and substantial" breaches of the code, she said.

It meant Halliwell could not face trial over Godden-Edwards' death because there was no other evidence apart from what had happened between the suspect and detective. The police did have other evidence linking Halliwell to O'Callaghan's murder, including forensics and CCTV footage.

But Latham argued that his client should not even face court over O'Callaghan's death, claiming he could not have a fair trial because Fulcher had announced to the media that the suspect had taken him to two bodies. He also alleged that Fulcher had leaked other information to journalists, including the fact that Halliwell had been seen burning something after O'Callaghan's disappearance, and even his words when he was arrested: "How did you catch me? Was it the gamekeeper?"

The judge ruled that Halliwell would face a fair trial over O'Callaghan's death if the jury was carefully directed. In the end, Halliwell admitted murdering O'Callaghan and was given the lengthy prison sentence, but could have been serving a whole-life term had he been convicted of abducting and murdering a second young woman. The attorney general, Dominic Grieve, referred the sentencing to the court of appeal but three judges decided the 25-year tariff was not unduly lenient.

Fulcher had support from within his own force. At the preliminary hearing, the chief constable of Wiltshire police, Patrick Geenty, said his officer had been brave and that he hoped he would have done the same thing. Most importantly, perhaps, the mother of Becky Godden-Edwards praised him for sparing them from the limbo of never knowing what happened to the young woman. Karen Edwards summed it up: "Without him, I wouldn't know if Becky was still alive or dead. I think he's a brilliant officer who didn't deserve reprimanding. He was doing the right thing as well as his duty."

Jails Struggle as Number of Older Sex Offenders Soars *Nigel Morris, Independent, 12/09/13*

A sharp increase in numbers of men convicted for decades-old sexual offences has left jails struggling to cope with a soaring population of older prisoners, ministers are warned today. MPs said many jails were built to house fit young offenders and are unsuitable for middle-aged and elderly inmates. The Commons Justice Select Committee pointed to the cramped conditions and poor accessibility in many of the country's jails and condemned the lack of mental health provision and help with social care across the prison estate. It called for the Ministry of Justice (MoJ) to develop a strategy to provide suitable accommodation for older inmates.

Offenders aged over 60 represent the fastest growing group behind bars, with the number jailed increasing by almost half in just four years. Older prisoners are most likely to be imprisoned for sexual offences, including those committed up to 30 years ago, which usually attract long sentences. The numbers are likely to continue as further investigations into historic sex abuse leads to convictions.

Sir Alan Beith, the committee's chairman, said: "Older and disabled prisoners should no longer be held in institutions which cannot meet their basic needs. Nor should they be released back into the community without adequate support. In one case we heard of a prisoner who was a wheelchair user being released from prison without a wheelchair." He added: "The lack of provision for essential social care for older prisoners, the confusion about who should be providing it, and the failure of so many authorities to accept responsibility for it, have been disgraceful."

Juliet Lyon, the director of the Prison Reform Trust, said: "Caring for wheelchair-bound, doubly incontinent, often demented people is beyond what we can reasonably expect of prison staff. Frances Crook, the chief executive of the Howard League for Penal Reform, said: "If someone is sentenced many decades after they committed a crime and where they are so infirm as to pose no continuing danger, then the courts should explore other options than simply imprisonment." The Prisons Minister, Jeremy Wright, said: "We are committed to ensuring older prisoners are treated fairly and have already introduced a range of provisions across the prison estate to meet their needs."

Prisoner Admits Attacking Child Killer Mark Bridger In Jail t*heguardian.com*

A prisoner serving a life sentence has admitted attacking the child killer Mark Bridger in one of Britain's most secure jails. Juvinai Ferreira, 22, pleaded guilty to the offence when he appeared at Leeds crown court via videolink. Ferreira attacked the 47-year-old in Wakefield prison just months after Bridger was sentenced to life in jail for abducting and murdering five-year-old April Jones in Machynlleth, Wales, last year. Bridger, was given a whole-life tariff by a judge in May at Mold crown court. The five-year-old's body has never been found.

No details of the attack by Ferreira were given in court on Wednesday 11/09/13, and Ferreira will be sentenced on 2 October. According to reports at the time of the attack, which happened on 7 July, Bridger needed hospital treatment to a face wound after he was slashed with a makeshift knife. He was returned to Wakefield after his injury was stitched.

On screen in court on Wednesday, Ferreira, who is a convicted murderer, looked bored and propped his head up with his hand for most of the proceedings as he sat at a desk in prison clothes. At one point in the 20-minute hearing he asked one of his guards: "I thought this was going to be quick?" After Judge Christopher Batty told him the case was going to be adjourned, Ferreira said to him: "Can you just not sentence me? I can't keep coming back. Just give me anything and move on." Batty told him he needed a pre-sentence report to assess his level of dangerousness and decide whether a second life term was appropriate.

Ferreira was found guilty at Norwich crown court in 2009 of murdering Elaine Walpole in Dereham, Norfolk, in April 2008. At the time police said Ferreira – who is originally from the Gambia – moved to Dereham in 2007 with a relative after escaping civil war in Africa. He befriended 47-year-old Walpole, who lived alone, after they met at a shop and she bought him cigarettes. Prosecutors at the time suggested that Ferreira was "sex-crazed". Postmortem tests showed that Walpole, a former hotel worker who had three children, had been stabbed three times and bitten. Detectives and forensic experts spent nearly a year carrying out checks to show Ferreira was an adult as he said he was 16. Once it was proved he was an adult, Ferreira was given a life sentence and told he must serve at least 22 years before being considered for parole.