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 731 (06/03/2019) - Cost £1

Craig Coley Just Got $21 Million After 39 years Wrongly Locked Up

Antonia Noori Farzan Washington Post: Mike Bender had spent a dozen years working his way up the ladder at the Simi Valley Police Department when he decided to break ranks. The case that turned him against his superiors began on Nov. 11, 1978, a month after he started working as a patrol officer in the quiet Los Angeles suburb. That day, Rhonda Wicht and her 4-year-old son, Donald, were found murdered in their beds. Wicht, a 24-year-old waitress and cosmetology student, had been raped, beaten and strangled with macramé rope. Her son had been smothered to death. Within a matter of hours, police arrested Craig Coley, an ex-boyfriend of Wicht's who still had a key to the apartment. It took two trials to get a jury to agree to convict him, but in 1980, Coley was sentenced to life in prison without the possibility of parole.

Bender hadn't been assigned to the case, so he was shocked when, roughly a decade later, he decided to look through the file and found what struck him as serious flaws in the investigation. "Going over how the case was handled, there were way too many red flags for me to believe that Coley was a suspect," he told The Washington Post. Coley had never stopped insisting he was innocent, and Bender became convinced that the man was telling the truth. When higher-ups ignored him, the detective decided to take matters into his own hands. For almost three decades, he petitioned everyone else he could think of: state legislators, the district attorney, the city manager and city council, members of Congress, multiple governors, California's attorney general, the FBI, a grand jury, the ACLU and the Innocence Project. "What motivated me was that there was no one else to do it," he said. "I felt strongly that an innocent man was in jail and the murderer was free."

It cost Bender his career in Simi Valley, but his persistence eventually paid off. In November 2017, Coley was pardoned by Gov. Jerry Brown (D) and released from prison. On Saturday, the Ventura County Star reported he would receive a $21 million settlement from the city as compensation for the nearly 39 years that he spent in prison. "While no amount of money can make up for what happened to Mr. Coley, settling this case is the right thing to do for Mr. Coley and our community," City Manager Eric Levitt said in a statement. Bender, now 63 and living in San Diego, agrees. He began looking into Coley's case in 1989, while he was working as a detective. At the time, he had tangled with a lieutenant over what he now describes as "minor politics stuff." When he refused to back down, other colleagues warned him to watch out for the man, telling him, "Look what he did to Coley." When Bender began looking through the case file, alarm bells immediately started ringing in his head. On the night of the murder, Coley had been at a restaurant, and had given a friend a ride home before showering and heading to bed. There was only about a 20- to 30-minute window when he didn't have an airtight alibi. There was no way that Coley could have driven to Wicht's apartment, raped and strangled her, suffocated her son, ransacked the apartment and driven back home in that time frame, Bender realized. While evidence had pointed to other possible suspects besides Coley, police had let them all go.

Looking back, Bender thinks the rush to judgment may have been the result of tunnel vision. "If you make your mind up that someone did something, then you stop looking at the stuff that points away from that," he said. Within the department, Bender's persistent questions about the Coley case weren't exactly welcome. "It met with great resistance, as you can imagine, because I was looking into my superiors," he said. But he kept trying to prove the man's innocence, eventually taking his findings to a grand jury, which declined to investigate. In 1991, he said, he had just been to maximum-security prison to meet Coley for the first time when he got an ultimatum: Stop investigating if you want to keep your job.

Up until that point, Bender had planned his life around being a police officer in his hometown. He had gone to high school in Simi Valley, then gotten into police work because he wanted to give back to his community. But he chose to walk away from what had once been his dream job and to keep fighting for Coley's exoneration, believing he would regret it on his deathbed if he didn't. His experience in Simi Valley had soured him to the point that he chose not to seek a job in another police department, instead moving to Northern California and finding work with a company that investigated insurance claims. "I got discouraged," he told The Post. "I went into the private sector, I sold all my guns. I wanted nothing to do with it whatsoever."

By then, Coley's father had passed away, and his mother was all on her own. Bender drove her to the prison for visits, and over the years she became like another member of his family, joining them for Christmas and other holidays. It scared him to think that the aging woman wouldn't have her son there to take care of her in her final years, or that Coley could die in jail. He repeatedly filed clemency petitions on Coley's behalf and urged every law enforcement agency he could think of to reopen the case. "It didn't seem to go anywhere," he said. "Too much power, too much politics, too many people trying to defend what they did, instead of trying to look into the truth of the matter."

Finally, in 2016, Simi Valley got a new chief of police, Dave Livingstone, who took a look through the evidence that Bender had gathered. He asked his cold-case detective to revisit the file. A judge had previously ordered that the evidence from the trial be destroyed after Coley exhausted all of his appeals, but it turned out that it was still being stored at a private lab. Using advanced forensic analysis that hadn't been available in 1978, technicians discovered that a key piece of evidence that had been used to convict Coley didn't actually contain his DNA.

On Nov. 20, 2017, the Simi Valley Police Department and Ventura County District Attorney announced they believed Coley was innocent and they would be backing his petition for clemency. "Reviewing the case in light of the new evidence, we no longer have confidence in the weight of the evidence used to convict Mr. Coley," the two agencies wrote in a letter that was sent to the governor's office. "We also believe that the evidence, as we now know it, would meet the legal standard for a finding of factual innocence." Brown granted Coley's pardon just two days later, and he was released from prison in time to spend Thanksgiving at Bender's house. After almost four decades behind bars, Coley was home free. But his mother had passed away by then, and he had virtually no family and friends left. He spent seven months at the former detective's San Diego home, slowly reintegrating with the world and starting to rebuild his life again. "If it weren't for Mike," he told the Simi Valley Acorn, "I would still be in prison." Police are now investigating who actually killed Rhonda and Donald Wicht, after DNA testing ruled out the possibility that the murder might have been carried out by the Golden State Killer.

While officials all seem to agree that Coley was unjustly convicted of murder, there remains some dispute over whether the officer who arrested him acted maliciously or simply made a mistake. In his pardon, Brown noted that multiple former police officials who testified before the Board of Parole Hearings had "opined that the detective who originally investigated the matter mishandled the investigation or framed Mr. Coley." Livingstone, the current police chief, denied Coley had been framed, and told the Acorn that there was no evidence of deliberate misconduct. Coley previously was awarded nearly $2 million in compensation from the state of California. Now 71, he wants to travel and work with veterans charities, Bender said, and the settlement from Simi Valley will allow him to live comfortably for the rest of his life. "As sad as it's been, it's a decent ending," Bender said. "It's definitely a wonderful gift under horrible circumstances."

Pat Finucane Murder: SC Rules Against Public Inquiry Condemns Previous Investigations

In the matter of an application by Geraldine Finucane for Judicial Review (Northern Ireland) [2019] UKSC 7 On appeal from: [2017] NICA 7 Justices: Lady Hale (President), Lord Kerr, Lord Carnwath, Lord Hodge, Lady Black

Background to the Appeal: Patrick Finucane was a solicitor in Belfast. On 12 February 1989, gunmen burst into his home and brutally murdered him in the presence of his wife and three children. Those responsible were so-called loyalists. It has emerged that there was collusion between the murderers and members of the security forces. Despite various investigations into Mr Finucane's death, none of these has uncovered either the identity of the members of the security forces who engaged in the collusion or the precise nature of the assistance which they gave to the murderers.

Following an inquiry into allegations of collusion between the security forces and loyalist paramilitaries, Brian Nelson was identified. Nelson was an informer for the security services and in particular for an organisation within the British army known as the Force Research Unit ("FRU"). His role had included the gathering of information about potential targets for assassination. In 2001, political talks were held between the UK and Irish governments. It was decided that a judge would be appointed to investigate allegations of collusion in a number of cases, including that of Mr Finucane. It was said that if the judge recommended a public inquiry in any case, the relevant government would implement that recommendation. Judge Cory was appointed in June 2002. Meanwhile, on 1 July 2003, following a case brought by Mrs Finucane, the European Court of Human Rights ("ECtHR") decided that there had not been an inquiry into the death of Mr Finucane which complied with Article 2 of the European Convention on Human Rights ("ECHR").

Judge Cory published his report on 1 April 2004. He concluded that a public inquiry into Mr Finucane's murder was required. In September 2004, the Secretary of State for Northern Ireland ("SSNI") wrote to Mrs Finucane and made a statement in the House of Commons to the effect that the inquiry would be held on the basis of new legislation which was to be introduced shortly. This new legislation was the Inquiries Act 2005. Mrs Finucane objected strenuously to the proposal that the inquiry would take place under the new legislation and various discussions as to the terms of the inquiry took place over the years that followed.

In May 2010, there was a general election and a new government was formed. Following a consultation on the form which an inquiry into the murder of Mr Finucane should take, the decision was made on 11 July 2011 that a public inquiry would not be conducted. Instead, Sir Desmond de Silva was appointed to conduct an independent review into any state involvement in Mr Finucane's murder.

Sir Desmond was given unrestricted access to documents and was free to meet anyone whom he felt could help with his inquiry. He was not given the power to hold oral hearings, however. Although, initially Sir Desmond wished to meet with one of Nelson's former handlers, this meeting did not take

place and Sir Desmond explained in his report that the reason that the meeting did not take place was that he had been informed that the handler felt unable to attend for medical reasons. It has become apparent that this information was given to Sir Desmond by the Ministry of Defence. No medical evidence to support the claim of ill-health was provided. In the event, Sir Desmond subsequently decided that he did not need to meet the handler, but did not explain why he had changed his view. Sir Desmond stated as part of the conclusion to his report: "… I am left in significant

doubt as to whether Patrick Finucane would have been murdered by the UDA in February 1989 had it not been for the different strands of involvement by elements of the state…".

Mrs Finucane's case is brought in judicial review. She claims that she had a legitimate expectation that a public inquiry would be held because of the unequivocal assurance given to her in September 2004. She says the government have failed to show valid grounds for failing to fulfil this promise and that the evidence suggests that the decision not to hold the inquiry was a sham with a predetermined outcome. Mrs Finucane supports her case by arguing that the failure to establish a public inquiry constitutes a violation of her rights under Article 2 of the ECHR and section 6 of the Human Rights Act 1998 ("HRA") which requires any public authority (including a Court) not to act in a way which is in contravention of an ECHR right.

Mr Justice Stephens dismissed Mrs Finucane's application for judicial review but made a limited declaration that an Article 2 compliant inquiry into Mr Finucane's murder had not yet taken place. The Court of Appeal upheld this decision, save that it set aside the declaration.

Judgment: The Supreme Court holds that Mrs Finucane did have a legitimate expectation that there would be a public inquiry into Mr Finucane's death, but that Mrs Finucane has not shown that the government's decision not to fulfil this promise was made in bad faith or that it was not based on genuine policy grounds. The Supreme Court makes a declaration that there has not been an Article 2 compliant inquiry into the death of Mr Finucane. Lord Kerr gives a judgment with which all members of the Court agree. Lord Carnwath delivers a concurring judgment.

Reasons for the Judgment: Legitimate Expectation: Where a clear and unambiguous undertaking is made, the authority giving the undertaking will not be allowed to depart from it unless it is shown that it is fair to do so [62]. The undertakings given by the various ministers amount, individually and cumulatively, to an unequivocal undertaking to hold a public inquiry into Mr Finucane's death [68]. This promise was not of a substantive benefit to a limited class of individuals. Instead, it was a policy statement about procedure. That policy procedure applied not only to Mrs Finucane but also to the world at large [63]. If political issues overtake a promise given by the government and a decision is taken in good faith and on genuine policy grounds not to adhere to the original promise, it will be difficult for a person who holds a legitimate expectation to enforce compliance with it [76]. Mrs Finucane's argument that the process was a sham and the outcome was fixed is a serious charge which would require clear evidence before this could be accepted [77 – 78]. There is no sustainable evidence to this effect, so this part of Mrs Finucane's appeal fails [81].

Whilst this issue did not arise on the facts of the present case, Lord Carnwath delivers a concurring judgment addressing the issue of detriment in substantive legitimate expectation cases [156 – 160]. Article 2 of the ECHR: Article 2 gives rise not merely to a duty not to kill people but, where there is an issue as to whether the state had broken this obligation, an obligation on the part of the state to carry out an effective official investigation into the deaths [83].

Mr Finucane died prior to 2 October 2000, which is the date when the HRA (which gives effect to the ECHR in domestic law) came into force [84]. The procedural obligation to investigate can be considered a detachable obligation, however. In that role, it is capable of binding the state even where the death took place before the critical date when these laws came into force [96]. The SSNI argued that there must be a genuine connection between the death and the critical date, and that this had not been established in this case [106 – 107]. It was suggested that the period between the death and the critical date should not exceed ten years.

It was held that there was not an absolute rule that the period between the death and the

critical date should be ten years or less. The period between the dates is important but the significance of this diminishes where, as in this case, most of the significant inquiries into the death took place after the HRA came into force [108].

It has been established by the ECtHR that any information or material which has the potential to undermine the conclusions of an earlier investigation or to allow an earlier inconclusive investigation to be pursued further would prompt a revival of the procedural obligation [117]. The need for an effective investigation goes well beyond facilitating a prosecution [127]. In order to be compliant, an investigation must be capable of leading to the identification and punishment of those responsible [128]. This must involve having the means to identify those implicated in the death [131].

Various features show that Sir Desmond's review fell short of being an effective Article 2 compliant inquiry: Sir Desmond did not have the power to compel the attendance of witnesses, those who met him were not subject to testing as to the accuracy of their evidence, and a potentially critical witness was excused attendance for questioning. The review by Sir Desmond, even when taken with earlier inquiries, was not sufficient to fulfil the requirements of Article 2 [134].

Mrs Finucane's representative had declined an invitation made by the Court of Appeal to amend her application and plead, as a freestanding issue, that the state was in breach of its Article 2 obligations. Notwithstanding this, the issue of whether there was a breach of the procedural obligation under Article 2 was before this Court and called for determination [151]. In any event, the confines of the deliberations of the Supreme Court are not necessarily determined by the manner in which the parties choose to make their presentations. Whilst it is unnecessary to decide this point in the present appeal, to allow a violation of an ECHR right to go unremarked upon may well be in breach of the spirit, if not the literal requirement, of section 6 of the HRA [152]. References in square brackets are to paragraphs in the judgment

Note: This summary is provided to assist in understanding the Court's decision. It does not form part of the reasons for the decision. The full judgment of the Court is the only authoritative document, available at: http://supremecourt.uk/decided-cases/index.html

Maintaining Public Order And Freedom Of Assembly "Yellow Vest" Movement

In a memorandum containing her observations on the events linked to the so-called yellow vest movement, the Council of Europe Commissioner for Human Rights, Dunja Mijatović, invites the French authorities to show more respect for human rights during operations aimed at maintaining public order and refrain from introducing excessive restrictions to freedom of peaceful assembly through the bill on strengthening and guaranteeing public order at demonstrations. While strongly condemning the racist, anti-Semitic and homophobic comments and assaults by some demonstrators, the Commissioner points out that the main task of law enforcement officers is "to protect citizens and their human rights". However, she considers that the number and seriousness of the injuries inflicted on demonstrators "raise questions about the compatibility of the methods used in operations aimed at maintaining public order with due regard for these rights".

The Commissioner encourages the authorities to publish more detailed figures on the wounded and to review the doctrine on the use of intermediate weapons as soon as possible. Pending this review, the authorities "should suspend the use of LBDs [rubber bullet launchers] during operations aimed at maintaining public order", she said, while also emphasising the duty of the authorities to guarantee the safety of journalists. She underlines the importance of avoiding impunity with regard to police violence so that all breaches of professional ethics and criminal law by law enforcement officers are punished, and invites the authorities to ensure that "all persons claiming to be the victims of such misconduct may not only report it to the General Inspectorate of the national police and of the gendarmerie and to the Defender of Rights, but also bring a complaint in court and claim compensation". The Commissioner notes that operations aimed at maintaining public order are particularly complex and that the officers who have been mobilised are working in a context of high tension and fatigue. She strongly condemns the violence committed against law enforcement officers, regrets the large number of wounded among their ranks and highlights the importance of paying them a sufficient salary and granting them adequate periods of rest and recuperation, together with appropriate psychological support and sound human rights training throughout their career.

The Commissioner also invites the authorities in charge of legal proceedings in the context of the yellow vest movement to show due care and restraint in their use of immediate summary proceedings and recommends that hearings should not be held at night. As to the arrangements for exercising freedom of peaceful assembly, the Commissioner is concerned about the taking in for questioning and custody of persons wishing to go to a demonstration when no offence was identified and no proceedings were brought subsequently. She considers that such practices constitute serious interferences with the exercise of the freedom of movement and the freedoms of assembly and expression, and invites the authorities to comply scrupulously with the requirement to ensure that any such restriction is strictly necessary, and to avoid using such procedures as preventive law enforcement tools.

The Commissioner also invites France's lawmakers to ensure that the law on strengthening and guaranteeing public order at demonstrations fully respects the right to freedom of assembly. For this purpose, she recommends that the introduction of an administrative ban on demonstrating should be avoided as this would constitute a serious interference in the exercise of this right, especially as there is already provision in the Internal Security Code for the judicial authorities to impose a ban on demonstrating. While sharing the authorities' desire to make it possible to identify the perpetrators of violence, the Commissioner recommends that they abandon the plans to make hiding all or part of one's face in or within the vicinity of a demonstration "without a legitimate reason" a more serious offence (délit). She also recommends dropping the idea of extending the scope of the supplementary penalty of a ban on demonstrating to the offence of failing to notify a demonstration and that the possibility of lightening the formalities for notifying demonstrations be explored.

Lastly, the Commissioner invites the government and the senators to refrain from reintroducing the proposal, dismissed by the National Assembly, to enable prefects to order searches and frisking within the vicinity and on the edges of demonstrations. The recommendations contained in the memorandum are based on the visit made by the Commissioner to Paris on 28 January to gather more information on the circumstances of the use of force by law enforcement officers and some demonstrators during various forms of action linked to the yellow vest movement.

Beyond Prison, Redefining Punishment

David Gauke here, sets out his vision for a "smart" justice system to reduce reoffending, protect the public and ensure serious criminals receive the punishment they deserve. Since the early 1990s, we've seen the prison population almost double, from about 45,000 in 1993 to just over 83,000 in 2008. Since then, it has been broadly stable and currently stands at a little below 83,000. This is the highest rate of imprisonment almost anywhere in western Europe. For every 100,000 people in the Netherlands 61 are behind bars in Denmark 63 in Germany 76 in Northern Ireland 8 inItaly 99 in France 104. in Scotland 138 England and Wales incarceration rate is 139 people per 100,000.

Why do we have such high rates of imprisonment – both by international standards and our own historical standards? Part of this is about our society and the government rightly recognising and responding to the rise in certain types of crime. More offenders are being jailed for violent crime for example. And last year, over a third of people sentenced for crimes involving knives or other weapons were given immediate custodial sentences. That's up from 23% in 2009. And the length of sentences is increasing – sentences for sexual offences, for example, have gone up from 43 months in 2007 to just under 61 months in 2018. It's also about changing expectations about the kinds of crimes for which we expect perpetrators to be more severely punished.

Look at sexual offences where we've seen more victims feel able to come forward, more people brought to justice, and with many more convictions and much longer sentences than a decade ago. But it's not just about violent or sexual offences. Prison sentences, in general, have been getting longer. Even for offences which aren't violent or sexual, the average sentence length overall has increased. Take fraud: the average custodial sentence for that has gone up from just under a year in 2007 to over 18 months in 2017. Now, whatever your own views on what should happen, as a matter of fact it is clearly not true that sentences overall are getting shorter or justice is somehow getting softer – as some argue. When it comes to the length of prison sentences we are now taking a more punitive approach than at any point during Mrs Thatcher's premiership.

Let me be clear, I do not want to reverse the tougher sentencing approach for serious offences. But equally, we should be extremely cautious about continuing to increase sentences as a routine response to concerns over crime. We have to recognise that such an approach would lead us to becoming even more of an international and historical outlier in terms of our prison population. Instead, we need to take a step back and to ask ourselves 3 questions: 1) Is our approach to sentencing actually reducing crime – when reoffending remains stubbornly high, creating more victims and putting the public at risk? 2) Are we running our prisons in a way which maximises offenders' chances of turning their lives around, of going on to gainful employment and re-joining society as a responsible citizen? 3) And should we be seeking opportunities in the coming years to find better and alternative ways of punishing as well as rehabilitating offenders?

It is these questions – how we punish people for their crimes - which I'd like to talk about today (18 February 2019). I think now is the time for us as a society, as a country, to start a fresh conversation, a national debate about what justice, including punishment, should look like for our modern times. Because as I see it, there is a false choice between the narrow and often polarising discussion about 'soft' justice versus 'hard' justice. In my view, we should be talking about 'smart' justice. Justice that works.

Now, for most of us in society, the very idea of going to prison for even a short amount of time, and the loss of liberty that entails, is a real deterrent. But that thinking fails to get into the mindset of many of today's criminals –who are either reckless, or who don't fear prison because they have friends and family who have all done time. Perhaps their lives are so chaotic that prison, in the scheme of things, might not seem so bad. That is true of no group more than those serving the shortest sentences.

In the last five years, just over a quarter of a million custodial sentences have been given to offenders for six months or less; over 300,000 sentences were for 12 months or less. But nearly two thirds of those offenders go on to commit a further crime within a year of being released. 27% of all reoffending is committed by people who have served short sentences of 12 months or less. For the offenders completing these short sentences whose lives are destabilised, and for society which incurs a heavy financial and social cost, prison simply isn't working. The most common offence

for which offenders are sentenced to less 6 months – some 11,500 offenders – is shoplifting.

We know that offenders who commit this kind of crime often have drug or alcohol problems, and many are women. Almost half of women sentenced to a short custodial sentence are there for shop theft. The impact of short custodial sentences on women generally is particularly significant. Many are victims, as well as offenders, with almost 60% reporting experience of domestic abuse and many have mental health issues. For women, going into custody often causes huge disruption to the lives of their families, especially dependent children, increasing the risk they will also fall into offending. And for many offenders, both men and women, who may not have a stable job or home, and who are likely to have alcohol or drug problems, a short stay in prison can result in them losing access to benefits and drug or alcohol support services and treatment. Coming out of prison, they find themselves back at the start of the process and feeling like they have even less to lose.

That's why there is a very strong case to abolish sentences of six months or less altogether, with some closely defined exceptions, and put in their place, a robust community order regime. Let's be honest. The public will always want to prioritise schools or hospitals over the criminal justice system when it comes to public spending. But where we do spend on the criminal justice system, we must spend on what works.

Why would we spend taxpayers' money doing what we know doesn't work, and indeed, that makes us less safe? We shouldn't. The reception of a new offender into custody – that first night inside – is one of the most resource heavy moments in an offender's journey through the system. Every offender must have their property logged. They must be issued with their prison essentials – toothbrushes; clothing; bedding. They must be risk assessed for self-harm risks and the risks they pose to other offenders. There are full security procedures including a strip search for many. And then once these offenders are set up inside, there's no time for the prison service to do any meaningful rehabilitative work with them.

In 2017, almost 50,000 offenders were sentenced to immediate custody for 6 months or less. By abolishing these sentences we'd expect also to reduce the number of receptions carried out. Just think how much better we could use the prison officers' time and resources, whether focusing on security, whether looking after those at risk of self harm, or whether spending more time on running regimes which really will make a difference – those built around temporary release for work, education, and tackling drug addiction. And offenders are less likely to reoffend if they are given a community order, which are much more effective at tackling the root causes behind criminality. Now, I do not want community orders which are in any sense a 'soft option'. I want a regime that can impose greater restrictions on people's movements and lifestyle and stricter requirements in terms of accessing treatment and support.

And critically, these sentences must be enforced. That's why on Saturday I announced the roll-out of our new GPS tagging programme which will allow offenders' movements to be more effectively monitored. Working with our justice partners, I hope that GPS tags will be available across the country by April. It will be an important new tool in controlling and restricting the movement and certain activities of offenders. It will also help manage offenders safely in the community and strengthen the protection available for victims by monitoring exclusion zones. Other new technology and innovations are opening up the possibility of even more options for the future too. For example, technology can monitor whether an offender has consumed alcohol, and enables us to be able to better restrict and monitor alcohol consumption where it drives offending behaviour.

We are testing the value of alcohol abstinence monitoring requirements for offenders on

licence, building on earlier testing of its value as part of a community order.

Underpinned by evidence of what works to reduce reoffending, we are also increasing the treatment requirements of community orders. Our research shows that nearly 60% of recent offenders who engaged with a community-based alcohol programme did not go on to reoffend in the two years following treatment. Offenders given a community sentence including mental health treatment have also shown to be significantly less likely to reoffend. That's why we have worked with the Department of Health and Social Care, NHS England and Public Health England to develop a Treatment Requirement Programme which aims to increase the number of community sentences with mental health, drug and alcohol treatment requirements. The programme is currently being tested in courts across five areas in England –Milton Keynes, Northampton, Birmingham, Plymouth and Sefton. It dictates a new minimum standard of service, with additional training for staff to improve collaboration between the agencies involved – all of which is increasing confidence among sentencers to use them. I look forward to seeing the outcomes of those trials shortly.

Many offenders in prison have mental health problems, but often struggle to engage with treatment on the same terms as they could in the community. That is why the Health Secretary and I want to explore how innovative digital technologies can be put to use to serve the mental health needs of our prisoners. We also know stable accommodation is a key factor in reoffending. As part of the Government's Rough Sleeping agenda, we are investing up to £6.4 million in a pilot scheme to help individuals released from three prisons – Bristol, Leeds and Pentonville – who have been identified as being at risk of homelessness into settled accommodation, while providing them with wrap around support for up to two years. This is part of a cross-government action necessary to cutting reoffending and tackle the root causes of criminality. But if we want to successfully make a shift from prison to community sentences it is critical that we have a probation system that commands the confidence of the courts and the public.

I will return to the subject of probation in much greater depth later this year. But, in thinking strategically about the future of our justice system I believe in the end there is a strong case for switching resource away from ineffective prison sentences and into probation. This is more likely to reduce reoffending and, ultimately, reduce pressures on our criminal justice system. I am determined to strengthen the confidence courts have in probation to ensure we can make this shift away from short custodial sentences towards more punitive and effective sanctions and support in the community.

However, as I mentioned earlier, prison will continue to be right for some. My second question was about what sort of prison regime we want. For those who are serving longer sentences, we need to ensure that prisons are humane, safe and secure. Much good work has been done over the past year, led by the excellent Prisons Minister Rory Stewart. But in prison, to reduce the chances of reoffending on release, there needs to be a positive outlook for the future and a sense that there is light at the end of the tunnel so long as an offender wants to turn their back on crime. That's why I have spoken before and we have consulted on a new approach to incentives and privileges that better incentivises prisoners to abide by the rules and engage in education, work and substance misuse interventions, whilst ensuring poor behaviour can still be tackled through the loss of privileges.

It means maintaining a link to the outside world – for example with work and family – so that prisoners don't get institutionalised and lose hope. If, at the end of a prison term, our objective is to release into the community a responsible citizen, we must first ensure that we have a responsible prisoner. An important way we can do this for some prisoners is release on temporary license – or ROTL. Research last year shows the more ROTL a prisoner gets, the

less chance there is of them reoffending. It provides purposeful activity and experience while in prison so that they have the right attitude for work, can get a job when they're released, prepare for re-joining their families and society and turn their back on crime for good. We are currently consulting on loosening some of the barriers to using ROTL for some prisoners. Our plans will encourage using ROTL more often to get prisoners off the wings and into the workplace by removing blanket restrictions on when governors can consider ROTL, particularly those who have progressed to open conditions. Rather than blanket bans, the focus will rightly be instead on how safe it is for a prisoner to be released on ROTL, enabling them to go out to work sooner, and helping them to prepare for eventual release. I am pleased to say that three prisons, HMPs Drake Hall, Ford and Kirkham, are currently testing out new arrangements for ROTL, giving their Governors more discretion over temporary release for men and women. This will be a great opportunity to learn from their experience, and explore the best ways to safely and more quickly get prisoners out for work.

Our other reforms will also make reoffending less likely on release. Whether that's our £7 million investment for new in-cell telephones to maintain family links or looking at how we categorise the risk prisoners pose so they are put in the right type of category prison. This brings me to my third fundamental question. Is it time to begin to think again about how we punish offenders in future. Historically, for many offenders our earliest prisons were little more than holding pens ahead of transportation or indeed capital punishment. Of course, those sanctions are no longer available to us. And, for the avoidance of doubt, I am not advocating their return. But for the past couple of centuries, we have – almost by default – come to accept the view that punishment essentially means prison. Looking at reforming short sentences by providing a robust community orders regime is a near term initiative that will help us tackle the problem of reoffending.

But thinking about effective punishment for different crimes isn't limited to those that currently get short sentences. I believe we are nearing a time when a combination of technology and radical thinking will make it possible for much more intensive and restrictive conditions to be applied in more creative and fundamental ways outside of prison. I think for some offenders we need to revisit what effective punishment really means. Home curfew, driving bans, alcohol bans and foreign travel bans are just some of the options that already exist and which might play a bigger role.

I believe the biggest potential comes from being able to better target someone who makes large profits from committing a financial crime like fraud. Or the kingpin drug baron who makes his money one step removed from the violence and misery this illicit trade creates. Fraud, for example, is a serious offence. It is far from victimless and the consequences for innocent people can be devastating. So, it needs a serious punishment. And the criminals who commit these offences are calculating. They are premeditated. And they are motivated by greed. In recent years, the custody rate has increased from 14.5% in 2007 to over 20%, and the average custodial sentence going up from under a year to over 18 months. But once fraudsters have sat out their sentence, they may be able to return to their comfortable lifestyle as soon as they get out. Indeed, serving a 2 year prison sentence but knowing your illicit cash is still hidden from the authorities, is not an effective punishment.

I can see us being able to take a different approach. For example, this kind of fraudster or kingpin would still need to spend time in prison. And we will continue to pursue relentlessly to confiscate the proceeds of crime. But we could go further. I want to look at what happens after prison – whether our more effective punishment and deterrent for these criminals might involve jail time and more lasting and punitive community interventions. After serving part of their sentence behind bars, we could, for example, continue to restrict an offender's movement, their activities and their lifestyle beyond

prison in a much more intensive way. And that could also mean a real shift in the standard of living a wealthy criminal can expect after prison. I want to look at how, once a jail term has been served, we can continue to restrict their expenditure and monitor their earnings, using new technology to enable proper enforcement. They would be in no uncertainty that, once sentenced, they wouldn't be able to reap any lifestyle benefits from their crimes and would need to make full reparation to the community as part of the sentence.

I'm keen to get industry working with us to develop the necessary technology. Our banks are looking more and more at their social responsibilities, and they could look at what part they can play in investing to help us to deliver this vision. Community sanctions like this won't be soft options, but they will be smart ones. They will enable us to impose an unprecedented level of punitive sanctions outside of a prison, with punishment hitting closer to home and hitting criminals where it always hurts – the pocket. It will allow us not only, as the old adage goes, to 'let the punishment fit the crime', but to let the punishment properly hit the criminal in a more tailored and targeted way outside of prison.

Prison will always play a part in serving as punishment for serious crimes and in rehabilitation, and our reforms will deliver that. But we need to think more imaginatively about different and more modern forms of punishment in the community. Punishments that are punitive, for a purpose. As with our approach to short sentences, ultimately, it's about doing what works to reduce reoffending and make us all safer and less likely to be a future victim of crime. In that sense, I believe the choice – and the debate – isn't one of soft justice or hard justice. It's a choice between effective justice or ineffective justice.

I know that there will be some who argue that the only problem with our criminal justice system is that it isn't tough enough, that the answer to short sentences is longer sentences, that the best way of stopping recently released prisoners from reoffending is not to release them. And that the endless ratchet effect of higher sentences is giving the public what it wants.

But I believe that those in positions of responsibility have a duty to show leadership. To confront difficult issues, be led by the evidence and pursue policies that are most likely to deliver for the public. That, I hope, is the approach I have set out today – thank you.

Scotland: Tougher Sentences For Criminals Who Target The Elderly

Scottish Legal News: Scottish courts would impose tougher sentences on criminals who target the elderly under proposed laws. Adults with dementia or chronic illnesses will be given new protections to prevent their mistreatment. The legislation is planned for September, according to The Times, and would make Scotland the first part of the UK to legislate specifically on abuse of the elderly. Campaigners are seeking more prosecutions for complaints about elderly abuse and argue that too few cases are resulting in prison terms.

Elder Abuse Scotland, Age Scotland, the Law Society of Scotland, and Social Work Scotland all support the proposals. Social Work Scotland said in a submission to the Scottish Parliament's Justice Committee: "The legal system has challenges in providing protection and justice where the investigation and prosecution processes fail people whose reliability as witnesses may be questioned, for example, frail older people and adults affected by dementia."

The results of a hate crime review undertaken by Lord Bracadale last year found that there should be new statutory aggravations in relation to gender and age as protected characteristics. Margaret Mitchell, convener of the Justice Committee, said: "Safeguards to stop elder abuse occurring in the first place [are] clearly very important. When this abuse does happen, it is vital that perpetrators face tough consequences."

Family of Jordan Towers vow to fight on after failed appeal

Jordan Towers, who was just 16 years old when he was convicted of murder in Newcastle-Upon-Tyne Crown Court in 2007, has lost his appeal against conviction. His conviction had been referred by the miscarriage of justice watchdog on basis of the 2016 ruling of Supreme Court in R v Jogee in which the court ruled that the law on joint enterprise had taken a 'wrong turn' 30 years ago . Towers and his co-defendants were convicted after Kevin Johnson was fatally stabbed in May 2007 during a fight outside his home in Sunderland. A few minutes later another man, Jamie Thompson, was also stabbed but his injuries were not life-threatening.

Towers, who did not wield the knife on either occasion, pleaded not guilty but was convicted and sentenced to a minimum custodial term of 13 years. He had tried to appeal against his conviction but his application for leave was refused in 2008. He applied to the Criminal Cases Review Commission (CCRC) in 2009 and 2013 but no referral was made. He applied again in 2015. In February 2016, while the case was under review at the CCRC, the Supreme Court made its landmark decision in the Jogee case. That decision related to 'foresight' being incorrectly used instead of 'intent' as a way to convict a secondary party to the crime. At the time, many campaigners and lawyers hoped that the court's recognition of the 'wrong turn' would mean that people convicted under joint enterprise (i.e. for example, someone who was part of the incident but was not the stabber) would have their convictions overturned on appeal. In the case of Jogee, he had his murder conviction replaced with a manslaughter conviction and was then sentenced to 12 years compared to the 20 years he had received for murder.

In October 2016 the Court of Appeal denied leave to appeal to 13 defendants in six separate cases in the case of R v Johnson & other. According to the ruling in Jogee, permission to appeal could be granted if 'substantial injustice' could be demonstrated but it would not do so 'simply because the law applied has now been declared mistaken'. So far only one post Jogee appeal has been successful and the substantial injustice requirement has proved an almost insurmountable hurdle – see here on the Justice Gap.

Following Jogee, Towers' lawyers made new submissions to the CCRC. The watchdog decided to refer the case to the Court of Appeal on the basis that the change in the law meant there was real possibility that court would quash the conviction and conclude that to uphold Towers' conviction for murder would amount to a 'substantial injustice'

Representing Towers, Henry Blaxland QC argued that the substantial injustice test was not very far removed from the usual safety test for allowing appeals. However, the judges spent some time emphasising the stringent requirements as set down in Jogee and Johnson. Blaxland also sought to add to the points made by the CCRC relating to Towers' youth and the direction by the trial judge as to the lack of adverse inference to the drawn by the jury for Towers decision not to give evidence.

Those additional points raised by Blaxland were dismissed by the court , as was the primary argument relating to the change in joint enterprise law. Pointing to his youth, Blaxland argued he was 'susceptible to peer pressure and had an adolescent concern to avoid exclusion'. But Sir Brian Leveson, who was sitting with Mr Justice Nicol and Sir Brian Keith, said that there was 'absolutely no evidence from Towers to that effect'. Jordan Towers' sister, Ashleigh, has vowed to carry on the fight to clear her brother's name. 'We are going to fight on 100%. We are going to look at the Supreme Court and then The European Court of Human Rights,' she told the local press.

Sir Brian accepted that the attack on Johnson was unplanned and that Towers 'stepped away' before the killing. But he added: 'His behaviour thereafter was not, in any sense, to distance himself from the joint attack'. Leveson J commented that the 'starting point' was that Towers was aware that he and at least one of the others in the group was armed. The court was satisfied that Towers

had not been the victim of a substantial injustice by the reason of the change in the law. The Appeal judges concluded that the three youths were 'clearly looking for trouble' and it was 'undeniable that Mr Johnson was goaded and encouraged' to leave his house and become involved in the fight. They based this on three reasons: First, Towers 'involved himself in a joint enterprise knowing that he and his co-adventurers were armed'; second, he 'took part in, or associated himself with, the attack (however ineffectually) by lifting and throwing a paving slab' at Johnson; and, third, he went on, with the intention of causing grievous bodily harm, to involve himself in the attack on Thompson.

Ashleigh Towers insisted her brother is not a murderer. 'I know he was stupid, I'm not going to deny that, but he did not kill anyone. He did not even realise Mr Johnson had been stabbed… . We do not believe Jordan was part of a joint enterprise. This has 100% been a miscarriage of justice. I can't believe he was convicted.' Since Jogee, the CCRC has received around 103 applications featuring arguments about joint enterprise. They have also considered such issues in an additional 104 joint enterprise cases which had already applied before the Supreme Court decision. The Court of Appeal recognised the hard work of the CCRC. 'Their consideration of these cases has, as always, been thorough and detailed. The fact that, following examination with the benefit of submissions on behalf of the Crown, in relation to Towers, it has not prevailed does not diminish the importance of its work either in general or, indeed, in this case.

Global Day Of Solidarity With Kevan Thakrar & Against Solitary Confinement

When: Wednesday 13th March 2019. Please join us for a peaceful demonstration outside the Ministry of Justice, 102 Petty France, London SW1H 9AJ. If you cannot make it to London, organise a solidarity demo where ever you are in the world.

The 13th March 2019 marks nine years that Kevan has been held in a Close Supervision Centre (CSC) under conditions of solitary confinement. He was first incarcerated in the CSC after suffering an assault by four prison guards in his cell at HMP Frankland in 2010. He defended himself, for which he was charged with attempted murder and GBH and placed in the CSC system. He won the case brought by his assailants but today, over seven years after he was cleared, remains in the CSC with no indication of when he may leave. His indefinite isolation clearly contravenes the position of the UN Special Rapporteur on torture and on these grounds we demand his immediate release from the CSC system."

We are calling for people to organise actions and events in their region. IWOC London will also be organising a demo, with details to be announced. We encourage groups to not only raise awareness about Kevan but to highlight solitary confinement in their own countries and amplify the voices of those behind bars. It is Kevan's birthday on the 9th of March, and we encourage people also to write letters and birthday cards!

Why: Kevan Thakrar has been fighting for his life for the last 11 years after a wrongful conviction [1]. In 2008 at the aged of 20 Kevan began serving a life sentence, with a minimum term of 35 years, under the highly controversial "joint enterprise" doctrine [2]. Kevan's refusal to submit to racist abuse from prison guards has made him a target for reprisals. Notably, in 2010 he suffered a premeditated attack in his cell by HMP Frankland guards. When he fought back, he was charged with attempted murder and GBH, and put in solitary confinement, wherein one form or another he remains to this day. The charges were sufficiently brazen that a jury cleared him unanimously in a rare victory against the testimony of prison offices.

Despite his success in court, Kevan has been isolated in Closed Supervision Centres (a 'prison within a prison') across the country and currently at HMP Whitemoor. Closed Supervisions

Centres are the most extreme form of imprisonment in the UK, modelled on the "supermax" prisons in the United States, and Kevan's testimony is one of the few sources of information available to those on the outside. They are the ultimate punishment in the British prison system and subject people within them to brutal dehumanisation, degradation and demonisation.

Kevan Thakrar is a crucial voice from inside the UK prison today, writing extensively on the conditions endured by people held in the worst prisons in the country. Read his recently published letter that he sent to the Justice Secretary that details the perpetual injustice of his case[3]. You can also read two historical zines published about the CSC written by Kevan distributed by Bristol Anarchist Black Cross [4]. Kevan continues to suffer both PTSD and further reprisals for shining a light on the abuse suffered by himself and by other incarcerated people but still refuses to stay silent about the abuses of the prisons system in general and the Closed Supervision System in particular. "All I can ever do is drag some of these events into the light. Ignorance can no longer be an excuse for indifference." – Kevan Thakrar

If you would like more information about Kevan or would value support from IWOC to help organise an event/talk/info night, please contact us at iwoc@iww.org.uk. We have friends, family and comrades of Kevan who are keen to help share his story, as well as an ex-prisoner who was in the CSC who passionately wants to expose the system.

Letter From Kevan: Wednesday 13th March 2019 marks the 9th anniversary since I was first isolated from the mainstream prison population and detained within the notorious Close Supervision Centre (CSC) system under Prison Rule 46. The majority of this time has been spent in conditions which can accurately be described as Solitary Confinement, but thanks to the support and pressure of those outside, for the last few months I have been in small group isolation instead, mixing with five other guys. It is well known that serious harm is caused by detaining a human being even within the slightly improved environment I currently find myself in, for the shortest period of time. Reports have been published condemning this kind of treatment as long ago as 1997 by Amnesty International, and the prison service even have their own report saying the same things authored by their Chief Medical Officer, Sir Donald Acheson. It is for these reasons that the prison service lie about the conditions. They force me to suffer, officially they do not subject anyone to Solitary Confinement in this country.

They claim that I was sent here to HMP Whitemoor's CSC to enable me to access an "improved regime" and "psychological risk reduction" so that I can progress out of CSC. The problem is that to date they have never identified any so-called risks to reduce because of the fact that I have been wrongfully selected to the CSC based upon false allegations made by corrupt and racist prison officers at HMP Franklin, which I was subsequently proven innocent of at Newcastle Crown Court December 2011. The focus of psychologists then has been to coerce, manipulate and pressure me into going to the High Secure Hospital Broadmoor so that the prison system no longer has to deal with the problem that they have created.

Why should I go to a Mental Health Hospital to alleviate the pressure on prison service management to get me out of the CSC, rather than fight to be returned to mainstream prison population like I have been doing for the last nine years? So, what is needed instead is an increase in the pressure to progress me which to start with could begin with a protest demonstration to mark the anniversary.

I, therefore, call for the support of everyone willing and able to help me to overcome this challenge by publicising, then turning up for the demo, which will be announced by IWOC, as well as organising actions at embassies and other places where you are. Thank you all in advance for your support, and I look forward to soon being able to tell you the positive results of your action. *Kevan Thakrar A4907AE HMP Whitemoor*

Sally Challen Conviction Quashed - Will Face a New Trial

Caroline Davies, Guardian: Sally Challen, who killed her husband in a hammer attack at their Surrey home, will face a new trial after her murder conviction was overturned in a landmark decision. Challen, 65, said she had killed her husband, Richard Challen, 61, in August 2010 after 40 years of being controlled and humiliated by him. She was jailed for life for his murder following a trial at Guildford crown court in 2011. But her conviction was quashed and a retrial ordered at the court of appeal in London on Thursday 28th February, after a panel of three judges ruled it was unsafe in light of new evidence that was not available at the time of her trial.

Speaking outside the court after the ruling, her son David Challen, 31, said: “It’s an amazing moment. The courts have acknowledged this case needs to be looked at again, as we have always said as a family. “The abuse our mother suffered, we felt, was never recognised properly and her mental conditions were not taken into account. As sons, we get another shot for our story to be heard, the events that led to our father’s death to be heard, and for our mother to have another shot at freedom – a freedom she has never had since the age of 15.”

Challen, of Claygate, Surrey, who was separated from her husband at the time of the crime, hit him with a hammer 20 times. She admitted killing the former car dealer, but denied murder claiming diminished responsibility. Her case was that she had been subjected to abuse and intimidation by her husband, whom she met when she was 15. The prosecution case was that it was the action of a jealous woman who suspected infidelity, and she was found guilty of murder and jailed for life with a minimum term of 22 years, later reduced on appeal by four years. She has so far served eight years of her sentence.

Quashing her conviction on Thursday, three senior judges ruled fresh evidence given by a psychiatrist undermined the safety of her conviction. Challen, who attended the appeal over a video link from HMP Bronzefield in Ashford, Surrey, burst into tears as she heard the result and there were cheers and applause from relatives and supporters in the public gallery. Challen will now face a retrial on a charge of murder. Lady Justice Hallett, sitting with Mr Justice Sweeney and Mrs Justice Cheema-Grubb, said: “The court of appeal heard that, in the opinion of a consultant forensic psychiatrist, the appellant was suffering from two mental disorders at the time of the killing. This evidence was not available at the time of the trial and the court quashed the conviction and ordered a retrial.” The judges rejected an application by Ms Challen’s lawyers for her to be released on bail.

At a press conference, one of Challen’s lawyer, Harriet Wistrich, said: “Whatever may be the ultimate outcome, we have managed to raise awareness and a much deeper understanding of the concept of coercive control, which is such a recent one.” Wistrich said she had spoken to Challen immediately after the hearing. “It has not sunk in yet. She was obviously delighted that the appeal was won, but daunted by the prospect of what’s to come.” She said this time the case would be “armed with great deal more concerning the context of how Sally came to act”. She had been portrayed as a jealous wife in her first trial, she said, adding: “I think that picture is now turned on its head because of our understanding of coercive control.” The case was also supported by Challen’s other son, James Challen, and the campaign group Justice for Women, which had run a high-profile campaign ahead of the appeal. Challen’s legal team is expected to pursue a bail bid at a future crown court hearing. The court ordered Challen will have to have the fresh murder charge put to her within two months.

Justice for Women was established in 1990 as a feminist campaigning organisation that supports, and advocates on behalf of, women who have fought back against or killed violent men.We strive to eradicate the discrimination in the legal system against women who have suffered male violence.

All-Party Parliamentary Group (APPG) on Miscarriages of Justice

On 5th February 2019, met at Portcullis House in Westminster. The APPG was set up to examine the structural problems within the Criminal Justice system which result in miscarriages of justice and to provide a forum from which to improve access to justice for the wrongly convicted. The APPG is setting up a Commission to investigate, take evidence, and receive submissions on what is required to raise awareness of miscarriages of justice and call for reforms that help prevent wrongful convictions and improve access to justice for those who have been convicted of crimes they did not commit. They have said: "With the support groups and families providing the passion and supplying much of the information, and the APPG’s determination to feed evidence through to government - we have what is needed for change. So it is up to us all to decide how best to present our ideas for change. They will then be fed through via the new Commission, along with evidence of the type and scale of wrongful convictions." This APPG is extremely important; finally, we have a group that is willing to listen to those working to protect victims of miscarriages of justice and who has the power to present findings to Parliament.

Radio Dj Paul GambaccinI and Harvey Proctor, a former Conservative MP, who were both falsely accused of historical sex offences, are launching a pressure group to campaign for law reform. Other founders of the group include Daniel Janner QC who recently announced the launch of Falsely Accused Individuals for Reform (Fair), said it would be pressing for anonymity for those accused of sexual offences until they were charged. SAFARI supports the new group's goals, but we go further; we believe there should be anonymity for those accused of sexual offences until they are convicted - not just charged. This is because publishing the identity of an innocent victim of a false accusation so often results in more people out to get compensation jumping on the bandwagon (which is often referred to by the police and media as "other victims coming forward"). The cumulative effect of false accusations almost always results in an unfair trial, as people tend to think (and prosecutors tend to say): "Why would so many people all be telling lies?"

No End To The Suffering. People who have been falsely accused, wrongfully convicted, and then imprisoned suffer the emotional after-effects for the rest of their lives. Sometimes the symptoms die down for a while, but they are always ready to rear their heads again. Symptoms can include: nightmares and flashbacks (re-experiencing events), physical symptoms like sweating, nausea, pain, and trembling can occur as well; hyperarousal, including irritability, rage, insomnia, having trouble concentrating, and hyper-vigilance; and avoidance of anything that reminds them of the psychological trauma they have been through.

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.