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 829 (13/01/2021) - Cost £1

'Shameful': Just £10,000 Paid Out to Victims Of Wrongful Conviction in Two Years

Jon Robins, Justice Gap: The system for compensating the wrongly convicted has almost ground to a halt with the Ministry of Justice having received 157 applications in the last two years and only paying out £10,000. Only eight people have received compensation since the Coalition government restricted payouts with the introduction of the Anti-Social Behaviour, Crime and Policing Act 2014. Since then, the Ministry of Justice has received 316 applications for compensation including Victor Nealon and Sam Hallam who are currently challenging refusal before the European Court of Human Rights. In response to a freedom of information request submitted by the Justice Gap, the Ministry of Justice has confirmed just how effectively the 2014 reforms shut down compensation payouts for the wrongly convicted.

To put this into context, in a two-year period from 2007 to 2009 the Ministry of Justice paid out a total of £20.8 million in respect of 19 applications granted and 78 applications received. That number included two ex gratia payments. In 2006, the Labour government axed that scheme to compensate the victims of miscarriages of justice leaving just the statutory scheme. It was costing over £2 million a year to run and benefited about 10 applicants a year.

As reported on the Justice Gap, Professor John Spencer QC, of Cambridge University, damned New Labour's scrapping of the ex gratia scheme without consultation as 'monstrous'. The Coalition government compounded the problem with the 2014 legislation which restricted payouts under the statutory scheme to those people who could demonstrate their innocence 'beyond reasonable doubt'. As it went through parliament, the proposals were heavily criticised for effectively reversing the burden of proof and described by Baroness Helena Kennedy as 'an affront to our system of law' . 'It's nothing short of a scandal the way that the state now treats the victims of miscarriages of justice,' comments Glyn Maddocks, special adviser to the all-party parliamentary group on miscarriages of justice and member of the Justice Gap's advisory board. 'These people are innocent victims of state error. The current arrangement are woefully miserly and lacking in any principal.' For more information on the miscarriage of justice compensation scandal on the Justice Gap here. Former high court judge Dame Linda Dobbs DBE is the current Independent Assessor for Miscarriages of Justice appointed by the secrecy of state for justice. The assessor only determines the level of compensation and not eligibility. During Dame Linda's tenure just three payouts have been made totalling only £10,000.

The cases of Sam Hallam and Victor Nealon, who spent a total of 25 years wrongly convicted, have featured regularly on the Justice Gap – see here. Nealon's conviction was overturned by the Court of Appeal in 2013 after spending 17 years in prison. He had his conviction for attempted rape overturned after DNA testing pointed to another attacker but was still denied compensation. Sam Hallam became one of Britain's youngest miscarriage of justice victims when, at 17 years of age, he was convicted of murder after a trainee chef was stabbed during a fight in London. Hallam spent seven years in prison.

'Sam Hallam spent seven years in prison for a murder conviction which was quashed due to failings by the prosecution and police but now has to prove his innocence to get any money,' comments his solicitor Matt Foot. 'It is utterly shameful that we live in a society where miscarriages of justice victims are denied compensation.' In his case, the miscarriage of justice watchdog was highly critical of the police investigation saying that the office in charge had 'no control'. There was no forensic evidence linking Hallam to the murder, no CCTV, plus there was a shocking failure in disclosure. The police had Hallam's mobile phone with photos of him in a pub with his father earlier in the evening. Thames Valley Police, instructed by the CCRC to investigate the case, spoke to 37 separate witnesses at the busy scene and not a single one put Sam Hallam there. Tragically, his father took his life whilst he was in prison because he blamed himself for his son's predicament. Again, he was denied compensation under the legislation.

Home Office Floats Automatic Deportation After Six-Month Sentence

Freemovement: The Home Office may cut the minimum prison sentence required to trigger automatic deportation from 12 months to six months, it emerged over the holidays. The Mail and Times appear to have been briefed independently on the idea, with the former reporting that "the measures are likely to form part of the Sovereign Borders Bill, which is due to be published within the next few months". How big a change would this be? On the one hand, a significantly higher proportion of criminal sentences would now be caught by the automatic deportation rules. Around 10,000 people in England and Wales are jailed for between six and 12 months every year, which is 12-13% of all those sent to prison. Those figures are not broken down by nationality, but as around one in ten people currently serving a prison sentence is a foreign national, a back-of-the-envelope reckoning suggests that perhaps 1,000 people a year could be newly subject to automatic deportation. That certainly doesn't mean that there would be 1,000 extra deportations a year under these proposals, though. For one thing, automatic deportation already applies to people sentenced to less than 12 months but who are "persistent offenders" or have caused "serious harm". For another, there is a residual power to deport low-level offenders who tick none of the above boxes but whose removal is "conducive to the public good". So people sentenced to between six and 12 months can be, and are, deported as things stand, although they can appeal on the basis of their human rights.

'Deep Crisis' in British Prisons as Use of Force Against Inmates Doubles

Michael Savage, Guardian: The use of force against inmates has doubled over the past decade, amid continuing concern over high levels of violence and disorder in prisons. A loss of experienced prison staff, overcrowding and a subsequent growth in violence against both prisoners and staff has been blamed for force being used 49,111 times in England and Wales in the 12 months before the Covid pandemic began. According to data obtained under the Freedom of Information Act, force was used 59.1 times per 100 inmates in the year from April 2019. The last such figures, published in 2011-12, showed force used about 27 times per 100 prisoners.

Experts said the findings reflected the disorder inside a UK prison system described as in "deep crisis" last year by the European Committee for the Prevention of Torture, part of the Council of Europe. It said the jails it visited were "violent, unsafe and overcrowded". Nick Davies of the Institute for Government thinktank said the use of force was further evidence of drastically declining standards: "Deep cuts to prison funding and staff numbers in the first half of the last decade were followed by big increases in incidents of assault, self-harm and poor prisoner behaviour, and reduced opportunities for rehabilitation. "Funding injections in recent years have stabilised the system but there is a long way to go to return prisons to where they were. The government's criminal justice reforms could see the prison population reaching record levels, and it's unclear whether

planned new prisons will be ready in time to safely house additional inmates."

Mick Pimblett, assistant general secretary of the Prison Officers' Association, said this came as no surprise: "These figures coincide with a period of instability in our prisons where record levels of violence against our members by prisoners and among prisoners themselves were commonplace. The reduced staffing levels and budget cuts imposed on [HM Prison and Probation Service] in recent years are an obvious contributory factor to these figures." Since March, restrictions designed to stop the spread of Covid have also led to a fall in violence. Visits have been curtailed, inmates have spent far more time in cells, and group activities have been reduced. There is now debate about how to lift some of the restrictions without a return to chaos. Peter Clarke, the recently departed chief inspector of prisons, warned that the pressures on the system "will not have gone away because of the health emergency". Pimblett said officers were now attempting to ensure that the system did not revert to the "lawless" state experienced just before the pandemic. "Since March 2020, the Covid crisis has proved that – with improved staffing levels, investment and spans of control – violence can be reduced in prisons by building relationships with prisoners in a way that was not possible prior to March 2020."

But Frances Crook of the Howard League for Penal Reform said the pandemic had revealed some "really awful" aspects of prison life. "Prisons were so violent and so under-resourced that people would prefer to sit locked in their cells all alone or with somebody else watching television all day and all night. If that is preferable, it's an incredibly damning indictment [of] how violent and frightening prisons were before."

Nick Hardwick, chief inspector of prisons from 2010 to 2016, said there was now an opportunity to improve conditions. "Prisons, up to the epidemic, were in the middle of an enduring crisis. Too many prisons were very violent places. As restrictions in prisons are eased, it is critical that it is done in a way that doesn't allow us simply to return to what existed before – and doesn't let the cycle of violence get out of hand. For the first time in a decade, there are some opportunities now. We can't go back to how it was before."

The Prison Service said: "Our officers use force as a last resort, and in the overwhelming majority of cases it is unfortunately necessary to protect themselves or others from harm. We are spending £100m to bolster prison security, clamping down on the weapons, drugs and mobile phones that fuel violence and crime behind bars."It said the term "use of force" covered techniques ranging from those which staff used to prevent themselves being hurt, to restraint carried out by a three-officer team to control a violent prisoner. Violence fell by 37% in the most recent quarter for which data is available, and by 19% in the 12 months to June 2020.

MI6 Unilaterally Assumed Power to Break Law on UK Soil

At the Investigatory Powers Tribunal today (16/12/2020), it was revealed that MI6 may have unilaterally assumed the power to authorise agents to commit crimes in the UK – potentially without any legal basis or limits on the crimes they can commit. Reprieve, the Pat Finucane Centre, Privacy International, and CAJ have been challenging a secret policy under which MI5 authorises covert agents, known as covert human intelligence sources or CHIS, to commit crimes in the UK. Late last year, the Investigatory Powers Tribunal issued the first split ruling in its history, finding only by a bare majority that MI5's activity was lawful.

It was revealed today that there may be a separate MI6 policy to break the law in the UK, and that the Government has for more than a year urged the Tribunal to keep it secret, despite admitting that it "does not raise a national security argument against disclosure". MI6 appears to be operating

this policy despite Parliament having only given them powers to break the law overseas, under section 7 of the Intelligence Services Act. Concerns that agencies may be authorising agents to commit crimes in the UK without any limits to ensure that murder, torture, or sexual violence are not authorised have been intensified by these revelations about MI6's secret law-breaking policy.

Earlier this year, MI6 was forced by the Tribunal to apologise when its officers wrongly sought to stop independent judges from scrutinising the agency's activities. Today's disclosures make clear that it was the existence of this secret policy which MI6 sought to cover up. These revelations come only a day after the Investigatory Powers Commissioner severely criticised MI6 for "several weaknesses" in its agent-running within the UK, leading to "several errors". It found that MI6 needed to "better recognise" and "authorise activity in compliance with" the law in the UK. This Government is now seeking to put these practices into legislation with the Covert Human Intelligence Sources (Criminal Conduct) Bill, which at present contains no express limits on the crimes covert agents may be permitted to commit, even against torture, murder, or sexual violence.

Maya Foa, Reprieve's Executive Director, said: "We've learned today that MI6 unilaterally assumed the power to authorise unchecked agent law-breaking on UK soil, going far beyond the rules set for them by Parliament. In light of this secret power-grab, Parliament should think twice about giving assent to the Government's CHIS bill, which places no express limits on agent lawbreaking even for crimes like murder, torture, or rape".

Daniel Holder of Belfast-based human rights NGO the Committee on the Administration of Justice (CAJ), said: "The Northern Ireland peace process was predicated on a future of law enforcement accountability including for covert policing, with the PSNI subject to powerful oversight bodies. There was therefore major controversy when MI5 were formally given 'primacy' for running 'national security' informants here in October 2007, which led to some very limited but at least publicly available safeguards being built into the UK-Ireland St Andrews Agreement. It now however transpires another agency -MI6- can also run and 'authorise' informants to commit crimes here but on the basis of a policy kept entirely secret."

Ilia Siatitsa, Programme Director at Privacy International, said: "The intelligence agencies' powers derive from the democratically elected parliament. Today, we have discovered MI6 may have authorised criminal acts in the UK in secret without parliamentary approval. The European Court of Human Rights has repeatedly said that 'a system of secret surveillance set up to protect national security may undermine or even destroy democracy under the cloak of defending it'. Today's revelations are a stark example of how such concerns can materialise. The disregard that the intelligence agencies have shown for fundamental democratic procedures and the rule of law is deeply concerning."

Paul O'Connor, Director of the Pat Finucane Centre, said: "It is not surprising that a Government that refuses to properly investigate the role of its own intelligence agencies in the 1989 murder of Pat Finucane would turn a blind eye to criminal authorisations in 2020."

Shrinking the Space for Human Rights - A Look Back on 2020

A raft of new laws, Home Office measures and government proposals attempt to restrict the legal accountability of state actors, including ministers, while removing legal protections from those who need them most. In this IRR News long read, Frances Webber examines the various threats to human rights over the last year. In the year since Boris Johnson's Conservatives won the election with an impregnable majority, the man described by the media as a 'libertarian by instinct' has, under cover of the pandemic, pushed through the most authoritarian, draconian emergency powers

seen in peacetime. Meanwhile, his home secretary has overseen an immigration policy which threatens to breach the Refugee Convention as well as international obligations on rights to dignity and health and the rights and welfare of children, drawing the wrath of several senior officials, who have resigned, and the condemnation of official monitors and the courts. The government's legislative programme has included Bills which break international law – not only the EU Withdrawal Bill but one which authorises informants and spies to commit any crime with complete impunity, and another which time-bars prosecution for murder and torture by British forces abroad.

At the same time as creating impunity for law-breaking by informants and soldiers, the government is seeking to develop its own impunity. The possibility of leaving the European Court of Human Rights (ECtHR) and replacing the Convention (ECHR) by a British Bill of Rights is being mooted again, and moves are afoot to limit courts' powers to hold ministers to account, through restrictions on judicial review and curtailing the powers of the Supreme Court. Critical reports from parliamentary committees, government-appointed inquiries and reviews, and even court judgments, have been ignored. And even investigative journalists have been blocked by a secretive Cabinet Office unit.

Impunity in Policing Dissent: As the Black Lives Movement emerged, ministers, while careful to express horror at the brutality of the treatment of George Floyd and concern at injustice, soon proceeded to label BLM protesters in the UK as 'mobs', 'thugs and criminals', reportedly seeking fast-track prosecutions within 24 hours of arrests and proposing more police powers to crack down on protest. The state's equation of protest, dissent and criminality, and its willingness to collude in law-breaking, are vividly on show at the Undercover Policing ('Spycops') inquiry, which started hearing oral evidence in November. Commissioned in 2015, it reveals how since 1968, up to 1,000 mainly left-wing and anti-racist political and campaigning groups, and the family of Stephen Lawrence, were infiltrated by police, whose crimes included having sexual relationships with activists by deception (in some cases fathering children); stealing the identities of dead children; facilitating criminal protests; committing perjury by giving evidence to criminal courts 'in character', resulting in miscarriages of justice; and colluding in crimes including murder and perverting the course of justice. It is not expected to report until 2023.

The government is not waiting. Its Covert Human Intelligence Sources (Criminal Conduct) Bill (CHIS Bill) gives carte blanche for undercover police and informants to commit any and all crimes in the course of the state's business, immune from criminal and civil liability. No prior judicial authority is required; the Bill places no limits on the crimes that can be authorised (as former Director of Public Prosecutions Ken MacDonald QC observed, it will be easier for police to commit a serious crime than to search a shed); and the purposes are not limited to grave matters of national security but include the interests of public order or the economic well-being of the UK (legitimising illegal disruption of trade union activity).

The government argues that the Bill merely puts on a statutory footing the current ad-hoc arrangements, but as critics argue, its blanket advance immunity is very different from the current case-by-case scrutiny of the public interest in prosecution by the CPS, and the civil redress available for victims, which the Bill removes – leaving no remedy, in violation of the right to redress guaranteed by Article 13 ECHR. MPs, peers, trades unions, rights groups and even former undercover police have issued grave warnings about the failure to put explicit limits on the crimes that can be authorised under the legislation. And a joint briefing by Reprieve, the Committee for the Administration of Justice (CAJ), Pat Finucane Centre, Privacy International and Rights & Security International has also drawn attention to state collusion with crimes in Northern Ireland, including the 1989 murder of solicitor Pat Finucane (which according to an official report was 'actively furthered and facilitated' by

employees of the state, who 'in the aftermath … [engaged in] a relentless attempt to defeat the ends of justice').[Such crimes, the groups say, 'fuelled the conflict, damaged the rule of law and have left a poisoned legacy to this day'. Rights groups thus remain unconvinced by the government's assertion that the Human Rights Act provides the necessary protection against authorisation of murder, torture or rape, the lack of prior judicial consent, the removal of the power to prosecute and of victims' right to seek redress.[6] But with Labour whipped to abstain – provoking a rebellion by 34 MPs and the sacking of seven Labour frontbenchers – the Bill passed its Commons stages in October 2020.

How Legislation Enlists Children as Informants: Shockingly, the Bill failed to ban the use of children as informants, a practice only revealed in July 2018 when a House of Lords subcommittee flagged up regulations extending the period for which children may be deployed from one to four months. In a Lords debate in October 2018, Baroness Sally Hamwee spoke of a 17-year-old among a group of girls sold for sex by a man she thought of as her boyfriend, then enlisted by police to collect information about her pimp – which led her to become an accessory to murder. A legal challenge led to a draft revised code of guidance, stating that children ('juveniles') should only be used as informants in 'exceptional circumstances', but ministers refuse to ban the practice. As Rosalind Comyn, legal and policy officer at Rights Watch (UK) has said, 'Enlisting children as foot soldiers in the darkest corners of policing, and intentionally exposing them to terrorism, crime or sexual abuse rings – potentially without parental consent – runs directly counter to the government's human rights obligations [under the UN Children's Rights Convention and domestic law], which demand the interests of children be placed at the heart of decisions which affect them. It is also an affront to the government's own safeguarding guidance, which requires our public authorities to help children escape crime, not become more deeply embedded in it.'

The Home Office – a Culture of Impunity: The Home Office has been no less brutal in its treatment of vulnerable refugees and migrants. Despite the rising death toll caused by the lack of legal, safe routes and the militarisation of the English Channel, and despite strong campaigning and fierce opposition in the House of Lords, the government scrapped the obligation it had accepted in 2018 to negotiate to retain a mechanism for child refugees stranded in Europe to join asylum seeking family members here, in pursuance of a plan to remove these rights. Equally retrogressive is its attempt to violate the key obligation of non-refoulement in the Refugee Convention, through the promise of legislation to 'deny asylum' to those using 'illegal routes' to enter the UK. Earlier in the year, when, with borders closed, it was physically impossible for anyone to be deported, and the Home Office was refusing to release immigration detainees, many immigration judges granted bail, since the only lawful rationale for detention is for deportation. In an arrogant reversal of accountability, the Home Office wrote to judges demanding an explanation for the release of so many detainees.

Now, in its rush to remove new arrivals as quickly as possible before Brexit, the Home Office has cut corners and acted illegally, according to lawyers and detention visitors. At least one senior Home Office official has resigned and others have expressed concern over the prioritisation of 'cruel and quite brutal' enforcement over children's welfare – resulting in some cases in separation of children from parents and in others the use of physical force on children. An unlawful practice of curtailing asylum interviews so as not to ask questions which would identify trafficked children, to whom special duties are owed – creating a 'serious risk of injustice and of irreversible harm', as a judge ruled in November, continued despite his ruling. The Court of Appeal ruled in October that the Home Office had for five years acted unlawfully in removing people at such short notice that they could not seek legal advice – a policy pursued in 40,000 cases, which 'risked removing people with a legal right to be in the country'.

In this fevered climate of enforcement, the health, physical and mental, of those under the care of the Home Office is a low priority. Prison inspectors examining Home Office asylum reception arrangements found hundreds of wet, cold migrants forced to spend hours in cramped containers on a 'rubble-strewn building site' without access to dry clothes, bedding or washing facilities in October. The following month, four independent monitoring boards reported that asylum seekers crossing in small boats faced 'inhumane treatment' (violating an absolute prohibition in the Human Rights Act) from arrival to departure, including being moved between detention centres with untreated broken bones, burns and cancer, and children held in adult detention centres. Over half of those detained for removal at one centre became suicidal or self-harming – but were still put on deportation charter flights.

Sidestepping the Windrush Lessons Learned review: The new 'compassionate culture' promised by Priti Patel in her response to the Windrush Lessons Learned review by Wendy Williams, published in March this year, includes the wholesale dumping of asylum seekers during the pandemic in shared, insanitary accommodation (a practice condemned by the Public Accounts Committee); evicting refused asylum seekers (a policy resumed in September after a six-month pause) and making rough sleeping a ground for deportation. The Williams review, published in March 2020, found that what happened to Caribbean pensioners affected by hostile environment policies was 'foreseeable and avoidable'. The 'culture of disbelief and carelessness', Williams wrote, 'must change'; the Home Office must acknowledge the wrong done, open itself up to greater external scrutiny, and policy must 'be rooted in humanity'. The Home Office pledged to implement all the 30 recommendations. But we are learning never to believe such pledges.

Even as they are held up as a foil to the 'dangerous criminals' deported to Jamaica at the beginning of December, the original victims are treated with contempt. With fewer than 200 compensated of the over 13,000 affected, and only £1.6 million of the estimated £200-£570 million for compensation paid out, with nine dead before they could be compensated and with victims still destitute, the scheme's head of policy, former barrister Alexandra Ankrah, resigned, saying it was 'systematically racist' and unfit for purpose. Officials administering the scheme, who had implemented hostile environment policies, brought with them the same attitudes, 'not just racism, [but] an unwillingness to look with any curiosity or genuine concern at the situation of victims', she said. Journalist Amelia Gentleman, whose reports publicised the scandal, said the scheme's delays, extremely low payouts and very high amount of proof demanded produce 'an uncomfortable echo … of the original problems where the Home Office was refusing to believe people'.

Overseas Operations Bill – Legislating for Impunity Abroad: Broken promises of redress, contempt for victims and nonchalant lawbreaking form part of a culture of impunity for the powerful, and an assault on legal accountability. Mirroring the CHIS Bill which gives agents impunity for UK crime, the Overseas Operations (Service Personnel and Veterans) Bill (OOB) creates a presumption against prosecution for human rights abuses committed on operations abroad after five years, including murder and torture, and prevents claims against the MoD after six years. This defies international humanitarian law (which regulates the conduct of warfare), as well as international human rights law including the UN Convention Against Torture, which bans any grant of impunity or statute of limitation in the case of torture. The government's law officers – the attorney-general, the solicitor-general and the lord chancellor – all voted for the Bill; and Labour leader Keir Starmer, a human rights lawyer, whipped Labour MPs at second reading not to vote against it but abstain, and three junior shadow ministers lost their jobs for voting against it.

The Bill is the culmination of the pushback against the campaign for accountability for abuses in Iraq and Afghanistan, which started when the courts ruled in a number of cases that British soldiers breached the Geneva Conventions (the laws of war) and subjected Iraqi civilians in their custody to inhuman and degrading treatment, and intensified after the Al-Sweady inquiry cleared British soldiers of murdering detainees. In presenting the Bill, ministers portrayed the soldiers as victims – of what Policy Exchange, the government's go-to thinktank, dubs 'lawfare'.

European Convention of Human Rights to be Reviewed? But then the OOB, like the CHIS Bill, cannot stand with the European Convention on Human Rights – and the ECHR has long been in the sights of powerful Conservative ministers and their advisers. Policy Exchange, whose alumni include Michael Gove, Munira Mirza, Trevor Phillips and David Goodhart, has long campaigned to repeal the Human Rights Act and leave the European Court of Human Rights. It argues that English law protects human rights perfectly well, without the imposition of a supranational jurisdiction which frequently imposes 'newly invented legal requirements on states'. The OOB had its origin in the landmark ECtHR ruling that human rights obligations applied to British soldiers abroad, which infuriated right-wing Tories, as did the Court's interventions in deportation cases such as Abu Qatada, the Jordanian imam accused of support for terrorism. The Tory Right has campaigned against the Human Rights Act (which incorporated the ECHR into UK law)[16] ever since its passage in 1998, arguing that it gives rights to foreign offenders and other 'undeserving' groups. In 2011, the coalition government set up a 'Bill of Rights Commission' to examine replacing the ECHR by a British Bill of Rights, and a pledge to repeal the Human Rights Act featured in the 2015 election manifesto. But liberal Tories pushed back, joined by senior judges and rights groups, and the issue subsided, overtaken by the 2016 Brexit vote.

Now, with the UK in trouble with the Council of Europe over issues including prisoners' voting rights and security force killings and collusion in Northern Ireland, and recent ECHR decisions on deportation, the ECHR is back on the agenda. One of the Brexit negotiation sticking points in November was said to be the government's refusal to give an undertaking to adhere to the Convention. The 2019 Conservative Manifesto pledged to 'update' the Human Rights Act, and in December 2020, a review of the Act was announced, with a panel including former appeal court judge Sir Stephen Laws, senior fellow at Policy Exchange's Judicial Power Project (see below). Its themes include 'whether domestic courts are being unduly drawn in to areas of policy' and whether the Act ought to apply outside the UK. Rights groups fear it will aim to limit access to legal protection by asylum seekers and other vulnerable groups.

Loosing the Chains of Law: The same theme, that judges have wrongly assumed powers to intervene in constitutional and 'political' matters where they have no right to, informs the government's proposal for a Constitution, Rights & Democracy Commission, to 'examine the broader aspects of our constitution … and develop proposals to restore trust in our institutions and in how our democracy operates'. The initiative emerged out of fury at the supreme court's ruling that Johnson's suspension of parliament was null and void. Other high-profile judgments such as that Gerry Adams' internment was unlawful, that Shamima Begum must be allowed to attend her revocation of citizenship appeal, that exorbitant fees for children to exercise their right to citizenship breached their rights – added fuel to the fire. Once again, the government takes its tune from Policy Exchange, whose Judicial Power Project aims to 'correct the undue rise in judicial power', arguing that 'the ongoing expansion of judicial power increasingly corrodes the rule of law and effective, democratic government'. A parliamentary committee is currently taking evidence on what the Commission's priorities and workload should be.

A third body tasked to clip the wings of the judges is the Independent Review of Administrative Law (IRAL), set up in July 2020 and chaired by Lord Faulks, a Bill of Rights Commission member who called for leaving the Human Rights Convention and repeal of the HRA, and has accused the supreme court of 'unconstitutional' trespass on prerogative powers over its prorogation judgment. (He has praised the work of Policy Exchange in this field.) IRAL is examining legal challenges to administrative decisions, within the framework of the 'need to strike a balance between the right of citizens to challenge government through the courts and the elected government's right to govern'. As Liberty points out, the dichotomy is false: 'judicial review is essential to good governance', by ensuring that 'public bodies discharge their legal duties, do not abuse their powers and act compatibly with the rights of those affected by their actions'. Judicial review is a powerful and inexpensive tool to ensure that 'official decisions are lawful, reasonable and fair' – a constitutional right, according to a senior constitutional expert, which 'allows ordinary people to ask an independent judge to decide whether a public body has acted lawfully or not' and bridges the 'imbalance of power between individuals and the state', as the Law Society said. But it seems the last thing this government wants is to remedy this 'imbalance of power'.

Instead, lawyers and the judges who attempt to keep government action within the law are held up to public hatred as villains. When judges stayed the removal of most of the proposed deportees on the December charter flight to Jamaica – the first since March – immigration minister Chris Philps blamed law firms using 'last-minute tactics', rather than questioning whether Home Office officials had indeed learned any lessons from the Windrush scandal. Blaming the lawyers, attacking them as 'activist' 'do-gooding' 'lefty lawyers', seems to have become a knee-jerk response to losing in court. The result of such rhetoric, which comes from the top, has been the extension of the kind of hate crimes associated with the 'hostile environment' to the spaces where lawyers work. Dismayed by a 'violent racist attack' by a man with a knife on a member of staff at a London law firm, as well as evidence that other immigration law firms are being targeted with serious threats, immigration law firms are taking action to secure their offices and protect their staff. Yet the unprecedented chorus of disapproval from senior judges and national and international legal bodies at the inflammatory language from the prime minister and the home secretary, far from restraining them, seems to goad them into further verbal attacks.With the Equality and Human Rights Commission transformed by recent appointments from a (tooth-decayed) watchdog into an instrument of government policy, a Cabinet Office unit blocking 'sensitive' FOI requests from too-zealous investigative journalists, and court rulings met with threats to curtail jurisdiction, the government is well on the way to violating human rights with impunity.

Miscarriage of Justice Watchdog Calls For a Review of Juries

Jon Robins and Noah Robinson, Justice Gap: The miscarriage of justice watchdog has called for a review of the role of juries highlighting the absence of reasoning for verdicts as an impediment to progress on referring cases of those wrongly convicted under joint enterprise. In a submission to the House of Lords' Constitution Committee inquiry into COVID-19, the Criminal Cases Review Conviction (CCRC) argued that the pandemic has led to debate 'whether small juries or trials in the absence of a jury may be a viable option' to help clear the backlog of cases.

The group highlighted its own problems reviewing joint enterprise cases in the aftermath of the 2016 Jogee ruling in which the Supreme Court held that the controversial law had taken 'a wrong turn in 1984'. Lord Neuberger handed down judgment saying: 'This court is always very cautious before departing from a previous decision. It is the responsibility of this court to put the law right.' The miscarriage of justice watchdog in its 2018 annual report reported

that it received 103 applications based on the ruling. 'Since the Supreme Court's decision in 2016, only two convictions under the "old" law have been quashed by the Court of Appeal,' the CCRC said in its new report. 'In the CCRC's view, were juries required to give reasons, there would be considerably more certainty as to the safety (or otherwise) of any conviction reached under the "old" law.' According to CCRC, it is 'extremely challenging' to demonstrate that the correct legal direction 'would, in fact, have made a difference without first knowing on which basis the jury reached their original decision' . 'The act of examining the jury's verdict and seeking to infer findings of fact is fraught with difficulty and, arguably, unsatisfactory in an appellate system which relies upon the primacy of the jury's verdict,' it continued.

The barrister Felicity Gerry QC, who was lead counsel in the Jogee case, is critical of the watchdog's approach to the cases. 'About a thousand people remain in prison wrongly convicted,' she told the Justice Gap. 'Rather than challenge the approach of the Court of Appeal, the CCRC has taken the disappointing approach of accepting the injustices perpetuated by the court in choosing factual options to uphold wrongly achieved convictions. It is remarkable that the CCRC is seeking clarity on reasons for jury verdicts instead of arguing that convictions are unsafe. Perhaps that shows how wrong the Court of Appeal must be.' Gerry argues that upholding guilty verdicts 'when at least one option given to a jury is incorrect, especially when one option is wrong in law seems contrary to the very purpose of a second appeal'. 'It might have been better for the CCRC to be plainer on how they have found themselves unable to refer unjust cases post Jogee,' she added.

The CCRC highlighted a number of instances of cases which raised serious concerns about the conduct of juries, including a robbery trial in which the foreman contacted the court expressing concern that they had returned the wrong verdict. 'Interviews with the jury less than a month after the trial resulted in a confused and contradictory response as to what the correct verdict was,' the CCRC reported. 'The CCRC also discovered that nine members of the jury were part of a "WhatsApp" group.' The Court of Appeal quashed the conviction. In another case, a prison officer sat on a jury where the defendant was held on remand at the prison where they worked unbeknown to the judge. The watchdog argues that the 'secret nature' of jury deliberations means that the system is 'reliant on a member of the jury "blowing the whistle"' on any errors. According to the CCRC, its work is often 'complicated' by the jury system and the 'absence of reasons for their verdicts'. Any change to the deliberations would help tackle the challenge in 'demonstrating that the correct legal decision' was reached 'without first knowing on which basis the jury reached their original decision'.

Julian Assange: UK Judge Blocks Extradition Due to Concerns Over Mental Health

Zaki Sarraf, Justice Gap: A court in London Monday 4th January 2021 ruled that while US prosecutors met the test for Wikileaks founder Julian Assange to be extradited it was 'satisfied the procedures described by the US' would not prevent him from 'finding a way to commit suicide'. Assange founded WikiLeaks in 2006 and the US justice department claimed that whistle-blower website endangered lives and filed 17 charges in 2020 for violating the Espionage Act. His lawyers stated that if he is to be extradited to the US and convicted, he could face a possible penalty of up to 175 years in jail. Yesterday, District Judge Vanessa Baraitser said: 'Faced with the conditions of near total isolation without the protective factors which limited his risk at HMP Belmarsh, I am satisfied the procedures described by the US will not prevent Mr Assange from finding a way to commit suicide and for this reason I have decided extradition would be oppressive by reason of mental harm and I order his discharge.'

Professor Michael Kopelman had prepared two reports on Assange's mental health, dated

17 December 2019 and 13 August 2020. At the time of his December 2019 report, Prof Kopelman – an emeritus professor of neuropsychiatry at King's College London – diagnosed a recurrent depressive disorder which was sometimes accompanied by psychotic features and often with ruminative suicide ideas. I am as confident as a psychiatrist ever can be that, if extradition to the United States were to become imminent, Mr Assange will find a way of suiciding.' Jennifer Robinson, barrister at Doughty Street Chambers and a member of Assange's legal team stated that 'it is a welcome decision in the sense that the Judge recognized in her judgment that Julian should not be extradited.' However, Robinson also said that the extradition was not blocked for press freedom concerns, rather it was blocked on the narrow grounds of Assange's declining mental health condition and the specific prison conditions he would face upon return to the US. 'It is still very concerning and free speech groups should still be concerned… as the Judge agreed with the US prosecutors in all other matters,' Robinson continued. The US authorities have 14 days in which to lodge an appeal and they are expected to do so. Mr Assange was taken back to Belmarsh prison, and his legal team are expected to apply for his bail.

Covid Pandemic Fueling Digital Repression Worldwide

Adrian Shahbaz, Allie Funk, Freedom Net: The coronavirus pandemic is accelerating a dramatic decline in global internet freedom. For the 10th consecutive year, users have experienced an overall deterioration in their rights, and the phenomenon is contributing to a broader crisis for democracy worldwide. In the COVID-19 era, connectivity is not a convenience, but a necessity. Virtually all human activities—commerce, education, health care, politics, socializing—seem to have moved online. But the digital world presents distinct challenges for human rights and democratic governance. State and nonstate actors in many countries are now exploiting opportunities created by the pandemic to shape online narratives, censor critical speech, and build new technological systems of social control. Three notable trends punctuated an especially dismal year for internet freedom.

First, political leaders used the pandemic as a pretext to limit access to information. Authorities often blocked independent news sites and arrested individuals on spurious charges of spreading false news. In many places, it was state officials and their zealous supporters who actually disseminated false and misleading information with the aim of drowning out accurate content, distracting the public from ineffective policy responses, and scapegoating certain ethnic and religious communities. Some states shut off connectivity for marginalized groups, extending and deepening existing digital divides. In short, governments around the world failed in their obligation to promote a vibrant and reliable online public sphere.

Second, authorities cited COVID-19 to justify expanded surveillance powers and the deployment of new technologies that were once seen as too intrusive. The public health crisis has created an opening for the digitization, collection, and analysis of people's most intimate data without adequate protections against abuses. Governments and private entities are ramping up their use of artificial intelligence (AI), biometric surveillance, and big-data tools to make decisions that affect individuals' economic, social, and political rights. Crucially, the processes involved have often lacked transparency, independent oversight, and avenues for redress. These practices raise the prospect of a dystopian future in which private companies, security agencies, and cybercriminals enjoy easy access not only to sensitive information about the places we visit and the items we purchase, but also to our medical histories, facial and voice patterns, and even our genetic codes.

The third trend has been the transformation of a slow-motion "splintering" of the internet into an all-out race toward "cyber sovereignty," with each government imposing its own internet

regulations in a manner that restricts the flow of information across national borders. For most of the period since the internet's inception, business, civil society, and government stakeholders have participated in a consensus-driven process to harmonize technical protocols, security standards, and commercial regulation around the world. This approach allowed for the connection of billions of people to a global network of information and services, with immeasurable benefits for human development, including new ways to hold powerful actors to account.

Allure of Cyber Sovereignty: Rather than protecting users, the application of national sovereignty to cyberspace has given authorities free rein to crack down on human rights while ignoring objections from local civil society and the international community. China's regime, a pioneer in this field and the world's worst abuser of internet freedom for the sixth year in a row, has long blocked popular foreign services and centralized technical infrastructure to allow for the pervasive monitoring and filtering of all traffic coming into the country. Following this model, Russian authorities have passed legislation to isolate the country from the international internet during national emergencies, and Iran's government similarly cut off connections to hide the police's violent response to mass protests in late 2019.

Recent events in Hong Kong illustrate in frightening detail the implications of greater state control over the online civic space. The leadership in Beijing directly imposed a draconian National Security Law on the autonomous region, prescribing harsh punishments for broadly defined speech offenses that encompass any expressions of solidarity with prodemocracy protesters. To escape such penalties, political websites, online forums, personal social media accounts, and entire apps engaged in preemptive closures or deletions. At the same time, US technology companies announced that they would suspend data-sharing agreements with local law enforcement officials to avoid complicity in human rights abuses. Authorities could raise the cost of noncompliance by mandating that companies store user data within the jurisdiction or face blocking, large fines, or the arrest of company representatives.

Alarmingly, these sorts of practices are not unique to the world's most repressive regimes. Countries across the democratic spectrum are erecting their own digital borders in a sign of fraying trust in the open internet. The United States and India banned many popular Chinese apps, citing national security concerns. Legislators in Brazil, Nigeria, and Turkey passed or considered regulations requiring companies to keep user data from leaving the country, meaning law enforcement agencies would have easier access to sensitive information. The European Union's highest court found that US national security programs violate Europeans' privacy rights, invalidating one of the world's largest data-sharing agreements. Even when aimed at curbing repressive practices, these actions serve to legitimize the push for each state to oversee its own "national internet," which was previously championed only by autocratic governments in countries such as China, Iran, and Russia.

A Stronger Role for Global Civil Society: The best way to stave off the rise of cyber sovereignty is to restore confidence in the legitimacy and efficacy of the existing multistakeholder model. This means envisioning new systems of internet and platform governance that uphold democratic principles of popular representation and participation. Current self-regulatory mechanisms run into difficulties when the public interest contrasts with the self-interest of the tech industry. While the scale of the international discussion—and of the leading platforms themselves—makes it difficult to incorporate input from all members of the public, global civil society organizations can provide the expertise and independent oversight required to tackle some of the problems surrounding the impact of technology on human rights.

Future initiatives on platform governance and content moderation should go beyond mere transparency. They will have to ensure that systemic human rights deficiencies flagged by various independent assessments are addressed and replaced with updated rights-respecting practices and policies for the entire internet and telecommunications industry.

As COVID-19 has demonstrated, addressing the challenges of an interconnected world requires effective coordination among policymakers and civil society from all countries. For matters related to competition, taxation, and cross-border data flows, for example, intergovernmental coordination is likely to prove more effective than ad hoc state regulation, due to the internet's global nature. New institutions built for the digital age can manage transnational problems that do not fall neatly under one government's jurisdiction, while ensuring that users in smaller or less powerful countries receive the same protections and care as their counterparts in large democracies. This international, multistakeholder approach will not halt the efforts of the Chinese and Russian governments to fortify themselves against—and impose their will on—the global network, but it may limit short-sighted regulatory initiatives by established and aspiring democracies, preventing a further splintering of the internet.

An irreplaceable Asset For Democracy: There is tremendous value to an internet that is open, free, and global. Even in settings that are otherwise highly oppressive, an unrestricted online space offers immeasurable possibilities for free expression, community engagement, and economic development. But when civic organizing and political dissent overflow from the realm of social media onto the streets of cities like Minsk, Khartoum, and Caracas, dictators shut down networks to choke off any calls for greater democracy and human rights. State and nonstate actors drown out political dissent by spreading fear and disinformation on online platforms, even resorting to arrests and physical intimidation in some cases. Protesters from Hong Kong to Minneapolis—equipped with cameras and the courage of their convictions—risk retribution from the world's most technologically advanced security forces.

If digital communication platforms are to advance the cause of human rights in the 21st century, the internet freedom movement must raise its ambitions from simply demanding policies that respect basic rights, to actually building robust governance structures that enshrine and enforce those protections. This report outlines concrete recommendations for governments, technology companies, and civil society on how to rekindle faith in a free internet and push back against digital authoritarianism and repressive cyber sovereignty. Reversing the antidemocratic transformation of today's internet is a vital step in preventing even worse outcomes that could arise from the digital technologies of tomorrow.

New Lockdown Will Bring Desolation to Prisons

Frances Crook', Howard League for Penal Reform: The last ten months have been extremely difficult for all of us, and my heart goes out to the families who have lost a loved one. It has, of course, been particularly awful for prisoners and challenging for prison staff. The prospect of more months locked in a small cell, either alone or crammed into a cell designated for one person but forced to share with someone else, is terrible. This, my first blog of the new year, is bleak. There seems to be evidence that during the initial lockdown, good communication from governors helped prisoners to join with the rest of the community in understanding that to a certain extent we were all in it together and we had to go through the isolation for a limited time.

The closure of the courts meant fewer people sent into jails on short sentences or remand and as releases continued, the number of men, women and children in prison started to

go down. Additional single cell accommodation was dropped into some prisons. The result was an easing of overcrowding – not its eradication, but an easing of the pressure. We have asked for early release to be increased, better support for people on release, every effort inside prisons to get people at least one hour outdoor walking or exercise a day, investment in healthier food, and as much activity and contact with staff as can safely be delivered The number of people dying in prison by their own hand went down. It was still happening, but not in anything like the number that we had seen before. Self-injury appeared to reduce too, possibly because isolation was preferable to the uncontrolled violence that had been daily life.

I don't think this is tenable. Before Christmas the rate of self-injury appeared to be creeping up and people are taking their own lives by suicide. The new announcement will bring desolation to prisons. The prospect of sitting in a cell for months to come, with nothing to do but watch television, having not seen family for almost a year, little exercise or purpose and hardly any social interaction, will be devastating. I am really worried. I have a conversation booked with the Minister and I will tell her this. We have asked for early release to be increased, better support for people on release, every effort inside prisons to get people at least one hour outdoor walking or exercise a day, investment in healthier food, and as much activity and contact with staff as can safely be delivered. It is not acceptable, it is not safe, to lock people up all day. The consequences will be catastrophic.

Brutal Lockdown in Berwyn Prison

In the last FRFI we highlighted the sickening comments by Prison Officers' Association (POA) chair Mark Fairhurst, who welcomed prisoners being locked down due to Covid, as it gave the staff more control. Long-term prisoner Kenny Carter replies. I have spent 31 years in these hell holes, ghosted and moved over 200 times, with 15 years in solitary confinement in special units, cages and blocks. I've endured 18 years as a Cat A, been subjected to horrendous brutality and psychological torture, and witnessed the same treatment of countless other prisoners – all of it instigated and carried out by members of the POA. The POA wants an end to association. Maybe Mr Fairhurst, you could petition for the return of bread and water, remove all TVs, play stations and stereos, bring back prison uniform and get rid of access to private cash. Would you like to see prisoners revert to the mentality they were forced to adopt in the '70s, '80s and early '90s, which eventually brought the prison system to its knees in a crumbling pile of rubble? When Strangeways fell apart in 1990, followed by riots across the country, it told the world that prisoners had finally had enough and it was time to stand up and fight back. Valuable lessons were learned, but clearly the POA learned nothing.

I would now like to invite you to come to HMP Berwyn. I have never been anywhere like it. Those employed here don't work to help you with anything at all and not one of them is familiar with the correct procedures and policies re the use of force. Prisoners are being jumped on every single day by uniformed thugs who thrive on confrontation and instigation. Work that out Mr Fairhurst – your members in this prison alone are committing over 365 criminal offences a year. Is it not policy that prison warders must do their utmost to defuse situations? Is it not law that they have no right to put their hands on any prisoner except in exceptional circumstances where that prisoner is being violent or threatening violence, and even there the use of force should only be a last resort?

Since this pandemic started back in March 2020, every Friday prisoners have been denied their fundamental right to exercise. Your comrades here are under the impression that exercise is a privilege and not a right. So much so that they are now starting to

cancel exercise on staff training days. As you are aware, it's unlawful to deprive prisoners of daily time in the open air, but according to your comrades they can do whatever they want. They call it 'the Berwyn way'. Prepare yourself for legal action Mr Fairhurst, as it is coming. So here we are in a system that's once again thriving on systematic abuse: no visits, controlled unlocks, lockdowns on top of lockdowns, deprivation of fundamental rights such as exercise and basic cleaning materials. You need to remember Mr Fairhurst that prisons can only operate with the co-operation of prisoners. All we want is humanity, respect and dignity, not degradation, disrespect and brutality. Time to wake up, before prisoners themselves start to wake up and rise up once again.

Kenny Carter A7075AQ, HMP Berwyn, Bridge Road, Wrexham, LL13 9QE

Lawyer Jailed After Illicit Calls With Prisoner

Scottish Legal news: A lawyer has been imprisoned after exchanging hundreds of calls and messages with a prisoner via contraband phones smuggled into a jail. Dene McClean, 37, communicated with Jonathan Gomez on various illicit phones on more than 500 occasions, it was found. Mr McClean pleaded guilty to offences relating to illicit communication at Southwark Crown Court and was imprisoned for 42 weeks. He had represented Mr Gomez, 36, after he was tried for possession of a gun as well as a silencer and ammunition, with intent to endanger life. He was jailed in January 2018. During his trial, a phone was found and an investigation thereafter found a total of seven. Mr Gomez was sentenced to an additional nine months on top of the 12 years for his firearm offences.

Acting detective inspector Nick Harvey, who led the investigation, said: "The use of mobile phones in prisons poses a security risk, both within prison and to victims and witnesses of crime. This is why they are strictly prohibited. "McClean, as a legal professional, undoubtedly knew his actions were illegal and unethical, but the phone evidence showed prolonged contact with a convicted criminal he knew was using phones smuggled into prison." Robert Hutchinson, a prosecutor, said: "Dene McClean demonstrated a flagrant disregard for the integrity of the criminal justice system by repeatedly and deliberately flaunting the ban on communicating with prisoners on illegal mobile phones. The possession of these phones can lead to prisoners committing further offences or intimidating witnesses. "The rules are clear in that legal professionals must use official routes to speak with their clients or they risk bringing the very core of the profession into disrepute."

Forthcoming Hearings From the UK Supreme Court

Protestors at the Defence and Security International Weapons Fair appeal their Arrest

The appellants took part in a demonstration protesting the Defence and Security International weapons fair at the Excel Centre. They were charged with obstructing the highway, contrary to section 137 Highways Act 1980. They were acquitted at Trial because their actions fell within the "lawful authority or excuse" defence contained in section 137 Highways Act 1980. The Director for Public Prosecutions appealed successfully by way of case stated to the High Court. The appellants now appeal to the Supreme Court.

The issues are: In criminal proceedings arising out of protest activity: (1) is deliberate physically obstructive conduct by protesters capable of constituting a lawful excuse for the purposes of s.137 of the Highways Act 1980?; and (2) what is the test to be applied by an appellate court to an assessment of the decision of the trial court in respect of a statutory defence of 'lawful excuse' when Convention rights are engaged in a criminal matter?

Was a 15 year Old's Treatment in FYOI a Breach of his Human Rights?

The appellant, AB, was held in Feltham Young Offenders' Institution when he was 15 years old. During this period, there were various breaches of the Young Offender Institution Rules 2000 relating to AB's removal from association from other inmates and the provision of education to AB, who was of compulsory school age. AB brought judicial review proceedings before the High Court, alleging (i) that his treatment at the institution between 10 December 2016 and 2 February 2017 amounted to inhuman or degrading treatment, contrary to Article 3 of the European Convention on Human Rights; and (ii) that his removal from association with other inmates during this period breached his right to respect for his private life under Article 8 of the European Convention on Human Rights. The High Court dismissed his claim under Article 3 but allowed his claim in part under Article 8. The Court of Appeal dismissed AB's appeal. AB now appeals to the Supreme Court, having been granted permission to appeal on the Article 3 issue.

The issues are: Whether the Court of Appeal erred (i) in its approach to international materials and (ii) by failing to apply a 'strict necessity' test when determining whether the respondent's treatment of the appellant during the first 55 days of his detention at Feltham Young Offenders' Institution breached Article 3 of the European Convention on Human Rights?

Racist and Sexist' Hampshire Police Unit Officers Dismissed

Three members of a "toxic" police unit have been sacked for gross misconduct after their "offensive" conversations were secretly bugged. The devices picked up "homophobic, racist and sexist" conversations in the offices of Hampshire's Serious and Organised Crime Unit in Basingstoke in 2018, a misconduct panel heard. A number of force staff referred to it as a "lads' pad". Two other officers would have been sacked but had already left the force. The misconduct hearing was told in the 24 days the office was bugged - following concerns raised by a whistleblower - there was "enough profanity, casual sexism and racism to last a lifetime". Det Sgt Oliver Lage, Det Sgt Gregory Willcox and PC James Oldfield have been dismissed while retired Det Insp Tim Ireson and former PC Craig Bannerman were the two who had previously left the force. Trainee Det Con Andrew Ferguson, who sent colleagues a fake pornographic image of members of the royal family, has been given a final written warning. Imposing the sanctions, panel chairman John Bassett said the conduct had been "shameful". He said police officers could not "pick and choose the standards they will abide by" in order to create more "cohesive" teams. Mr Bassett said PC Ferguson was "essentially a good officer" who joined the team three months before the recordings, by which time the "culture was well-established". He said the officer was "conflicted by what he witnessed" and "felt unable to raise the matter with a supervisor". Chief Constable Olivia Pinkney said the force's internal investigation had revealed a "catalogue of sexist, racist, homophobic and ableist language and commentary that has rightly shocked us all".

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.