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 828 (06/01/2021) - Cost £1

Minority Ethnic Prisoners' Experiences of Rehabilitation and Release Planning

Black and minority ethnic (BME) groups are greatly overrepresented in the prison population: as of March 2020, 27% of prisoners were from a BME background, compared with only 13% of the general population. People who identify as 'black' are imprisoned at an even more disproportionate rate: they comprise only 3% of the general population but 13% of adult prisoners (UK Prison Population Statistics, 2020). HM Inspectorate of Prisons (HMI Prisons) inspection reports consistently show that BME prisoners report worse experiences and outcomes than white prisoners across a wide range of indicators covering most areas of prison life. The Lammy Review (published in 2017 and subtitled 'An independent review into the treatment of, and outcomes for, Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic individuals in the Criminal Justice System') drew extensively on HMI Prisons' evidence and other sources to highlight under-identification of BME prisoners' vulnerabilities, widespread feelings among

BME prisoners of being treated less well than white prisoners and shortcomings in important systems of redress and internal assurance. People from a BME background have less trust in the criminal justice system than white people and worse perceptions of the system's fairness, whether or not they have had any significant involvement in it (Lammy, 2017). The reasons for these perceptions are complex and under-researched, and result not just from criminal justice processes, but also from long-term patterns of social inequality and prejudice (Bhui, 2009).

Developing a greater understanding of the perceptions of prisoners and disproportionalities in the prison system, and finding ways to address them, is an important task for those working in prisons. This thematic review is a small but original contribution to that effort. We will consider carefully how the findings might be built upon in future work. Little has been written on BME prisoners' experiences of offender management and resettlement services, and there is very limited work on the increasingly influential concept of 'rehabilitative culture' and the degree to which efforts to achieve it have taken account of the specific experiences of BME prisoners.

The Lammy Review also highlighted the recurrent problem of a lack of data on Gypsy, Roma and Traveller (GRT) prisoners in prisons, which limits understanding of potential problems. We know that GRT prisoners are greatly overrepresented in prisons, while distinctive needs they may have are not well identified or addressed. The experiences of this group are therefore included in this review, although, as is made clear, poor identification of GRT prisoners limited the number that we were able to interview.

Rehabilitation and release planning is not a well-understood area for any prisoners, in part because systems for supporting rehabilitation have been in flux for several years. Procedures for assessing prisoners' risks and offending-related needs, managing sentence progression and helping them to prepare for release have been subject to regular reform and changes in practice. Most notably, a new offender management in custody (OMiC – see Glossary of terms) model is currently being rolled out across the prison system (HMI Prisons, 2020) and the outsourcing of pre- and post-release services to community rehabilitation companies (CRCs) is being largely phased out in favour of a more unified service provided by the National Probation Service (see Strengthening Probation, Building Confidence,

This review provides insights into BME and GRT prisoners' experiences of rehabilitation and release planning in this changing environment. It seeks to expand the very limited current evidence on their experiences of rehabilitation and release planning, largely using prisoner surveys and verbal accounts from prisoners and key staff. It explores the extent to which the distinct needs of BME and GRT prisoners are being identified and met; responsive services which reflect individual needs are essential to building a criminal justice system in which BME communities can have greater confidence (Ministry of Justice, 2020).

Forty-Three Prison Staff Sacked Over Prohibited Items

Mattha Busby, Eric Allison, Guardian: Dozens of prison officers have been dismissed and some have been convicted for bringing prohibited items – which can include drugs, tobacco and mobile phones – into jails in England and Wales over the past five years, the Guardian can reveal. Drug finds in jails rose by 18% this year and there have been claims that some prisons have seen similar levels of substance use during the coronavirus lockdown as before. From 2015 up until 10 October this year, HM Prisons (HMP) dismissed 43 staff over prohibited items, and 187 outside staff not directly employed by HMP were banned from working in jails. There were 88 subsequent convictions and 10 police cautions among all those dismissed or banned, according to data released by the Ministry of Justice (MoJ) under the Freedom of Information Act. This year alone, six HMP officers have been dismissed, 23 outside staff have been excluded, and there have been 12 convictions and one caution. Further data from the MoJ shows that at least 22 of the officers dismissed from 2015 to 2020 had trafficked contraband, almost certainly to inmates or organised crime groups inside prisons. The number of prison staff found in possession of prohibited items has been falling since 2017 but looks set to rise this year.

The number of drug finds in prisons rose by 18% in 2019-20, to 21,575, and sim card and mobile phones finds rose by 3%, to 17,302, MoJ figures show. Prison staff, prisoners and inmate relatives told the Guardian that some jails reported either an increase or no change in drug use during lockdown, while others said it had decreased. A prisoner at Wandsworth in south-west London said it had been "business as usual" in terms of drug supply during the lockdown. "So when there were no visits and no teachers or lawyers coming into the jail, how were the drugs, phones and snout getting in?" he asked. This year, four prison officers at Wandsworth were suspended over a range of misconduct allegations, and one was taken out of the prison in handcuffs. The MoJ confirmed that one of the officers had since left the Prison Service. A healthcare worker at a Welsh prison said: "A lot of staff bring drugs and mobile phones in as they are offered a lot of money."

The Independent Monitoring Board said in a report on HMP Whitemoor in Cambridgeshire that during lockdown "intelligence about and finds of drugs (as well as mobile phones and sim cards) continued at a level similar to that experienced in normal conditions. As there were no visits and the itemiser was in regular use, it is likely that these items were brought in by staff." An educator at a London prison claimed mobile phones were frequently smuggled in by staff and that there has been "a lot more" smoking of spice, a synthetic and potentially lethal cannabinoid. "Drug use has been up during lockdown – it shows it was the prison officers bringing it in." However, a prison officer in south-east England said the smell of cannabis and tobacco was no longer noticeable, with far fewer people visibly under the influence of drugs.

John Podmore, a former prison governor who presided over several prisons during his career and also headed an anti-corruption unit, said: "We often had success in finding stashes of drugs on or

about inmates. But the biggest haul we ever seized was strapped to a prison officer's leg. He could barely walk for the amount of drugs we found on him." He said the massive profits to be made from smuggling contraband into jails meant it was inevitable that some prison staff would succumb to temptation or pressure. The MoJ's counter-corruption unit works to detect and disrupt the activities of corrupt staff, who were said to be in a small minority. The unit's specialist staff supports prisons and probation services, and works with the police to support their investigations.

A Prison Service spokesperson said: "While the vast majority of officers carry out their duties to the highest standards, we will take the strongest possible action against those who seriously transgress – for instance by smuggling drugs. But in some cases dismissal would be disproportionate, such as where the incident was clearly accidental. There is no evidence to suggest that drug use has gone up in prisons since the start of the pandemic." Mick Pimblett, the assistant general secretary of the POA, formerly the Prison Officers' Association, said: "The overwhelming majority of prison staff are dedicated and honest, but it is only correct that the small minority that engage in inappropriate behaviour are investigated and suitable action taken against them. "The increase in disciplinary cases could be due to a number of factors and the cases should be looked at in conjunction with recruitment processes, training and remuneration for the difficult job prison officers do."

Known Unknowns? The Crazy World of Pre-Charge Bail Policy

It's too easy to make policy based on assumptions. We all have beliefs we don't question. But good policy-making relies on challenging assumptions. Unfortunately this doesn't seem to have happened in the case of pre-charge bail. Those in police custody whom the police want charged but don't have enough evidence to do so are either released on pre-charge bail or released under investigation. This policy underwent radical change in April 2017. The new policy was implemented very quickly to address a great wrong – that people were being left in limbo for months, if not years, subject to pre-charge bail restrictions, waiting for the police and the CPS to make a decision. The new policy limited the use of pre-charge bail and brought in "release under investigation" (RUI) whereby suspects were released without conditions while police continued investigations. Unfortunately the policy change did not address the underlying problem – that people whom the police wanted to charge, and their alleged victims, were waiting way too long for their cases to be resolved. So over long pre-charge bail periods were replaced by over long RUI periods. Then concerns about RUI grew and people starting lobbying to change policy again. And groups representing victims were among them – both because victims should not be held in limbo, and because victims' groups believed that pre-charge bail gave victims greater protection from re-victimisation.

But it is this assumption, which is partly driving policy change, which needs challenge. A new report from the police inspectorate perpetuates the belief. "Since the publication of National Police Chiefs' Council guidance in 2019, the police have made renewed efforts to redress the balance between protecting victims and the rights of suspects. This has resulted in some notable improvements. But we think there is much more that should and must be done to keep victims who are most at risk safe". Throughout the report police are criticised for not using pre-charge bail more to protect alleged victims. We need to protect alleged victims as much as we can, but there is no hard evidence in this report or from any other research/data that pre-charge bail actually stops anyone offending. In a qualitative research report, there are quotes from lawyers who say that they think their clients are less likely to offend if on pre-charge bail, and lots of quotes from victims who say that they would have felt safer if their alleged attacker had been subject to pre-charge bail, but no actual evidence that pre-charge bail protects.

I'm willing to believe that some pre-charge bail conditions may influence offending. If suspects are barred from contacting witnesses or from going near the alleged victims' home, I can see that the victim would feel safer. But there is still no evidence that they are safer. And most bail conditions are much "lighter"- such as having to forfeit a passport or to report to the police station regularly. My hunch is that bail conditions don't prevent reoffending much or at all, and that that hunch is shared by most custody and investigating officers. If they were really convinced that pre-charge bail conditions prevented reoffending, surely these officers would more often go through the bureaucratic effort of imposing them and they would let fewer lapse?

Why am I practically alone in suggesting that pre-charge bail conditions may not be worth the paper they are written on? Because most people are convinced that deterrence works in preventing crime, and because everyone wants to think there is a relatively easy, relatively painless way of reassuring stressed victims that they are unlikely to suffer again in the short term. Unfortunately there is no evidence that deterrence works and plenty of evidence that someone determined to reoffend will not be put off by some conditions on a piece of paper. So I think we may be leading victims down the garden path. If there's no evidence that pre-charge bail conditions reduce offending and prevent victimisation we should be honest and find out what does work (remembering that there are limits on restricting the liberty of someone who has not been charged with a crime).

I don't really understand why the Home Office has not done its own research/data analysis on this issue. It left the HMICFRS to do some qualitative research, which is interesting but inconclusive. So inconclusive that I think HMICFRS was unwise to use it to underpin their findings – the report says "Research from BritainThinks found that victims of these crimes feel that the crime hasn't been taken seriously when suspects are RUI", but this is based on the testimony of only 27 victims, of whom many according to the research don't know the difference between bail and RUI. Most of the recommendations of the HMICFRS report are spot on, but its risky to base the idea that pre-charge bail protects on 27 victim interviews in the absence of any other data.

The main way we can protect and reassure victims is to have shorter investigations and to communicate regularly about what is going on. Pre-charge bail conditions seem to have become a proxy for effective victim support, a symbol of how victims are let down. They certainly are let down, but it's the system which is failing, rather than pre-charge bail conditions. I fear whistling in the wind. People think pre-charge bail conditions improve victim safety so the law will change yet again. I only hope, this time, that the government does monitor what difference pre-charge bail actually makes.

Expectations for Women in Prison

HMI Prisons is currently consulting on our Expectations: Criteria for assessing the treatment of and conditions for women in prison. The Expectations have been developed independently by HMI Prisons and set out the criteria by which we inspect outcomes for women in custody. This is the second version of our Expectations for women in prison, which we have revised so that we can continue to fulfil our responsibility to deliver independent and objective assessments of outcomes for prisoners. The revision follows a literature review, focus groups and extensive consultation with a range of stakeholders, including women in custody. The Expectations also incorporate learning from our inspections of women's prisons and other best practice. They are underpinned by human rights treaties and standards.

After much deliberation and consultation, we have chosen to retain the four healthy prison tests of safety, respect, purposeful activity and rehabilitation and release planning. Rehabilitation and release planning has replaced resettlement, as it more accurately describes the content of the

test. We have thought carefully about the content of each test and made changes to reflect the differing risk and needs of women in prison and to promote the issues that are most relevant to them. For example, the role of safe and healthy relationships now underpins the safety test; relationships with children, families and other people who are significant to women is now central to the respect test and features more prominently in other sections, such as early days in custody. We have integrated the importance of well-being, fostering a community and supporting women to deal with their needs throughout the four tests, rather than limiting these considerations to one test. We hope that these changes will lead to improved outcomes for those held in women's prisons. The final version of the Expectations produced following this consultation will include short explanations of the human rights treaties and standards relevant to each Expectations area.

How to give feedback: We welcome comments on any aspect of the draft Expectations and have provided a feedback form, for this purpose. We have also provided a Word copy of the Expectations so that you can make comments or suggest changes to the drafting in the document, as we recognise that it is often easier to provide feedback in this way. You may provide feedback using either or both options. If you are commenting on or suggesting changes to the draft Expectations document, please use tracked changes as this allows us to ensure we capture all of your suggestions. Please ensure that you provide the name of the organisation you are replying on behalf of (if applicable) and contact details for a named individual so that we can get back to you with any questions. All feedback should be returned by email to caroline.wright@hmiprisons.gov.uk by 31 December 2020. Please contact Caroline by email or call 020 7340 0500 if you have questions or require any assistance to complete this consultation. Draft Expectations for women's prisons (Word file) (384 kB) https://is.gd/7XfBL8 Consultation form for women's Expectations (Word file) (26 kB) https://is.gd/7XfBL8

Further Equality Act Challenge to Pava in Prisons

A Deighton Pierce Glynn client has returned to court to challenge the Justice Secretary's decision to equip prison officers with PAVA spray before safeguards were in place and action was taken to comply with the Equality Duty. Our client instructed this firm to challenge the original decision to roll out chemical restraint in Autumn 2018. Following a decision by the Justice Secretary to authorise deployment of PAVA in all male prisons at the height of the COVID-19 pandemic in Spring 2020, the Equality and Human Rights Commission funded our client to bring this challenge back to court. The Judicial Review application has now been withdrawn after an agreement was reached between the parties. This means the Ministry of Justice implementing or committing to introduce a number of measures to monitor PAVA. In particular, to collect and publish information capable of capturing any emerging discrimination in the drawing or discharge of PAVA against disabled and minoritised people in prison. The implementation of these commitments will be closely monitored by the Equality and Human Rights Commission. "The challenges that the Claimant has brought against the weaponisation of prison officers have repeatedly exposed the limits of what is known about discriminatory use of force across prisons. The Public Sector Equality Duty requires a full, conscious and informed confronting of the potential discriminatory impact of PAVA spray and consideration of how those impacts can be mitigated. It is startling that the Ministry of Justice apparently does not hold central information to answer even basic questions such as how many people incarcerated in prisons are disabled. More public reporting on PAVA will assist people at risk, and those representing them, to scrutinise every use of PAVA, to be informed about their rights and to call the Prison Service to account where patterns of discrimination emerge."

Inquest Into Death of Leon Bridges Restrained By Police Finally Due To Start

Zaki Sarraf, Justice Gap: The inquest into the death of a man who died after being restrained by police seven years ago has is finally due to start on January 4th 2020. In November 2013, police were called following reports of that Leon Bridges was behaving unusually in the street. Once the Bedfordshire police officers arrived, they restrained the 39-year-old man from Luton and detained him under the Mental Health Act. He was then transported to Luton Police Station and placed in a cell where he was further restrained. After being restrained by the officers, he became unresponsive and was pronounced dead at the hospital in the same day.

His family has been waiting seven years for answers surrounding their loved one's death. In 2016, the Independent Police Complaints Commission (later replaced by the Independent Office for Police Conduct or IOPC) referred the case to the Crown Prosecution Service (CPS) to consider whether the police officers involved should face manslaughter charges. Two years later, in 2018, the CPS confirmed that they examined the evidence and concluded that their test for bringing a prosecution was not met, and so they took no further action.

At the time, Leon's mother Margaret Briggs was 'devasted and outraged' and said that to be told that the officers wouldnot face any public scrutiny was 'a further denial of justice and accountability for Leon'. In February this year, the Director General of the IOPC, Michal Lockwood withdrew directions to bring gross misconduct proceedings for five Bedfordshire Police Officers following Leon's death. The misconduct hearings were due to consider allegations against the officers for breaching standards relating to duties and responsibilities. Whilst the IOPC were responsible for investigating and identifying if officers should face disciplinary action, Bedfordshire Police Force were responsible for presenting the evidence against its officers—the police force refused to provide any evidence. Thus, the IOPC were forced to withdraw the directions. Now the six-week inquest due to start on January 4 will explore the actions of the police, the ambulance service, and whether their actions were appropriate, or whether they contributed to Leon's death.

Margaret Briggs, Leon's mother said: 'It has been over seven long years of delays and excuses. Enough is enough. It is my belief that, if Leon had been fairly treated by the Police, he would still be with us today.' Jocelyn Cockburn, partner at Hodge Jones & Allen Solicitors said that the fact that it has taken this long to hold a public inquest into his death was 'in itself a miscarriage of justice'. 'The need for public scrutiny in this case is acute. The truth of what happened to Leon must come out and the right lessons must be learned,' the solicitor continued.

Benjamin Bestgen: Consensual Harm

This week Benjamin Bestgen looks at the legalities surrounding certain extracurricular activities. Every law student has probably heard of R v Brown [1993] UKHL 19 during their studies. The case concerned a group of men who had occasionally gathered for consensual, but rather severe sadomasochistic sex in private accommodations, removed from public view. Activities included whippings, spankings, applying hot wax and sandpaper to their private areas, among much else. They also recorded some of their activities on film for personal gratification. On trial, each man confirmed that all activities were entirely consensual and nobody suffered lasting harm. The court had to decide whether consent to physical injury can be a defence to accusations of assault which results in actual bodily harm on a person. By a 3-2 majority, the court decided that consent could not be a defence against criminal charges of occasioning severe physical harm on another person. Philosophically and legally, this ruling is controversial, as it allows courts to judge what adults of sound mind and legal capacity can and cannot do regarding their own bodies.

Volenti Non Fit Iniuira: Roman jurist Ulpian asserted that "Nulla iniuria est, quae in volentem fiat." No wrong is done to a person where he or she wants the thing to be done. Both English and Scots law acknowledge this principle in tort/delict where Jack cannot sue Jill for injuries suffered if Jack was fully aware of the risks involved and gave free and voluntary consent. Classic examples are sports like rugby or boxing, where participants know that they risk getting hit, pushed, tackled and suffer injury but freely and voluntarily waive any claim they might have against other participants.

Aesthetic Limits of Consent: Tattoos or piercings, once deemed morally sketchy and reserved for prisoners, prostitutes, "exotic" foreigners, sailors, artists or soldiers are nowadays widely accepted in Western societies and lawful, subject to restrictions for minors. However, aesthetic body modifications like eyeball tattoos, split tongues, branding, scarification, trans- or subdermal implants or the removal of body parts like an earlobe or nipple remain illegal or of doubtful legality, as affirmed in R v BM [2018] EWCH Crim 560, regardless of consent. The court took the view that such severe procedures are not extensions of commonly accepted categories of aesthetic adornments but extreme and surgical in nature, requiring trained and licensed medical staff to be carried out safely and generally not without a valid medical reason. The mental health of people desiring body modifications should also be professionally assessed to account for the risk of e.g. Body Dysmorphic Disorder. In addition, the court stated at para. 43: "The fact that a desire to have an ear or nipple removed or tongue split is incomprehensible to most […]", including, it appears, the judges.

Paternalistic State: The idea that the state can tell you what you can and cannot do with your own body for the good of public morals, safety and welfare derives from a metaphorical "family model" of government, where the rulers exercise quasi-parental rights over their subjects. Sexual activities, aesthetic self-expression, artistic pursuits, drug consumption, ways of raising children, censorship of literature, movies or videogames are often subject of political and legal interference. These regulation attempts are commonly justified as "upholding or safeguarding prevailing public opinion or sentiments" for the good of social order and peace.

Critics counter that "prevailing public opinion" is often used by governments to discriminate against minority interests or justify atrocities such as slavery or religious persecution. Individual autonomy is a high public good in itself and should be protected from political overreach. If a competent adult in possession of their intellectual and emotional faculties wishes to do something with their body or mind or have it done to them by another person and causes no harm to the rights and liberties of others, the law should not interfere.

Intellectually Unsatisfying: Whenever courts meddle in what are ultimately aesthetic questions, an intellectual muddle is unavoidable. Lawyers Maeve Keenan and Sandra Paul note the confusion of courts when trying to differentiate clearly between legally acceptable and unacceptable bodily harm. In R v Wilson [1996] 2 Cr App Rep 241 a husband who consensually branded his wife's buttocks with a hot knife as part of sexual activity was acquitted, as the branding was deemed a private matrimonial matter between husband and wife. It is doubtful that the husband adhered to proper medical standards of hygiene or technique when carrying out the branding or that the wife got a mental health assessment first. It is also unclear why the matrimonial status should matter at all on a decision about criminal harm, particularly as the defence of "s/he wanted it" is common in cases about domestic violence, sexual abuse and "rough sex" defences. All this leaves the law around consensual harm and bodily autonomy intellectually and legally unsatisfying.

Transhumanism: Body modifications are also part of increasing research into human-computer interfaces and robotics studies into creating cyborgs or aiding the human body through implanted machinery. Academic Kevin Warwick experimented with the implantation of

RFID chips into his body and linking a neural interface to his own nervous system. Artist Neil Harbisson has an antenna implanted into his skull, which extends colour perception and can receive signals through the internet. Harbisson and fellow artist Moon Ribas also have Bluetooth teeth implanted, allowing them to communicate in morse code through vibrations in their mouths. The desire of persons to experiment with their own bodies, decorate and modify them is ancient. So is the wish to do risky and maybe idiotic things like playing rugby, wingsuit flying, consuming drugs or having unprotected sex with strangers of unknown health status.

Instead of focussing on what "most people" might find "incomprehensible", courts and politicians may apply statistical reasoning to assess harm to the public: while having your tongue split or foreskin nailed to a board is arguably extreme, there are very few people engaging in such activities. Compare that to the millions who every day drink alcohol excessively, smoke, eat over-sugared foods, get concussions from contact-sport or have their health and livelihoods endangered by political incompetence. The harm caused by the latter is certainly not consensual and affects a vast majority of us.

Fantastic Truths: How do Judges Decide Which Witnesses to Believe?

It cannot have escaped anyone's notice that Johnny Depp recently lost his libel claim against the publishers of The Sun newspaper after Mr Justice Nicol held that the allegations made against him of domestic violence were substantially true. Whilst questions over the future of his film career abound, on any view his credibility lies in tatters; with the judgment handed down after a 16-day trial where Mr Depp gave evidence for over 20 hours. The case turned largely on witness evidence and the credibility, or otherwise of those giving evidence, shedding a light on the difficulty of assessing witnesses and over relying on them in proceedings. Short of polygraph tests, truth serums or time machines, how do judges decide whether witnesses are telling the truth?

Bingham Factors: Lord Bingham, former Master of the Rolls, Lord Chief Justice and Senior Law Lord set out a good starting point for assessing witness credibility in his essay entitled, "The Business of Judging". Although noting their relative importance will vary widely from case to case, he outlined each of the below factors as the main tests needed to determine whether a witness is lying or not. Consistency of the witness's evidence with what is agreed or clearly shown by other evidence Evidently, clearly obvious facts and contemporaneous documents provide a useful framework for what has happened. Thus, witness evidence, which is consistent with those "fixed point facts", is obviously more credible than evidence that is inconsistent.

This is neatly illustrated by the Depp case, especially through a particular incident on an aeroplane. Mr Depp had said that he remembered the flight in detail, however this was contradicted by a text message he sent after the flight in which he said he had blacked out. Additionally, his former personal assistant had also sent a text saying, "He doesn't remember much". Whilst Mr Depp and his assistant tried to explain the texts away as being sent to placate Ms Heard, they formed the basis for the judge's findings that Mr Depp had assaulted Ms Heard on that occasion, that he blacked out at times and that, perhaps because of this, he did not recall the assault until reminded of it.

Witness evidence can also be undermined by metadata (hidden data within documents showing information such as the dates on which they were created or modified). For example, a member of Mr Depp's security team, Mr Betts, originally stated that he had seen Mr Depp with an injury on 21 April 2016 and had taken a photo of it, which was exhibited to his witness statement. He subsequently amended this to say that the photo attached to the statement was not the one he had taken, although it was similar. In cross-examination it then emerged that the photo had a date stamp of

23 March 2015 (a date on which Ms Heard accepted that she had struck Mr Depp). Due to the inconsistencies in this statement, the judge found Mr Bett's evidence that he saw an injury to Mr Depp's face on 21 April 2016 was considerably weakened. As the smallest inconsistency can be blown up to epic proportions under the microscope of cross examination, the need for witnesses and their legal teams to be completely on top of the detail of a case is vital.

Iternal Consistency of Witness Evidence: If a witness gives an account of events during cross-examination which contradicts itself, this obviously raises doubts about the credibility of their evidence. In other legal systems, witnesses can be coached so that they can practice their evidence. However, this is not permitted under English law. The most witnesses can do is to undergo witness familiarisation training, which gives them an understanding of the process of giving evidence and what is expected of them. This may help them to remain calm during cross-examination and minimise the risk of them saying something that they do not really mean.

Consistency With What the Witness Has Said on Other Occasions: If a witness says something different to what they have said (or not said) on a previous occasion this can obviously damage their credibility. During cross-examination in the Depp case, Mr Depp admitted that he had, or may have, head-butted Ms Heard. Mr Depp agreed that this was a very important detail, but when asked why it was then omitted from his witness statement, he said that he had not noticed that it was not included in his witness statement, saying, "'I am sure that I read some of [the witness statement]. I do not know that I read it all." With these words, all credibility in Mr Depp's written witness statements were lost, highlighting the clear need for witnesses to read their statements carefully and to speak up if any amendment is needed. However, witnesses can take some heart by the fact that inconsistences may not be fatal if they can be legitimately explained. For example, Ms Heard had originally said that Mr Depp had defaced a painting on 8 March 2013, only to subsequently say, having read through the materials again, she had realised the incident had actually happened on 22 March 2013. The judge accepted Ms Heard's explanation as to how the mistake had come about and her credibility remained intact.

Credit of the Witness in Relation to Matters Not Relevant to the Litigation: A judge may take the view that if a witness is willing to lie or can be shown to have acted dishonestly in an unrelated matter it is support for the proposition that he or she might be willing to lie or act dishonestly in giving evidence. In the Depp case, Mr Depp's lawyers sought to argue that Ms Heard's alleged dishonesty on other occasions should lead the judge to disbelieve her allegations of domestic violence. These arguments were unsuccessful on the particular facts of the case but evidence of dishonesty on the part of a witness should always be considered carefully for deployment in legal proceedings.

Demeanour of the Witness: Due to its subjectivity, this is perhaps the most difficult factor that judges seek to assess. Further, people are not always aware of the extent to which their own and other people's memories are unreliable, and we believe our memories to be more faithful than they are. The approach in commercial cases is to treat demeanour of witnesses with caution. In one case, Lord Justice Leggat said that it was a fallacy to suppose that, because a witness has confidence in his or her recollection and is honest, evidence based on that recollection provided any reliable guide to the truth. Instead, best approach was to place little, if any, reliance on witnesses' recollections of what was said in meetings and conversations, so basing factual findings on documentary evidence and known or probable facts. He saw the value of oral testimony was as a tool to subject the documents to critical scrutiny and to allow a judge to gauge the personality, motivations and working practices of a witness.

Unfortunately, this approach is not always possible as many matters litigated before the

courts will not be fully recorded in documents. In such cases, Judges must make findings of fact based upon all of the evidence and where a party's sworn evidence is disbelieved the court must say why. Witness familiarisation training can also help with demeanour issues and creating the right impression. Above all, it is sensible for witnesses to keep calm, consider questions carefully, to give considered and thoughtful answers and make concessions when obviously required.

Additional Factors for Consideration: Importantly, there are other factors that can mean the difference between evidence being believed or not. For example, the independence of a witness can make their evidence more credible, whereas the evidence of clearly partisan witnesses makes their evidence less credible. In the Depp case, few of the witnesses were independent because they were mainly friends, relatives or employees of Mr Depp or Ms Heard. However, the judge did note that one particular witness, Mr Murphy, was "an enthusiastic supporter of Mr Depp", quoting an email he had written to Mr Depp, which said "I'll always have your back … anytime/anywhere …". Less weight was placed on his evidence as a result.

Additionally, Occam's razor says that the simplest explanation is usually the right one. Judges are likely to deploy this principle, applying a healthy dollop of common sense, when assessing witness evidence. To give an example from the Depp case, in one incident, Mr Depp sought to explain a text to his assistant asking for drugs as being a request for prescription drugs. The judge rejected this on the grounds that, as Mr Depp's personal nurse was with him at the time, it would make no sense for his assistant to be the source of prescription drugs rather than her.

Preparing the Witness: With credibility under the microscope and every statement pored over by the other side and the court to try and trip them up, it may seem like witnesses face an impossible task. However, there are some principles that can be followed to counter this. Whilst it should go without saying that the most important thing for a witness to do is tell the truth, they must also remember that contemporaneous documents are the most important evidence for the fact-finding exercise at trial. Therefore, if a witness is to depart from what they show, he or she needs to be able to explain why. The preparation of the witness statement is also key. A witness should be closely involved in its drafting and intimately acquainted with its contents, as well as the documents exhibited to it. Any omissions should be discussed and, if necessary, added. Anything that is not completely true, or which could be misinterpreted should be removed.

Witness preparation training is another great way to get into the mindset a good witness needs. Paramount is the principle that the job of a witness is to help the judge find the truth of the case, therefore, a witness who is helpful, open and honest is far more likely to be believed than one that is evasive, combative or slippery with his or her answers. Assessing the truth or otherwise of witness evidence is notoriously difficult. Memory is fallible, and courts are having to increasingly rely on witness evidence, which many are ill-equipped to deal with. However, through thorough preparation and consideration of the intense scrutiny witness evidence will be subject to, witness credibility can be strengthened, helping judges get closer to the truth.

Benjamin Bestgen: Revenge is Mine Saith the Lord

"If a man put out the eye of another man, his eye shall be put out" and if he breaks another's bone, his shall be broken. So states Hammurabi's Code, an ancient exemplar of the precept of lex talionis. Why is revenge so compelling? Imagine you suffered a grievous wrong, the kind of wrong that scars you for life, a damage you can never undo: think about being framed for murder or a sexual offence, being cheated out of your business, life savings or education, being tortured or losing a loved one due to some terrible event like a drug addiction or fire. You may or may

not know who is responsible. Maybe you only have vague suspicions that whatever happened wasn't bad luck but caused by somebody's callous negligence, crime or intent.

Suddenly an elderly, stern-looking man appears: dark glasses, black suit and tie, holding a slim attaché. He introduces himself as Agent Graves and tells you the story of what happened to you and who is really responsible. He hands you the briefcase, explaining that it contains irrefutable evidence that what he's telling you is true, a gun and 100 rounds of ammunition. Both gun and bullets are untraceable: if any law enforcement agency discovers either in your possession or at the scene of an incident, all investigations cease immediately. You are free to do whatever you want with the briefcase and its contents. If you decide to use the gun, you'll be legally untouchable. Scenarios like this are part of Brian Azzarello's and Eduardo Risso's epic graphic novel 100 Bullets. They ask what you should do if you had the chance to exact retribution without legal consequences for a terrible wrong that was done to you. But is it revenge or justice Agent Graves offers you?

Retributive Justice: Revenge can look like a form of retributive justice: Jack hurts Jill or somebody important to her so she will inflict comparable harm on Jack to get back at him and rebalance the scale. The punishment shall fit the crime and knowing that Jill exercises revenge may deter Jack. If we replace Jack with "offender" and Jill with "the coercive power of the state", we see typical arguments for retributive justice: deterrence and proportionate punishment. Indeed, retribution is a key argument of proponents of the death penalty and some current legal systems still afford it an important role. For example, in Islamic jurisprudence, qisas is the legal doctrine providing for punishment equal to the crime in cases of murder or intentionally caused physical injury. If John assaults Chris with a cricket-bat and paralyses him, qisas permits that John should also be paralysed to condemn him to the same life and suffering he inflicted on Chris. Chris could opt instead to accept a compensation payment (diya) from John or to forgive him but it's his choice what should be done. Qisas forms part of the law in Saudi Arabia, Pakistan, the United Arab Emirates and Iran.

Differences: Some argue that revenge is to justice what lust is to love. While they overlap, they are not the same. Philosopher Robert Nozick claimed that revenge is typically personal and involves an emotional tone (Jill wants Jack to suffer), while retributive justice doesn't need to be personal and if any emotion is involved – it is satisfaction to see justice done. Justice is also more concerned with proportionality while revenge need not be: justice for a proven public insult to my honour may be payment and an apology following a defamation lawsuit. Revenge for said insult may involve a duel at dawn and digging graves. Lastly, it's often noted that in allowing revenge, feuds and vendettas, we would slip into anarchy and lawlessness by letting individuals decide how to get satisfaction for their real or imagined grievances instead of turning to the orderly realm of law for redress.

Vengeance is Divine: The Bible counsels "Never avenge yourselves but leave it to the wrath of God, for it is written: 'Vengeance is mine, I will repay.' says the Lord." (Romans 12:19). Judaism and Islam likewise advise that revenge is a divine right. Humans should cultivate a more forgiving attitude. But it's worthwhile pondering whether God wants to protect humanity from its darker impulses by preserving vengeance for himself or whether putting things right through revenge is just too great a pleasure to leave it to lesser creatures such as us?

Revenge and the Law: Legal academic William Ian Miller asserts that many arguments against revenge, such as Nozick's, are strawmen, legalistic, bureaucratic and to a degree missing the point of how justice and revenge interact. Admittedly, revenge in modern times is considered primitive or vulgar, street-justice dispensed by gangs of adolescents on each

other for turf and "tough guy" reputation. But analysing the history of Icelandic law, Miller notes that honour-based cultures like old Iceland, which permitted individual assertion through revenge, found lawlessness, arbitrary or excessive reactions to real or perceived offences just as problematic as we do today. Escalating feuds like the Hatfields vs McCoys or Montagues vs Capulets were undesirable. Icelandic law was fully aware of the social, material and political costs of vengeance being unregulated and so embedded it into its law as an honourable, law-abiding person's right to seek just retribution. First there had to be a real, proven grievance which caused the prospective avenger harm, shame and injury and was legally actionable. Any act of revenge had to be legally justified as executing the law and passing what we may call the "right thing to do" test. The targets of vengeance and the proportionality of measures had to be justifiable also or the avenger risked being declared an outlaw himself.

Closure: Miller muses that our fascination with revenge stories like Dirty Harry are that these heroes (or anti-heroes, if you wish) assist justice, not replace or undermine it. Harry helps justice to provide closure instead of probation and parole. He provides equitable remedies and assistance where the law fell short of achieving just results. He is constrained by justice, but not bureaucracy. If Harry's cause wasn't just, his motivating emotions not understandable and his methods not proportionate to the crime he seeks to remedy, we wouldn't be rooting for him. He would just become a violent bully and outlaw we had no sympathy for. But when justified vengeance is achieved and society functions again the way it should have all along if the law had worked properly, we feel content and complete. Maybe what Agent Graves offers you is neither justice nor revenge: he gives you the truth, a degree of freedom from the bureaucratic parts of justice and leaves it up to you how you may obtain closure.

Sexual Exploitation Bill Will Make Vulnerable Women Less Safe

Rachel Trafford, Each Other: Paying for sex could become a criminal offence in England and Wales if Parliament approves a new Bill which claims to protect women from sexual exploitation. But criminalisation will only further harm people who are already marginalised, argues Rachel Trafford. "You can put your whole life in danger for this money," Maria, a sex worker and Romanian interpreter, said during an English Collective of Prostitutes (ECP) event earlier this month. She has supported 50 sex workers in north London. Many came to the UK from rural areas of her home country, where unemployment is high. But on arrival in the UK, they found it hard to get work, or to obtain jobs which pay a wage they could live on. With prostitution, there is money coming quickly. And double, sometimes triple, the money you can make on the other jobs," Maria added. "Woman take this risk for children and for their family … or because they need do it."

Maria's testimony highlights the intimate link between poverty and sex work. Britain is home to more than 72,800 sex workers, according to the latest estimates, of which 88% are women. About 86% of the burden of austerity was in 2017 estimated to fall on women. Universal credit benefit reforms have pushed women to sell sex for cash, food and shelter. Meanwhile, 'hostile environment' immigration policies have denied many migrants access to social security payments if they become unemployed or destitute. In this context, sex work has provided a means of survival for some women in the UK – but one that currently comes with a significant risk of harm. Between 1990 and 2016, at least 180 sex workers are believed to have been murdered in the UK according to a database held by safety charity National Ugly Mugs. Today – International Day to End Violence Against Sex Workers – is a day to remember them and fight for sex workers' rights and safety.

Labour MP Dame Diana Johnson has put forward a private members' Bill which claims

to protect people like Maria and those she helps. Among the law reforms it would introduce is decriminalising the sale of sex, while making it a crime for their clients to pay for it. It will also create new criminal offences relating to "enabling or profiting" from another person's sexual exploitation. But the reality is this legislation would expose sex workers like Maria to even more danger, not less – by keeping the industry underground.

Sex Work and the Law: At present, sex work is partially criminalised in the UK. It is not illegal to sell sex but organisational aspects of sex work – such as soliciting in a street or public place, or working collectively in a brothel – are punishable offences. Organisations including Amnesty International, the World Health Organisation, UNAIDS, and the Royal College of Nursing have called for sex work to be fully decriminalised. They argue that criminalisation undermines the rights and safety of sex workers by pushing it underground. National Policing Sex Work guidance states that "simple enforcement does not produce sustainable outcomes and can actually increase the vulnerability of sex workers to violent attack". It adds: "Brothel closures and 'raids' create a mistrust of all external agencies including outreach services. It is difficult to rebuild trust and ultimately reduces the amount of intelligence submitted to the police and puts sex workers at greater risk." In 2016, the Home Affairs Select Committee recommended that the government fully decriminalise sex workers as the best means of ensuring their safety. However, the Home Office responded by arguing that there is not enough evidence to warrant a change in legislation. Last year, EachOther commissioned a poll which revealed that more people in the UK support sex work law reform than those who oppose it.]

Trafficking: A Distinct Issue: Speaking to the House of Common's last week, Dame Johnson said her Bill aims to "bust the business model of sex trafficking" – dampening demand by punishing buyers. "Our continued tolerance of this harmful trade puts vulnerable women and girls at ongoing risk from traffickers and pimps who seek to profit from it," she added, before reading testimonies of sex trafficking victims. The MP appears to take the view that all sex work is exploitative. However, the distinction between the sex work and sex trafficking is internationally recognised. "The difference is that the former is consensual, whereas the latter is coercive," the UN's Global Commission on HIV and the Law said in 2012. Campaigners have highlighted that the conflation of sex work with modern slavery and trafficking is particularly common when it involves migrant women.

Human trafficking is a horrific human rights violation which must be tackled. It is the use of threats, force, abduction, deception and coercion in order to control people and exploit them. Meanwhile, sex work is a consensual transaction between adults. As Maria says, it is the only means of survival for some. Trafficking exists in the sex industry but is not unique to it. In 2018, there were three times as many confirmed victims of labour exploitation (307) – often working in agriculture, garment factories, building companies and car washes – than confirmed cases of sexual exploitation (102) over the same period. Kingston University Prof Nick Mai estimates that between six and 15% of migrant sex workers in the UK have been trafficked.

The 'Nordic' model: We all have a right to health, regardless of what we do for a living. While few would disagree with this idea, the debate on how best to protect this right when it comes to sex work is polarised. Johnson's Bill aims to introduce to England and Wales the so-called Nordic model of sex industry regulation, which was first introduced in Sweden in 1999 and is in place in other European countries and Canada. Reports indicate the policy has reduced people accessing the sex industry, reducing street prostitution in Sweden by half. But academics, including the Sex Work Research Hub, say demand has simply been displaced to other, more dangerous areas.

For instance, research by the Swedish National Bureau of Investigation indicated that, since

the introduction of the Swedish sex buyer law, the number of Thai massage parlours in Stockholm had increased from 90 to 250. Norwegian outreach workers told Amnesty International in 2016 that Thai sex workers had become more reluctant to take condoms after the country adopted the Nordic model in 2009 – fearful that they could be used as evidence if found by police.

In the year after the Nordic Model was introduced in Ireland in 2017, reports of violent attacks on sex workers have increased by almost 50 percent. "People who are doing the worst of the crimes are not deterred at all by this law," says Kate McGrew, director of the Sex Workers Alliance of Ireland told the New Statesman in 2018. "People see as us even more outside society, as vulnerable, as even less likely to call gardai [police] or draw attention." Earlier this year a diverse group of 80 experts called for the law to be repealed, saying that it "places sex workers at odds with the police and the criminal process and risks their health and their safety". As it stands, many sex workers have low levels of trust in the police. An October 2020 report by the International Committee on the Rights of Sex Workers in Europe found that 36% of sex workers interviewed did not go to the police at all for fear of deportation and arrest.

Ways Forward: In 2018, academics from the London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine compared sex work laws from 33 countries around the world to determine which approach best protects sex workers' safety, health and access to services. They found that sex workers in countries with repressive policing of the profession were also three times as likely to experience violence and twice as likely to contract HIV or an STI. "Laws prohibiting sex workers and their clients from soliciting or communicating in public places [which includes the Nordic model] meant that sex workers had to rush screening and negotiations, or conduct them in secluded places, leading to greater risk of violence and theft," assistant professor Pippa Grenfell wrote for EachOther last year. The best approach was said to be full decriminalisation – a policy adopted by New Zealand in 2003.

In 2016, the Home Affairs select committee acknowledged the change had "resulted in a number of benefits, including a clear policy message, better conditions for sex workers, improved co-operation between sex workers and the police, and no detectable increase in the size of the sex industry or exploitation of sex workers." Earlier this week, a New Zealand sex worker won major compensation following a tribunal against her employer over sexual harassment. Sex work rights campaigners described the case as a "milestone", showing the power of progressive legislation to protect her rights as a worker. Organisations including Amnesty International, the World Health Organisation, UNAIDS, and the Royal College of Nursing have called for sex work to be fully decriminalised. They argue that criminalisation undermines the rights and safety of sex workers by pushing it underground.

Meanwhile, tackling exploitation in the UK sex industry, among other sectors, will involve broader reforms to reduce poverty and increase trust between authorities and vulnerable people. It means lifting people out of poverty and destitution – through initiatives such as the Real Living Wage, and making the welfare system more compassionate. However, the situation for sex workers has only worsened during the pandemic. Sex workers were not entitled to Covid job support schemes, as they lack official worker status. It has fallen to groups such the Sex Worker Advocacy and Resistance Movement (Swarm) and Umbrella Lane to plug the gap – issuing grants to enable more than 1,200 sex workers to pay for essentials such as food and rent. It also means reforming hostile environment immigration policies which have made trafficking victims fearful of authorities – despite the introduction of modern slavery legislation – as they believe the Home Office wants to remove, deport and detain them. Even in New Zealand, migrants are still left out of the rights afforded to sex workers. Studies have shown that the discrimination still leads to threats of deportation, creating conditions ripe for exploitation and trafficking.

It also vital we listen to sex workers themselves – who have unionised and are calling for their profession to be recognised as work. Responding to Johnson's Bill, An Untold Story – Voices, a campaign group of women with lived experience of sex work in the MP's Hull constituency, said: "We are disappointed that our local MP has put forward a proposal to change the law, which has not been shaped in consultation with the women most likely to understand or suffer from its effects, before we have had a chance to discuss it with her." To protect sex workers rights, their voices must be heard and listened to. Decriminalisation is where a criminal offence ceases to be treated as such. In 2003, New Zealand fully decriminalised adult sex work, instead regulating the sex industry through occupational health and safety standards. This approach is not the same as legalisation and regulation, which is used in Germany and the Netherlands among other places. In these countries, the sale of sex is legal in certain settings or circumstances, such as in licensed brothels, often with mandatory registration and HIV and sexually transmitted infection (STI) testing. But it remains a criminal offence outside these settings or where people fail to meet registration requirements.

Reframing Crime and Justice

"We must never forget that to commit crime is to make a choice. There is, however, a sliding scale of increasing inevitability that we cannot ignore. The drivers are clear – it's a lack of prospects, chaotic lifestyles, ill-health and addiction. All these underlying causes of crime can so often be addressed much more effectively by looking beyond custody, to the right interventions that really will support offenders to change their ways. If we can do that and bring down crime, why would we do anything else?"

When Minister for Justice, Robert Buckland, launched the recent sentencing white paper he expressed two of the seemingly conflicting core beliefs people hold about those who commit crime – that they make a rational pre-meditated choice to offend, and that there are factors beyond their control, which drive them to make those choices. Last week Transform Justice brought together a panel of speakers with scars on their back from their efforts to reframe the narrative on why people commit crime and what can be done about it. The event, which marked the launch of our new guide to communicating about criminal justice, was both a celebration of sector unity and a clarion call to communicate better. On the panel were organisations which had been coached in reframing messages about crime and punishment.

Andrew Neilson of the Howard League, explained why he was open to a new approach "there is only so long you can bang your head against a brick wall, without thinking you have to try something different". This involves avoiding fatalism and always establishing why a particular CJS issue matters, what the problem is and how the problem can be resolved. Stephen Bell, Chief Executive of Changing Lives, feels that the sector needs to tell more positive stories and stop being "mood hoovers". Changing Lives' strap line is "the power of positive change". The reframing research suggests values are key to engaging people with criminal justice issues. Facts on their own can be a turn off. The FrameWorks Institute tested potential values to see which inspired interest and support for progressive reform. Of those which tested best, it was the value of human potential which appealed most to Stephen and to Sherry Peck, Chief Executive of Safer London – a criminal justice system which ensures everyone has the opportunity to achieve their potential so they can contribute to society. Sherry had used reframing to support a culture change within her organisation. As leader of an organisation working with young people, she criticised the media narrative of feral youth rampaging through the mean streets of London. And felt that her organisation had colluded in that. Nowadays Safer London doesn't talk about knife crime or serious youth violence, but about young people who are affected by violence.

The Pros and Cons of Case Studies: Everyone on the panel agreed on the need to use non-stigmatising language (person who… rather than offender). But there was a difference of opinion about "case studies" – whether charities should put forward their own clients or contacts to the media. Stephen and Sherry now refuse to give the media "case studies". Stephen pointed out that the stories stayed online forever and that the individuals described later either wanted to dissociate themselves from their former life (in a positive way) or had, occasionally, actually crashed and burned. Andrew Neilson agreed that there were immense risks in fielding potentially vulnerable people, but that with time and careful training, it could be done. They put forward to Newsnight a young woman who lived in unregulated accommodation as a child. She felt she had had a positive influence on the campaign to improve standards. So there is no consensus as to whether those with lived experience should share their stories with a thirsty media. Sherry Peck thought the sector "needed to find a more sophisticated way to challenge the narrative than plunder children's stories".

Anne Fox, Chief Executive of Clinks and Chris McCully, co-ordinator of the Scottish equivalent of Clinks (the Voluntary Sector Criminal Justice Forum) discussed the challenges of getting a whole sector to sing from the same song-sheet. Reframing crime and punishment only really works if everyone buys in to the same messages – to shift views we need endless repetition and reinforcement. The reframing learning is that values and metaphors are the most powerful ways to communicate – they are both familiar and memorable. Anne Fox uses a metaphor based on gears useful and used in an article in the Times: "If I drove my car in fifth gear most of the time, when the conditions didn't suit, its performance would be affected. Imprisonment should be the fifth gear of the criminal justice system, with a purpose, for use in certain circumstances. But the car's been driven in fifth too often, with overuse of imprisonment, of the wrong people, with the wrong sentences" Anne is a practiced hand at reframing and not everyone can jump straight to using metaphors in their work. But our new guide includes lots of easy first steps for anyone who wants to dip their toe into reframing evidence – why not have a go?

Prison Humour: A nice, calm and respectable lady went into the pharmacy, right up to the pharmacist, looked straight into his eyes, and said, "I would like to buy some cyanide." The pharmacist asked, "Why in the world do you need cyanide?" The lady replied, "I need it to poison my husband." The pharmacists eyes got big and he exclaimed, "Lord have mercy! I can't give you cyanide to kill your husband! That's against the law! I'll lose my license! They'll throw both of us in jail! All kinds of bad things will happen. Absolutely not! You cannot have any cyanide!" The lady reached into her purse and pulled out a picture of her husband in bed with the pharmacist's wife. The pharmacist looked at the picture and replied, "Well now. That's different. You didn't tell me you had a prescription."

Serving Prisoners Supported by MOJUK: Walid Habib, Giovanni Di Stefano, Naweed Ali, Khobaib Hussain, Mohibur Rahman, Tahir Aziz, Roger Khan, Wang Yam, 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, Warren Slaney, Melvyn 'Adie' McLellan, Lyndon Coles, Robert Bradley, 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, Robert Knapp, Thomas Petch, Vincent and Sean Bradish, John Allen, Jeremy Bamber, Kevin Lane, Michael Brown, Robert William Kenealy, Glyn Razzell, Willie Gage, Kate Keaveney, Michael Stone, Michael Attwooll, John Roden, Nick Tucker, Karl Watson, Terry Allen, Richard Southern, Peter Hannigan.