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 716 (21/11/2018) - Cost £1

Juno Mac and Molly Smith Revolting Prostitutes: The Fight for Sex Workers' Rights

Wendy Lyon, irish Legal New: From its striking cover – designed to resemble the outside of a Soho sex shop – and provocatively punny title, one might have expected a very different book. But, though the co-authors are writing from their own experiences, they are quick to assure readers in the opening pages that this book is "not a memoir". Rather, it is a well-written, comprehensively researched (and footnoted) treatise on how different legal frameworks and policy approaches affect the lives of people in the sex trade.

The introduction sets out a list of other things that the book is not about. It is not a defence of prostitution as "empowering"; it is not grounded in liberal ideals of sexual freedom and the rights of consenting adults. Indeed, the authors accept as a starting point that "the sex industry is both sexist and misogynist", and that many of the (mostly) women who enter it do so reluctantly and due to a lack of better options. None of this, they argue, justifies the almost universal urge to suppress the industry through some form of criminalisation – whether of sex workers, their clients, third parties, or any combination of the above.

Recognising the superficial appeal of punitive measures aimed at deterrence, the authors cleverly construct the book so that readers must first grapple with broader contextual factors. Noting the trend toward what sociologist Elizabeth Bernstein calls "carceral feminism", which advocates criminal justice methods to secure feminist goals, they point out that "the police appear as the most benevolent protectors in the minds of those who encounter them the least". To marginalised people like sex workers, they argue, police have traditionally been part of the problem, and cannot easily be accepted as part of the solution. This has significant implications for legal frameworks that give police an important role in attempting to "rescue" women from prostitution.

In a particularly impressive chapter titled "Borders", the authors reject both mainstream anti-trafficking discourse and the insistence of many sex workers' rights advocates that sex trafficking is readily distinguishable from voluntary sex work. Reductive depictions of ruthless criminals and naïve victims, they argue, deflect our attention from the role of government policy (in various areas including immigration, austerity, and free trade) in compelling young people to migrate – and rendering them vulnerable to exploitation when they do. While their ideal solution – the complete abolition of borders – will likely strike most readers as fantastical, they astutely point out that border controls as we know them are entirely a modern invention. Why, then, is abolishing prostitution often seen as a more realistic goal?

The chapters that follow consider the different legal frameworks in place around the world: partial criminalisation (Great Britain), full criminalisation (the USA, South Africa, and Kenya), client criminalisation (Sweden, Norway, France, and both jurisdictions of Ireland), legalisation (Germany, the Netherlands, and Nevada), and decriminalisation (New Zealand and New South Wales, Australia). Here, the lessons learned in the previous chapters are applied to show how punitive measures to reduce or control prostitution – even those ostensibly aimed at protecting sex workers or victims of trafficking – often have quite the opposite effect. Much of what the authors describe might seem counterintuitive, had they not so effectively laid out the groundwork in the first half of the book.

Critics may argue that the authors are western, educated women who sell sex indoors and thus cannot be presumed to speak for the more vulnerable in the sex trade. And indeed, they concede this themselves at the outset. In the concluding chapter, they note that full decriminalisation – their own preferred option, and that of the sex workers' rights movement generally – will not be enough to address all the problems faced by migrants and people of colour who sell sex, or other particularly disadvantaged groups within the industry. They call for those voices to be centred in their movement, moving it beyond a mere campaign for changes to the laws governing prostitution.

It is difficult for a review to do justice to a book of this depth. The chapters that address the "Sex" and "Work" aspects of prostitution deserve to be read in their entirety, so thoroughly teased out are these two issues (arguably the most contentious within the debate). The writing is impressive throughout, and the referencing displays a laudable commitment to evidence-based advocacy. As always with a subject this polarising, there will undoubtedly be readers who come to this book already so firmly opposed that nothing said in it could ever change their mind; the rest, however, are nearly sure to find something to challenge their previously-held views. Revolting Prostitutes may not be a memoir, but for that it is no less memorable.

Prison Officer Jailed for Smuggling £10,000 of Drugs

BBC News: A prison officer who smuggled in £10,000 of drugs has been jailed for six-and-a-half years. Claire Bennett, 44, also leaked prison intelligence to inmates at HM Young Offender Institution in Aylesbury. At Aylesbury Crown Court, Bennett, of Hailsham, East Sussex, admitted misconduct in a public office and offences relating to supplying drugs to prisoners. Thames Valley Police said her conduct "compromised safety" at the prison. Bennett, of Sandbanks Close, admitted one count of misconduct in a public office, one count of supplying a controlled drug of class B, one count of possessing a controlled drug of class B and one count of conveying a list 'A' prohibited article into/out of a prison. PC Maureen Moore, from the Thames Valley Police prison investigation team, said the officer's actions "jeopardised the safe running of the wings". She added: "Bennett knowingly brought drugs into the prison which causes danger and violence to both prisoners and officers alike. "Her conduct severely compromised the safety of staff and visitors to the prison." Prisons minister Rory Stewart MP said he was "pleased" to see Bennett receive a "significant sentence". He added: "Corrupt and criminal activity like this undermines a whole prison and puts our hard-working staff at risk."

Courthouse Well and Truly Bugged!

For the fourth time in less than a month, bedbugs have been found at the Moss Justice Center in York. The insects were found Friday afternoon in a reception area of the solicitor's office, said York County Clerk of Court David Hamilton. That office is on the second floor. The area had been "locked down" and "quarantined" after previous bedbug incidents in October in the 16th Circuit Solicitor's Office, but at least one live insect was found, Hamilton said. The area will be sprayed and treated over the weekend, and the building is expected to be open Monday after an inspection, Hamilton said.

The solicitor's office prosecutes criminal cases. Monday, the observance of Veterans Day, is a state holiday in South Carolina, but not a county holiday for employees, officials said. "We anticipate the area being cleaned and ready and being open for business Monday," Hamilton said. The courts building was open this past week, and held civil and criminal hearings despite bedbugs being found in the building next door on Monday. Bedbugs were found in the court building on Nov. 1 and in October. The building has more than 100 employees from offices

including the clerk of court, solicitor, public defender, court security and other court functions. The Moss center is made up of two buildings - the courts building and a building next to it containing the York County Sheriff's Office and county jail. Bedbugs were found in the lobby of the jail on Monday. All the lobby furniture was removed and the area was treated, according to sheriff's office officials. Sheriff's office officials said they did not believe the bugs found Monday were connected to the earlier instances at the building next door. No bugs were found in other areas of the sheriff's office building, Sheriff Kevin Tolson said Monday. The jail's 460-plus inmates did not have to be moved or forced to evacuate. More than 350 sheriff's office employees also remained in the building. However, the adjacent courts building at the Moss center was evacuated and court canceled Nov. 1 after bedbugs were found in the second floor courtrooms and other public areas on both the first and second floors.

Chemical treatment was done the weekend of Nov. 2-4, officials said. The first instance of bedbugs was Oct. 16. The insects were found in office areas of both the solicitor's office on the second floor and the public defender's office directly below on the first floor, officials said. Dogs trained to find the bugs "hit" on areas in both the prosecutor and public defender offices, officials said in October. Those offices were treated with heat treatment in October.bYork County officials have said all county-owned buildings will be inspected for bedbugs since the outbreaks at the Moss Justice Center interrupted court services. But county officials have not said when those inspections will take place or how much it will cost. It also remains unclear if more treatment measures will be used after the fourth incident.

Prison Labour and the Making of Poppies

At this time of year, people wearing red poppies are a common sight. Less known is that many of Britain's poppies are made in prison sweatshops paying prisoners less than £10 for a full working week. For many, poppies are a symbol of remembrance for lost relatives and those that have died at war. For others, they represent British nationalism, imperialism and militarism. Donations for poppies go to The Royal British Legion, a UK charity providing lifelong support for the Royal Navy, British Army, Royal Air Force, Reservists, veterans, and their families. Interestingly, veterans make up 3.5% of the total prison population itself, with more than 2820 people locked up according to research.

The poppies are manufactured at HMP Ford in West Sussex, which holds more than 521 prisoners. Prisoners writing to the prison newspaper Inside Time have described the prison as "a hostile environment" and "glorified super-enhanced C-cat". The prison itself was previously an army base. Faith Spear, former member of the Independent Monitoring Board at Hollesey Bay prison, has visited many prisons including HMP Ford. She described the work as "all mind numbing and boring" and says that jails are "akin to mental torture" due to the "abject lack of purposeful activities for inmates, with some forced to carry out effective 'slave labour' for big business, for hours on end".

Prison labour for poppy production is also exploited internationally. Prisoners in New Zealand manufacture poppies across three different prisons in the country, working six hours a day to assemble thousands. Since 2014, prisoners in Canada have been making poppies for the Royal Canadian Legion in partnership with a private printing company and company Trico Evolution. The Corcan job-training program of the Correctional Service Canada uses prison labour across 10 minimum security and healing lodge prisons. Healing lodge prisons are part of the Canadian Carceral State, a symptom of high rates of indigenous incarceration. 30 per cent of prisoners in Canadian prisons are Indigenous, although Indigenous people only make up 4.1% of the population of the colonised country.

Prison Labour and the British Armed Forces

In 2014, the Ministry of Justice (MOJ) and Ministry of Defence (MOD) joined forces to create prisoner workshops to manufacture supplies for the armed forces. Project Claustrum (Claustrum means prison in Latin) uses over 1000 prisoners to make items such as sandbags, camouflage nets and Demountable Rack Offload and Pickup Systems (DROPS). Former Justice Secretary Chris Grayling boasted of how the initial six-month trial of the project at HMP Coldingley saved the government nearly £500,000 in costs. Project Claustrum's first lead manager, Michelle Downer, described the possibilities of what the MOJ could offer to the armed forces as 'endless'. Meanwhile, the then Minister for Defence Equipment, Support and Technology, Philip Dunne, shared how "during times of austerity we're always looking at ways to be more efficient and this is a fantastic initiative".

Exploiting the prisoner workforce is a dangerous step in building the state's capacity to continue its repressive operations at home and abroad. Workers in prison have no rights to organise, no contracts, no pensions, no right to choose what they do, and if they do not work they can be punished. Likewise, having such an accessible workforce to exploit makes military operations even easier. The Government's Prison Education and Employment Strategy published in May 2018 paves the way for the escalation of the exploitation of prisoner labour. It creates a dangerous situation whereby the criminal justice system is entrenched further in a web of capitalist exploitation: from privatised prisons and probation services, to prisoner labour being sold as a solution to bosses experiencing the impact of Brexit on migrant labour.

Prison Labour and the Global War Machine

Why does it matter if prisoners are manufacturing items for the British Army? It only takes a look across the Atlantic to see how wars such as the invasion of Iraq were economically enabled by prison labour. In 2004, more than 21,000 prisoners across the US were working for Federal Prison Industries (also known as UNICOR) run by the Bureau of Prisons in the United States. Prisoners made everything from uniforms, helmets, night vision equipment and blankets to bomb components. Research by Ian Urbina, a reporter for the New York Times, showed that 300,000 pairs of trousers bought by the Department of Defence made their way to war zones, with at least three out of four active-duty soldiers in Iraq and the Middle East wearing clothes made by prisoner factories in Atlanta and Texas. Prisoners in the US also made significant volumes of gear for the 1990-1991 Gulf War.

In addition to manufacturing, prisoners are also used to clean, recycle or reassemble components and wash military uniforms. This often creates toxic consequences for prison workers. Sara Flounders shares how "prison work is often dangerous, toxic and unprotected. At FCC Victorville, a federal prison located at an old US airbase, prisoners clean, overhaul and reassemble tanks and military vehicles returned from combat and coated in toxic spent ammunition, depleted uranium dust and chemicals". Prisoners being exploited for national war efforts is nothing new. It is well-known that hard labour forced upon prisoners and the poor in 19th century workhouses often involved picking oakum (separating strands of rope) for the British Navy. Not forgetting the powerful historical role of penal colonies in the creation of the British Empire and other colonial projects.

One thing is clear: the prison industrial complex and the global war machine are intimately connected. This summer's prison strike that began in the United States and spread to other countries was the largest in history. It shows more than ever that prisoners are resisting this penal regime, often at great risk to themselves. The battle to end prison slavery continues.

Parole Board Has no Black People Among 240 Members

Jamie Grierson, Guardian: The body responsible for deciding whether prisoners can be released into the community has no black members, it has been revealed. Caroline Corby, the chair of the Parole Board, has said she fears unconscious bias could be behind the absence of black members and the low number of minority ethnic people. Corby also said the board had suffered a "loss of confidence" following the case of John Worboys, the black-cab serial rapist who the board had deemed safe to be released after around a decade. The decision was later reversed by the high court. Corby said she was concerned about the lack of diversity on the board, which consists of 240 members, 13 of whom are of Asian or minority ethnic background. "At the moment we have no black Parole Board members and that's of significant concern to me," she told the BBC. "But in terms of addressing this issue, we're very keen to have as many people with a BAME background apply to us as possible. We have learnt lessons from our last recruitment round because we actually had the same objective and we weren't successful, so I am determined to learn lessons from last time around." She said there were not enough BAME applicants during the last recruitment round and those who did apply did "very poorly" in the first two stages of the five-stage process for "reasons we don't entirely understand. But I think there must have been some kind of unconscious bias in those processes. We're not going to have those processes next time around." She said it was hard to gauge whether members were being more risk-averse following the Worboys case, but the release rate had dropped from 49% to 42% in the immediate aftermath and had since risen to 46%, with more adjournments and deferrals. "It was obviously a very difficult period for the board. We saw the departure of our previous chair in difficult circumstances, the board was subject to an unprecedented amount of publicity, the like of which we haven't experienced before, and I think there was a loss of confidence amongst ourselves a little bit, perhaps a loss of confidence in the wider public, and that was something I am very keen to repair."

Police In Talks To Scrap 'reasonable Grounds' Condition For Stop And Search

Vikram Dodd, Guardain: Police chiefs want to trigger an expansion of stop and search by lowering the level of suspicion an officer needs against a suspect to use the power, the Guardian has learned. They want to scrap the requirement that "reasonable grounds" are needed before a person can be subjected to a search, amid mounting concern over knife attacks. Senior officers have held talks with advisers to the home secretary, Sajid Javid, within the last fortnight to discuss the issue. It would fuel the debate about police discrimination against minority ethnic communities, civil liberties and the role stop and search has to play in tackling violent crime. The plans were confirmed by Adrian Hanstock, the deputy chief constable of the British Transport Police and national lead on stop and search for the National Police Chiefs' Council. The proposals, which apply to England and Wales, would also make it more likely that those caught with a knife could be dealt with by an education programme, the so-called public health approach, rather than ending up before the courts.

Hanstock told the Guardian: "There are a lot of calls for officers to do more stop and search. But the current individual threshold that officers have to meet is very tight and precise. So is there any appetite to reduce that threshold where [an] officer has a genuine fear that the person is at risk, or there is a safeguarding threat, or is a risk to others? If that officer does not have sufficient grounds or X-ray vision to see they are carrying a weapon, and they are concerned they may have something to cause harm, that should trigger a search. They will still have to record what has concerned them." Hanstock accepted the plans were controversial. It comes amid rising concerns about knife killings, especially in London, and calls from some to use stop and search more.

Stop and search is one of the most controversial powers police use on a daily basis, because black people are around nine times more likely to be targeted for its use than white people, by a police force that remains disproportionately white. The vast majority of those stopped turn out to be innocent and Theresa May, while home secretary, was concerned it eroded the trust ethnic minorities have in the police and Britain as a fair society.

Hanstock said the new proposed stop and search laws could fit better with a fresh approach to violent crime where it is treated as a public health issue, and not one solely for the criminal justice system. "The outcome of a positive search, does not have to be a criminal justice solution. What's the alternative? It could be a health or welfare approach." Hanstock said there was a difference between someone stopped with a knife who has a record of violent offending and a 13-year-old with a knife who suffers from bullying. "This is the daily dilemma our teams have to deal with," he said "The police mindset is on finding evidence and criminality. The question is, what if the police mindset was more about safeguarding people from harm?" The current law governing stop and search is contained in the Police and Criminal Evidence Act (Pace) of 1984, which says an officer requires "reasonable grounds for suspecting" someone before they can use their powers. Hanstock said the law was out of date "When Pace was enacted in 1984, it was built on 1970s thinking. The factors that motivate violence today are not a look across the dancefloor or spilling someone's pint, they are online and generating feuds online," he said "Now the trigger points that cause violence are not in the street, they are in internet chat rooms and in online communities. That is where the feuds are incubated. Then the individuals come together physically."

The London mayor, Sadiq Khan, last week said it could take a decade to tackle the root causes of violent crime, which has claimed 119 lives this year in the capital. Hanstock said: "It's about what breaks the cycle … How can we be more agile now?" He accepted the plans would trigger controversy, saying: "I think it would raise concerns with civil liberties groups that we could be using this as an excuse to search more people." The Pace laws were designed to stop baseless searches by officers such as those under the "sus" laws, from the "suspected person" section of the Vagrancy Act 1824, which critics said were used to harass innocent black people.

Katrina Ffrench of Stopwatch, which campaigns against misuse of the power, said: "The evidence indicates that reasonable suspicion already fails to provide a sufficiently robust safeguard against misuse, so it is deeply concerning that the police are considering weakening it further. "It should not be accepted that police can just make up a different standard to suit themselves. This kind of power would be too wide and open to abuse. Any lowering of the threshold … would be a step backwards and could encourage abuse of the power. We are are seriously concerned about the implications of introducing suspicious-less searches on the legitimacy of policing by consent and the relationship between impacted communities and the police."

If the government backed the plans it would be a U-turn from May. While home secretary she considered legislating to curb stop and search powers amid concerns over police misuse, with one official report finding 25% of stops could be unlawful. In 2014 she told MPs: "Nobody wins when stop and search is misapplied. It is a waste of police time. It is unfair, especially to young, black men. It is bad for public confidence in the police."

Since he became home secretary, Javid has made it clear he does not share such reservations about stop and search. Amid rising violent crime, Javid has portrayed himself as a champion of the tactic and used a newspaper interview on Friday to say: "I want to make sure it is easier for police to be able to use it and reduce the bureaucracy around it." Javid told the Police Federation in May: "I have confidence in your professional judgment. So let me be

clear, I support the use of stop and search." Hanstock welcomed the change in tone about stop and search from Javid, who became home secretary in May. "The government are signalling we have seen police are taking it seriously, now use your powers in a proper way, and you have our support," he said. The rate of use of stop and search powers dropped under pressure from the government but has increased in recent months in London, with police saying it is now more targeted and intelligence led.

Sleeping on the Job – Gets You Seven Years Sleeping in Jail

A burglar who was found fast asleep cradling stolen jewellery in his arms, has been jailed. Anthony Foord had burgled a house in Folkestone on 5 May, taking both the jewellery and money. Police tracked him down three days later after finding his DNA on a bottle left at the scene. They also received information that the 39-year-old was involved. When they raided a property he was staying in, they found him asleep on the sofa holding a jewellery box close to his chest. "He was surrounded by more than 180 other items including earrings, more jewellery boxes and watches," a spokesperson for Kent Police said. "Foord denied any involvement in the break-in and told officers he couldn't explain where all the goods had come from." A jury found him guilty of burglary at Canterbury Crown Court and he was jailed for seven years.

'Decades of Deceit': Ballymurphy Killings Inquest Opens in Belfast

Scottish Legal News: An inquest into the 1971 Ballymurphy massacre has opened before presiding coroner Ms Justice Siobhan Keegan in Belfast. The next two weeks of hearings will hear evidence regarding the killing of nine men and one woman over three days in August 1971. Attorney General John Larkin ordered a fresh inquest into the incident in 2011 after a campaign by the Ballymurphy families. Solicitor Pádraig Ó Muirigh, who represents some of the families, said: "Today, 47 years after these families lost their loved ones, 46 years after the original inquest, seven years after the direction for a new inquest, we are finally here. "It's a tribute to the adversity and resilience of these brave families, so I want to commend them through all the difficult days. Hopefully this is a new start of a process to find out what happened to their loved ones. Over the next few months the court will examine the evidence and we are very confident that their loved ones' innocence will be clear and their names will be cleared, finally."

Man Convicted of Rape Fails in 'Fresh Evidence' Appeal Despite Complainer's Retraction

Scottish Legal News: A man found guilty of the repeated rape of a former partner who claimed he was the victim of a "miscarriage of justice" based on "fresh evidence" that the complainer had sent a message to police stating that she had put "an innocent man in jail" has had his appeal against conviction refused. The High Court of Justiciary Appeal Court ruled that, while the evidence was potentially significant when viewed in isolation, it would not have had a "material bearing" on the jury's verdict when considered in the entire context of the trial and other prior inconsistent statements which had been used to attack the complainer's credibility.

The Lord Justice Clerk, Lady Dorrian, sitting with Lord Menzies and Lord Turnbull, heard that the appellant "NI" was convicted following a trial at the High Court in Edinburgh in April 2017 of charges of indecent or sexual assault on four complainers, including the repeated rape of his partner "CJI" (charge 6). The Crown relied on the doctrine of mutual corroboration for a sufficiency of evidence. In evidence CJI had asserted that her two children with NI, "L" and "B", were both the product of rape. She admitted that she had lied to the police, having falsely maintained that NI had sent her

threatening messages and an email when she had bought a second mobile and used it to send the messages herself. She was cross-examined about other untrue information she had supplied in her statement to the police and, consistent with the appellant's position it was suggested to her that all sexual activity with him had been consensual, but this she denied.

'Fresh evidence' Following his conviction the appellant appealed on the basis that there was a miscarriage of justice, there being fresh evidence which "would have significantly impacted upon the credibility of the complainer". The first source came from a witness "KHR", a friend of CJI who referred to a conversation in which the complainer described an instance of consensual sexual intercourse between herself and NI as the occasion of the conception of B, NI having been unaware of this conversation until KHR contacted his solicitor during the trial when the jury had already retired to consider their verdict. The second piece of fresh evidence which it was argued would have significantly impacted on the CJI's credibility was a message left by the complainer on a Police Service of Scotland internet contact system, which read: "My name is [CJI] and I am going to end my life tonight as I can no longer love [sic] with the knowledge that I helped put an innocent man in the jail for 10 years for something that he didn't do as everything that I said in court about him was lies and I can't live with myself for doing that to him".

It was submitted that the reasonable explanation for KHR's evidence not being heard at trial was that the appellant had been "entirely unaware" of the conversation until KHR contacted his solicitor towards the end of the trial once the jury had retired. If the jury had KHR's evidence it would have been entitled to infer that the sexual intercourse leading to the conception of B had been consensual, or at least been in reasonable doubt as to the matter, leading to acquittal. Further, the message left by CJI with the police after the trial "significantly undermined" the credibility and reliability of the complainer's evidence. It was argued that the "cumulative effect" of the fresh evidence would have been to have left the jury with no doubt that the complainer was untruthful in respect of material parts of her evidence.

'No Miscarriage of Justice' The court expressed surprise that KHR had not been identified as a potential witness, but the judges said they had some sympathy with the appellant's position that his legal team had no reason to think that KHR could assist with his defence. However, the court was not persuaded that KHR's evidence was capable of being regarded as credible and reliable by a reasonable jury, as there were a "significant number of inconsistencies" in her evidence concerning issues of materiality which contradicted her affidavits. "Her evidence on the circumstances which led to her providing her recollection of the conversation with the complainer's solicitors was a notable example," Lady Dorrian said, adding: "In totality her evidence on the circumstances which had led to the conversation between her and the complainer was also fluid and inconsistent." In relation to CJI's message to the police, the judges were of the view that, standing on its own, it would be "capable of being regarded as credible and reliable by a reasonable jury", but in a fresh evidence appeal it was "crucial to view any additional material relied upon in the context of the whole evidence laid before the jury in the original proceedings".

Delivering the opinion of the court, the Lord Justice Clerk said: "When reviewed in isolation and without reference to the complainer's evidence on why it was sent and other matters covered at trial then it had the potential to be seen as a matter of significance. When considered within the entire context of the trial that is not the case. We are of the view that it pales in significance to other inconsistent statements made by the complainer and the other material used to attack her credibility at the trial. It is clear from the transcripts that the appellant had a considerable amount of material to attack the complainer's credibility at trial. The material included other prior inconsistent statements given by the complainer... These statements related to and were in stark contrast to and inconsistent with the terms of the conduct libelled against the appellant."

The jury had also heard about a number of allegations CJI had made against NI prior to trial,

including threats to her life and general safety, which related to the messages she had herself sent from the second mobile; at trial she had explained this was due in part to her fear of NI. Lady Dorrian concluded: “Notwithstanding the seriousness of this conduct and the extent of the prior inconsistent statements made to the police the jury held the complainer to be credible and found the appellant guilty of the charges which concerned the complainer. Charge 6 was a unanimous verdict. “In our view the message accordingly pales in significance to this other significant and potentially credibility challenging material. Accordingly we are unable to conclude that the message is a piece of evidence of such significance that the verdict reached by the jury in ignorance of it was a miscarriage of justice.”

A.T. v. Estonia - Security Measures for Visiting his Daughter in Hospital Violation of Article

The applicant, A.T., is an Estonian national who was born in 1977. He is currently serving a life sentence in prison. The case concerned his complaint about the security arrangements for medical examinations outside prison and for a hospital visit he made to his baby daughter. The applicant has been serving his prison sentence in X Prison since 2008. In November 2010 and October 2011 he was taken to hospital for medical examinations. After a risk assessment, the prison authorities decided that he had to wear handcuffs and ankle cuffs. He stated that prison officers remained in the examination room with him, that they could overhear his conversation with medical staff and that he had not been allowed to wear his own clothes. He was also taken to visit his seriously ill newborn daughter in hospital in January 2012, which included the same security measures. He states that he was prevented from touching his child and the officers remained with him all the time, being able to overhear his conversation with his daughter's doctors. The applicant complained about the security arrangements for the visits but in January 2013 the Tartu Administrative Court dismissed his complaint in full. His appeal was rejected.

Relying in particular on Article 3 (prohibition of inhuman or degrading treatment) and Article 8 (right to respect for private and family life, the home and correspondence) of the European Convention on Human Rights, the applicant complained about the security arrangements which had been put in place for his hospital visits. He also complained about certain aspects of the visit to his daughter, under in particular Article 8. No violation of Article 3 - concerning the security measures during A.T.'s visits to hospital No violation of Article 8 - concerning the security measures during A.T.'s visits to hospital Violation of Article 8 - concerning A.T.'s visit to see his daughter in hospital Just satisfaction: 1,500 euros (EUR) (non-pecuniary damage)

Chinese student's murder conviction on contradictory witness statements violation of Article 6

None of the courts had addressed the applicant's arguments about the flaws in the evidence against him or the unfairness and arbitrariness of excluding evidence in his favour. The trial as a whole had thus led to a violation of his rights. In the Chamber judgment! in the case of Zhang v. Ukraine (application no. 6970/15) the European Court of Human Rights held, unanimously, that there had been: a violation of Article 6 § 1 (right to a fair trial) of the European Convention on Human Rights. The case concerned the applicant's conviction for murder. The Court found in particular that the applicant had been convicted on the basis of contradictory and inconsistent prosecution witness testimony, a reason the case had earlier been remitted several times for further investigation. The courts had in the end accepted that evidence, at the same time refusing to admit testimony in favour of the applicant. The courts had cited new procedural rules introduced in 2012 for their decision against admitting the evidence in favour of Mr Zhang, rules which had been introduced to strengthen an accused person's rights. However, the courts' interpretation and application of the provisions had been incompatible with the State's obligations under the Convention and had led to the

exclusion of all the defence witness evidence from the file.

Principal facts: The applicant, Vu Zhang, is a Chinese national who was born in 1983 and lives in Tianchang (China). On 1 May 2009, a fight broke out in Kharkiv between four Ukrainians and a group of Chinese students, including the applicant, while the students were having a picnic. During the fight, one of the Ukrainian men was stabbed. He died from his injuries in hospital three days later. Mr Zhang was arrested and charged with his murder the same day. A new Code of Criminal Procedure (CCP) came into force in Ukraine in November 2012, introducing major changes. By that time the proceedings against the applicant had been going on for three and a half years, with several rounds of pre-trial investigation aimed at rectifying numerous flaws and deficiencies. Meanwhile all the applicant's fellow Chinese students, who had made witness statements favourable to the defence, had left the country. Relying on the new CCP, the courts refused to admit the statements as evidence as they had not been made directly in court.

In July 2013 the Kharkiv Kyivskyy Court sentenced the applicant to 12 years' imprisonment. An ordinary appeal by Mr Zhang and an appeal on points of law were unsuccessful. He argued, among other things, that the testimony of the absent witnesses should have been admitted, as the old CCP had still been in force at the time of the events and it allowed such evidence. The appeal court did not take up that argument. His conviction was largely based on the testimony of two of the Ukrainian men involved in the fight, Sa. and SUo However, SUo had reportedly been too drunk to talk to the police on the day of the incident, while Sa. had offered contradictory accounts of events on at least three occasions, at one point conceding that his identification of Mr Zhang as the culprit had been driven by emotion. Mr Zhang was released in 2016 and returned to China.

Decision of the Court: The Court noted that the case against the applicant had been built on statements by the victim's friends, but that evidence had been inconsistent as the witnesses had changed their stories. It was because of such issues that the case had been remitted several times. However, the court which finally convicted Mr Zhang had based its verdict on those statements. That meant that even though the courts should have treated the evidence with caution, they had in fact chosen, without any explanation, to believe it, and had not interpreted any doubts in his favour. In addition, the courts, relying on the new Code of Criminal Procedure, had excluded testimony in favour of Mr Zhang that had been given in the pre-trial investigation by his fellow students. The goal of the new provisions was laudable as it prevented the use of testimony which the police had obtained under duress, a practice which the Court had criticised. However, the new provisions had been used to Mr Zhang's detriment and had led to all the evidence being in the prosecution's favour. At the same time, the Court noted that the events in question had actually taken place before the new Code had come into force, meaning the testimony of absent witnesses could have been allowed. Ultimately the Court found that whichever Code was valid in Mr Zhang's case, the domestic courts had interpreted and applied the criminal procedure provisions on assessing the admissibility of evidence in a manner that was incompatible with the State's obligations under the Convention. The courts at all three levels of jurisdiction had also failed to assess Mr Zhang's pertinent and important points about the serious flaws in the prosecution witness evidence and about the alleged unlawfulness and arbitrariness of the exclusion of all the defence witness evidence from the file. Taken as a whole, the criminal proceedings against Mr Zhang had led to a violation of his right to a fair trial under Article 6 § 1 of the Convention. Given this finding, the Court saw no need to examine separately his complaint about the length of the proceedings. Just satisfaction (Article 41). The Court held that Ukraine was to pay the applicant 7,500 euros (EUR) in respect of non-pecuniary damage. He did not make a claim for costs and expenses.

Misconduct Hearing of 3 West Mids Police Officers Following Death Of Kingsley Burrell

INQUEST: Three West Midlands Police officers are facing a misconduct hearing following the death of Kingsley Burrell in 2011. Police officers Paul Adey, 36, Mark Fannon, 45, and Paul Greenfield, 50, will be answering allegations that they breached standards of the use of force and honesty and integrity following the death of Kingsley. If the allegations are proven, they have been assessed as amounting to gross misconduct. Kingsley, a 29 year old Black man from Birmingham, died on 31 March 2011 following a prolonged and brutal restraint by police and a failure by medical staff to provide basic medical care. On 27 March 2011, four days before his death, Kingsley was detained by police under the Mental Health Act and forcibly restrained by means of rear cuffs, leg straps and threats of a taser for 4¼ hours. On 30 March police and a dog unit were called to the hospital, and Kingsley was once again restrained using rear cuffs, leg straps, and the threat of tasers. En route to another facility, an ambulance worker placed a blanket over Kingsley's head as he lay chest down on a hospital trolley, still restrained. During the time he was restrained Kingsley was subjected to baton blows, punches, and strikes by police. Police then left Kingsley lying face down and motionless in a locked seclusion room for around 28 minutes, with his trousers about his knees and the blanket still around his head. Even though medical staff observing him had already seen that his respiration had dropped to a worrying rate, no one entered the room. When they finally did, they found that Kingsley had suffered a cardiac arrest. Further delays followed in locating a functioning defibrillator and calling an ambulance. He never regained consciousness and died the next day.

Laura Mitchell Loses Appeal against Andrew Ayres Murder Conviction

Owen Bowcott , Guardian: Court of appeal's judgment criticised by campaigners seeking changes to 'joint enterprise' rules A trainee midwife sentenced to life imprisonment for murder, who claimed she was looking for her shoes in a car park when the fatal attack occurred outside a Bradford pub, has failed to overturn her conviction. The court of appeal's ruling in the test case of Laura Mitchell was greeted with dismay by supporters who have been campaigning for changes to the controversial "joint enterprise" rules.

Her appeal against her conviction was the first to be referred by the Criminal Cases Review Commission (CCRC) under new judicial guidance for joint enterprise cases. Her lawyers argued that the conviction was unsafe. Mitchell, then 22, was outside the bar in January 2007 with her boyfriend Michael Hall, also 22, when a fight broke out over who had booked a taxi. During the initial scuffle, Hall was seen to have pulled the victim, Andrew Ayres, 50, off Mitchell. She was later seen wandering around the car park and subsequently said she was trying to find her shoes, which had been lost.

In 2016, the supreme court ruled that a key test imposed by judges in assessing guilt in joint enterprise cases – where the accused acts in conjunction with the killer but does not strike the blow that causes death – had been incorrectly applied for 30 years. Courts had misinterpreted the foresight rule, the supreme court said. Foresight of what someone else might do was merely part of the evidence. "It is for the jury to decide on the whole evidence," the judgment said, "whether [a secondary party] had the necessary intent." The court of appeal has heard a series of applications since then from those imprisoned under the discredited joint enterprise guidelines. Only two have so far resulted in sentences being reduced or convictions overturned. Mitchell had already been through the appeal process so her case had to be referred by the CCRC.

The grassroots organisation, Joint Enterprise Not Guilty By Association (Jengba), has led the

campaign to overturn convictions, securing the support of the Commons' justice select committee, the playwright Jimmy McGovern and senior lawyers such as Lord Hooper, a retired appeal court justice. In a statement issued afterwards, Jengba said: "Laura is a young mum, a trainee midwife. She had gone on a night out, there was a row about a taxi, she didn't instigate any fight. She was pulled from the taxi and thrown to the floor. "The evidence of the case proves that Laura did not inflict the blow that tragically killed the victim, and that she was not at the scene when that fatal blow was delivered. She was not part of a plan to murder and she had no foresight that the actions of another would lead to the death of the victim." Gloria Morrison of Jengba added: "How tragic and unjust is it that a young mum has had to spend 12 years in prison for something she did not do." The Labour MP Lucy Powell said on Twitter: "The Laura Mitchell case was seen as the most clear cut case of substantial injustice of joint enterprise. That it's not even got over the first hurdle shows that the 'wrong turn' judgment of the supreme court is now meaningless".

Mitchell lost an earlier appeal against conviction in 2008. Her case has become the first to be referred by the CCRC, under its statutory powers, to the criminal court of appeal under changes made by the supreme court's 2016 ruling. Tim Moloney QC, for Mitchell, told the court: "There's a sufficiently strong case that a jury properly directed would not have convicted the appellant. The substantial injustice she has suffered is compounded by the life sentence." Although Mitchell was involved in punching and kicking in the initial phase of the fight, the court heard, she did not go to a nearby house where others collected weapons including a CS gas spray and a metal flail. However, Lady Justice Hallett of the court of appeal said it dismissed the application because Mitchell was party to the initial fight and had not communicated to her friends her intention to withdraw from the violence. A jury could therefore have inferred that she was still party to the later, fatal blows.

Under existing criminal court rules, there are exacting standards for defendants if they want to argue that they "withdraw" from a joint enterprise. They have to be able to demonstrate that they clearly communicated their intention to back out to those they believed were the principal attackers. "There was no evidence that she was part of the plan to get weapons," Moloney said. "She was encouraged to move away but she insisted on staying on to recover her shoes. "She was heard saying: 'I want my shoes.' It was clear from a number of prosecution witnesses that she had lost her shoes and wanted to find them." Mitchell appeared by remote video link from prison. She spoke at the beginning of proceedings only to confirm her name.

Ministry of Justice Pays Compensation to Blind Prisoner

The prisoner, known as Mr J to protect his anonymity, alleged that a prison where he was detained for 12 months had unlawfully discriminated against him by failing to properly meet his visual impairment needs. Mr J's visual impairment needs had been assessed by the local authority, and according to this assessment, he needed substantial help to perform his daily activities and to participate in the prison regime. Most significantly, the assessment determined that Mr J needed to be provided with a trained carer to help guide him around the prison. However, instead of this, the prison only provided him with another prisoner, who was not trained, and who was to provide this help in addition to another full-time job. The result of this was that Mr J did not have access to the care he needed, and, as such, was unable to participate in the prison regime. Amongst other things, he was unable to use the exercise yard, the gym or the library.

Furthermore, although Mr J was given a job, which was supposed to be full-time, it simply consisted of cleaning four telephone booths, which only took him five minutes to do. Therefore, he spent the vast majority of his day in his cell by himself with nothing to do.

In light of this, Mr J brought a claim against the MoJ alleging that he was discriminated against by the prison under the Equality Act 2010. He argued that, as a disabled person, the prison had a duty to make reasonable adjustments to allow him to have the same access to prison life as a non-disabled prisoner. After initially defending the claim, the MoJ agreed to pay compensation to him to settle it, although at the same time continued to deny liability.

Benjamin Burrows, head of the prison law team at Leigh Day, said: "Mr J's disability needs were significant and the prison, despite knowing what they needed to do, did the absolute minimum to meet them. The prison service must get themselves out of the mind-set that doing the bare minimum is acceptable. It is not. The duty is equal access, not some access."

On Armistice Day, We Had The Luxury Of Remembering The Great War

While Palestinians Are Still Living Its Consequences. For those refugees, still in their hovels and shacks as a result of the Balfour Declaration, the First World War never ended

There was something gruesomely familiar about the way we commemorated the supposed end of the First World War a hundred years ago. Not just the waterfalls of poppies and the familiar names – Mons, the Somme, Ypres, Verdun – but the almost total silence about all those who died in the First World War, whose eyes were not as blue as ours might be or whose skin was not as pink as ours might be or whose suffering continues from the Great War to this very day.

Even those Sunday supplements that dared stray from the western front only briefly touched on the after-effects of the war in the new Poland, the new Czechoslovakia, the new Yugoslavia and Bolshevik Russia, with a mention of Turkey. The mass famine – perhaps 1.6 million dead – of the Arabs of the Levant under Turkish looting and Allied blockade in the First World War received not a word. Even more astoundingly, I could find not a single reference to the greatest crime against humanity of the First World War – not the murder of Belgian hostages by German troops in 1914, but the Armenian genocide of a million and a half Christian civilians in 1915 by Germany's Ottoman Turkish ally.

What happened to that key document of the First World War in the Middle East, the 1917 Balfour Declaration which promised a homeland for Jews in Palestine and doomed the Palestinian Arabs (a majority in Palestine at the time) to what I call refugeedom? Or the 1916 Sykes-Picot agreement which chopped up the Middle East and betrayed the promise of Arab independence? Or General Allenby's advance on Jerusalem during which – forgotten now by our beloved commentators – he initiated the first use of gas in the Middle East. So smitten are we by the savagery of modern Syrian and Iraqi history, that we forget – or do not know – that Allenby's men fired gas shells at the Turkish army in Gaza. Of all places. But gas in the collective memory last weekend was confined, yet again, to the Western Front.

First World War Allied war cemeteries in both the Middle East and Europe contain tens of thousands of Muslim graves – Algerians, Moroccans, Indians – yet I did not see a photograph of one of them. Nor of the Chinese labourers who died on the Western Front carrying shells for British troops – nor the African soldiers who fought and died for France on the Somme. Only in France, it seems did President Macron remember this salient feature of the conflict, as well he should. For more than 30,000 men from the Comoros, Senegal, the Congo, Somalia, Guinea and Benin died in the Great War.

There used to be a monument to them in Rheims. But the Germans launched a ferocious racist attack on black French troops who participated in the post-First World War occupation of Germany for raping German women and for "endangering the future of the German race". All untrue, of course, but by the time Hitler's legions reinvaded France in 1940, the Nazi propaganda against these same men had done its work. Well over 2,000 black French troops were massacred by the Wehrmacht in 1940; the monument was destroyed. It has just been reconstructed – and reopened in time for the hundredth anniversary of the Armistice.

Then there are the sepulchral ironies of the dead. Of the 4,000 Moroccan troops – all Muslims – sent to the Battle of the Marne in 1914, only 800 survived. Others died at Verdun. Of General Hubert Lyautey's 45,000 Moroccan soldiers, 12,000 had been killed by 1918. It took the little French magazine Jeune Afrique to note that the graves of many of the Moroccan dead are today still marked with the star and crescent of the Turkish Ottoman caliphate. But the Moroccans, though notionally inhabitants of the Ottoman empire, were fighting for France against Turkey's German allies. The star and crescent have never been the official symbol of Muslims. In any event, Moroccans had by the Great War already got their own flag.

But of course, the real symbols of the First World War and its continuing and bloody results are in the Middle East. The conflicts in the region – in Syria, Iraq, in Israel and Gaza and the West Bank and in the Gulf – can mostly trace their genesis to our titanic Great War. Sykes-Picot divided the Arabs. The war – only days after the Gallipoli landings – enabled the Turks to destroy their Christian Armenian minority. The Nazis, by the way, loved Mustafa Kemal Ataturk because he had "cleansed" his minorities. When Ataturk died, the party newspaper Volkischer Beobachter edged its front page in black. The division of Lebanon and Syria and their sectarian systems of administration were invented by the French after they secured the post-war mandate for governing the Levant. The post-First World War Iraqi uprising against British rule was partly fuelled by disgust at the Balfour Declaration.

Mischievously, I delved into my late dad's library of old history books – he of the Great War, Third Battle of the Somme, 1918 – and found Winston Churchill, with rage and sorrow, writing about the "holocaust" of the Armenians (he actually used that word) but he could not see the Arab world's future even in his four-volume The Great War of 1935. His only disquisition on the smouldering ex-Ottoman empire came in a two-page appendix on page 1,647. It was entitled: "A Memorandum upon the Pacification of the Middle East".

As for the Palestinians who wake up every morning today in the dust and filth of the camps of Nahr el-Bared, Ein el-Helwe or Sabra and Chatila in Lebanon, Balfour's pen scratched his signature on this document of dispossession not in 1915, but only last night. For these refugees, still in their hovels and shacks as you read these words, the First World War never ended.

HMP Bedford Inmate Took His Own Life After Two Days In Jail

An inmate who killed himself after two days in jail had told staff he found it hard to ignore "voices" in his head telling him to do so, a report said. Michael Berry, 24, was the eighth inmate to take his own life at HMP Bedford since 2017. The Prison and Probation Ombudsman said "significant issues remain" in the delivery of [the mental health] service" at the jail. A Prison Service spokesman said all the report's recommendations were accepted. Mr Berry, who had a history of substance and alcohol abuse and mental health problems, was remanded at the jail on 8 March 2017, after appearing in court charged with 22 offences, including kidnap and sexual assault of an adult male. The report said a court team emailed the prison's mental health team requesting they assess his mental health and risk to himself, but the jail's team had no record of this correspondence. He was then assessed at the prison's reception without documentation, and self-harm and suicide procedures began.

The following day there was a care review but the report said "healthcare staff were not invited, despite Mr Berry saying that he heard voices telling him to kill himself". The ombudsman said this "should have prompted an urgent mental health assessment and a referral to a GP to consider prescribing antipsychotic medication as a matter of urgency". Instead they increased his observations that day and the next, but on 10 March he was found hanging in his cell, and died in hospital on 16 March. A Prison Service spokesman said: "This is a tragic case and our thoughts remain with Mr Berry's family and friends. "We accepted all the recommendations from the Prisons and Probation Ombudsman and the prison has since made a number of improvements to the work it does to prevent suicide and self-harm." There have been no deaths at the prison in 2018.

Charles Bronson Cleared Of Prison Governor Attack

The 65 year old was said to have lunged at HMP Wakefield governor Mark Docherty in January, during a confrontation at the jail over photos from the prisoner's wedding. Mr Docherty, who had been holding a welfare meeting with the Bronson at the time of the incident, told Leeds Crown Court that Bronson had pinned him to the floor and said: "I will bite your f***ing nose off and I will gouge your eyes out." Custodial manager Steven Coomber and a number of colleagues intervened to restrain Bronson, Mr Docherty told the court. Representing himself at Leeds Crown Court, Bronson denied the allegations levelled against him, insisting he intended to put Mr Docherty in a "gentle bear hug" and whisper "where's my wife's photos?" in his ear when he tripped, or was tripped by someone, and fell. The criminal, famously considered by some to be the most violent inmate currently held in British jails, said: "For the first time in 44 years in prison I never intended to be violent. I never meant to hurt the governor." Bronson, who stood trail under the name Charles Salvador, had earlier admitted he partly blamed the governor at Wakefield's segregation unit after he was told photographs of his prison wedding to Coronation Street actress Paula Williamson two months earlier would no longer be allowed to leave the jail until his release. Jurors found Bronson not guilty of attempting to cause grievous bodily harm with intent, after deliberating for just short of three hours on Thursday 15th November 2018. During the trial, prosecutor Carl Fitch outlined a number of Bronson's previous convictions, including one for actual bodily harm against the governor of HMP Woodhill in 2014. Bronson, born Michael Peterson, is serving a life sentence for robbery and kidnap.

Metropolitan Police 'gangs Matrix' Breached Data Protection Laws

The Metropolitan Police's list of suspected gang members has seriously breached data protection laws, potentially causing "damage and distress" to the disproportionate number of black men on it, an investigation by the UK's data protection watchdog has found. The Information Commissioner's Office (ICO) concluded the police's database, which was set up in the wake of the 2011 London riots, failed to distinguish between the approach to victims of gang-related crime and perpetrators, leading to confusion among officers. The ICO also revealed some London boroughs were using additional informal lists of people who had been removed from the so-called gangs matrix, meaning police continued to monitor people that intelligence indicated were not gang members. Moreover, the force was sharing the information with other bodies, such as local councils, housing associations, and education authorities, without providing sufficient guidance on how it should be used, the ICO said.

Elizabeth Denham, the information commissioner, pointed to the repercussions of the data breaches, saying "simply being on this database could lead to denial of services and other adverse consequences". She said inappropriate management of the database risked alienating groups the Met served. "Building trust with communities to tackle gang crime comes from people knowing that engaging with the police will not have adverse consequences," she continued. Ms Denham said her office had launched a separate investigation into how police information was being used by other public bodies, such as local councils.

The gangs matrix, which holds the details of around 3,500 subjects, some as young as 12, labels young people as "gang nominals" and each is given a green, amber or red rating denoting their perceived risk of violence. It stores their full name, date of birth, home address, and information on whether someone is a firearms offender or knife carrier. The "very serious" data breaches date back to 2011 and have affected a "significant number" of subjects including children and vulnerable individuals, the ICO found. The public organisation launched an investigation into the gangs matrix in October last year after Amnesty International argued it violated human rights and formed "part of an unhelpful and racialised focus on the concept of gangs". Young black men and boys made up more than three-quarters of the list, it said. The ICO stopped short of ordering the police force to stop collecting the information, but issued Scotland Yard with an enforcement notice, compelling it to reform its practices within six months. The watchdog said the Met must improve guidance to explain what constitutes a gang member; properly distinguish between victims of crime and suspected offenders; and erase any informal lists of people who no longer meet the gangs matrix criteria.

Scotland Yard said it had already stopped sharing the register with other organisations where there is no individual sharing agreement in place. James Dipple-Johnstone, deputy information commissioner of operations, said: "Protecting the public from violent crime is an important mission and we recognise the unique challenges the Metropolitan Police faces in tackling this. Our aim is not to prevent this vital work, nor are we saying that the use of a database in this context is not appropriate; we need to ensure that there are suitable policies and processes in place and that these are followed. Clear and rigorous oversight and governance is essential, so the personal data of people on the database is protected and the community can have confidence that their information is being used in an appropriate way."

Amnesty International's technology director Tanya O'Carroll said the ICO's investigation confirmed the gangs matrix was "currently not fit for purpose". Moreover, the force was sharing the information with other bodies, such as local councils, housing associations, and education authorities, without providing sufficient guidance on how it should be used, the ICO said. Elizabeth Denham, the information commissioner, pointed to the repercussions of the data breaches, saying "simply being on this database could lead to denial of services and other adverse consequences". She said inappropriate management of the database risked alienating groups the Met served. "Building trust with communities to tackle gang crime comes from people knowing that engaging with the police will not have adverse consequences."

Hostages: Sally Challen, 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, Glen Cameron,Warren Slaney, Melvyn 'Adie' McLellan, Lyndon Coles, Robert Bradley, John Twomey, Thomas G. Bourke, David E. Ferguson, Lee Mockble, George Coleman, Neil Hurley, Jaslyn Ricardo Smith, James Dowsett, Kevan & Miran Thakrar, Jordan Towers, Patrick Docherty, Brendan Dixon, Paul Bush, Alex Black, Nicholas Rose, Kevin Nunn, Peter Carine, Paul Higginson, Robert Knapp, Thomas Petch, Vincent and Sean Bradish, John Allen, Jeremy Bamber, Kevin Lane, Michael Brown, Robert Knapp, William Kenealy, Glyn Razzell, Willie Gage, Kate Keaveney, Michael Stone, Michael Attwooll, John Roden, Nick Tucker, Karl Watson, Terry Allen, Richard Southern, Jamil Chowdhary, Jake Mawhinney, Peter Hannigan.