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 736 (10/04/2019) - Cost £1

John Bowden - Now a Hostage in a Conflict Between Two Agencies of the State

On the 22nd January 2019 after almost forty years in prison, the Parole Board considered the case for either my release or continued imprisonment. In the case of a life sentence or indeterminately sentenced prisoners once such prisoners have been detained for the length of time initially recommended by the judiciary or Secretary of State, in my case 25 years. Then the Parole Board has statuary and legal obligation and responsibility to review the case for either the release or the continued detention of such prisoners. At three previous parole hearings, my release had been denied by the Parole Board claiming I was a "difficult and anti-authoritarian" prisoner, and insufficiently obedient to prison authority. My actual risk or danger to the public, the prime official criteria for denying the release of life sentence prisoners, was never cited as a reason for my continued imprisonment.

At my parole hearing on the 22nd January, this year, all the professionals employed to assess the potential risk of prisoners to the community, prison psychologists, probation officers, etc., all provided evidence stating that my actual risk to the community was either minimal or non-existent and that I could be 'safely managed' outside of prison. My lawyer informed the parole panel that the three main criteria were determining the 'suitability of release' of life sentence prisoners.

1. Has the prisoner served a sufficient length of time to satisfy the interest of retribution?
2. Does the prisoner represent a minimal risk to the community?
3. Can the prisoner be safely managed in the community?

Were all confirmed in my case and therefore there was no real lawful justification for my continued imprisonment. Especially as I remained in prison for almost fifteen years, beyond the length of time initially recommended by the judiciary. The issues raised by the parole panel were not, in fact, my potential risk to the community or potential for violent behaviour. All of which had been assessed by the system professionals who gave evidence at the hearing and who unanimously attested that my risk of either violent behaviour or risk to the community was minimal. The main concern of the parole panel was my propensity to challenge prison authority and my association with radical political groups on the outside, specifically Anarchist Black Cross.

Representatives from the London Probation Service informed the panel that all the groups that I was associated with were lawful and none were associated were illegal activity. Moreover, in terms of my relationship with the prison system, while I continued to question and challenge what I perceived as abuses of power, I had not been involved in violent protest actions against the system for over twenty years. After the parole hearing, the panel announced that it would deliver its decision regarding my release within fourteen days. By law, parole panels must deliver decisions within fourteen days of hearings. On the fourteenth day following my hearing the Parole Board claimed that it had not concluded the hearing on the 22nd January but had "adjourned" it and would conclude with a "paper hearing", when my lawyer and I would not be present, on the 20th February. They also requested additional information from the probation officers responsible for my post-release supervision concerning the conditions and rules of that supervision. The probation officers subsequently provided the Board with the information and reiterated that in their professional opinion I could be safely managed and supervised in the community.

On the 20th February, the Parole Board then claimed that they had "deferred" the "paper hearing" because one of the Board members considering my release had decided to go on leave. In early March in response to inquiries from the Probation Service regarding a parole decision, the Parole Board said that they were in the process of "finalising" their decision.

What was becoming increasingly apparent was that the Parole Board did not want to make a decision, or at least a decision authorising my release, which placed them in something of a quandary.

Confronted by the evidence and recommendations of system professionals such as probation officers and prison-hired psychologists who had all stated that there was no public protection justification for my continued imprisonment. The Parole authorities were denied a legitimate legal cover for my continued detention, and obviously were extremely reluctant to openly declare the real reason for their desire to deny my release - a determination to continue my punishment for ever having dared to fight and challenge the prison system, and my refusal to compromise or surrender my political integrity and spirit.

In reality, when considering the release of life sentence prisoners one criteria is given absolute priority over all others, and it indeed is not "public protection" or the propensity, or not, of the prisoner to criminally re-offend. The most fundamental criteria governing the release decision of life sentence prisoners is the absolute obedience of the prisoner to the authority of those enforcing that imprisonment? Essentially, prisons exist as instruments of social control to tame the rebellious poor and condition them into total obedience to the system; "rehabilitation" is merely a veneer used to legitimise an institution that is intrinsically brutal and inhuman.

Extremely high levels of "re-offending" and re-imprisonment illustrate just how ineffective prisons are as instruments of genuine "public protection". What influences and determines Parole Board decisions is more the "model prisoner" inclination of the prisoner being considered for release then whether they represent a genuine "risk to the public" or are likely to "re-offend." In my case, therefore, while the Parole Board was probably satisfied that my actual risk to the ordinary public was either minimal or non-existent, and after being imprisoned for almost forty years the "interests of retribution" had been adequately satisfied in my case. Nevertheless, my continuing propensity to challenge the authority and power of those imprisoning me, in the eyes of a white middle-class Parole Board, rendered me "unsuitable for release."

In 1980 I, along with two other men, was imprisoned for the killing of a fourth man during a drunken gathering of petty criminals in a South London council estate. Imprisoned for a minimum of 25 years I was cast into a jail system characterised by naked brutality and violent repression that dealt with "difficult" prisoners in an often-destructive way. An already emotionally and psychologically much damaged young state-raised prisoner and now with absolutely nothing to lose, I responded to the violence of the system with extreme resistance.

In 1983 I was convicted of taking a prison governor hostage and had an additional ten years added to my sentence. I was also consigned to solitary confinement for four years in conditions of total de-humanisation. I continued to resist and fight back, and was frequently brutalised, but also experienced profound political radicalisation and came to see my struggle against the prison system as part of a much broader struggle against state oppression everywhere.

For the next three decades of my imprisonment I committed myself totally to the struggle for prisoner's rights, and as a result, was labelled by the prison authorities as a "subversive and difficult prisoner." In 1992 I managed to escape and with the assistance of political supporters outside I lived and travelled widely around Europe before being re-captured two years later.

In 2007 I was finally transferred to an open prison, supposedly as preparation for release, and worked each day in the outside community as a literacy tutor for adults with learning difficulties.

Then 12 months later I was "Down Graded" back to a high-security prison following a report by a prison probation officer that I was linked to what he described as a "terrorist organisation". A subsequent official investigation established that the organisation concerned was, in fact, a completely lawful prisoner support group, and I was eventually returned to an open prison. Twelve months later I failed to return to the prison following an outside shopping trip and following my apprehension was again "Down-Graded" to a high-security jail. Eleven years later I remain in "closed conditions". Devoid of a genuine "public protection" justification for my continued imprisonment that imprisonment is continued purely because I am perceived by the establishment as unbroken and defiant, and motivated by a political belief system that condemns me irredeemably as the other.

The reality is that although the Parole Board has little choice but to appear to review my continued imprisonment, it has no intention of agreeing to my release, at least not while I retain even a semblance of defiance and political integrity. My actual perceived risk or danger to the community, which has been assessed by system professionals as basically non-existent, is no longer even evoked by the Board as justification for what has now become my unlawful detention.

On the 18th of March, the Parole Board finally delivered its decision that it prefaced with the admission: "All the professionals support your release on licence and do not consider your risk to the public to be imminent". Martin Jones, CEO of the Parole Board, recently stated to the media: "We have a statutory release test that we have to apply in every case. Moreover, that releasing test is whether the parole applicant's continued detention is necessary for the protection of the public". In my case, however, the Parole Board decided that I would remain imprisoned not in the interest of public protection. However, because a parole hostel intended to house and "supervise" released long-term prisoners had not given a definite confirmation that it would provide accommodation and "supervision" in my case for a more extended period than usually required for released prisoners. The hostel concerned, the London Probation Service and the Multi-Agency Public Protection Agency had all assured the Parole Board that following a specific length of time in the hostel my continued accommodation there would be assessed and an extended period provided if considered necessary.

This was ignored by the Parole Board who were determined to find any semblance of a reason or justification to deny my release. It was subsequently revealed that there was a double-edged reason for the denial of my release. Essentially my refusal to submit mind, body and soul to the authority of the prison system was the prime reason I was considered "unsuitable for release". However, for some time there had been tension between the Parole Board and Justice Ministry because the former had wanted the period of time that released life sentence prisoners were held in parole hostels significantly extended. While the Justice Ministry claimed that a huge demand on places within a restricted number of such hostels and a general lack of resources at their disposal made longer-stay hostels uncreatable.

The refusal of my release was clearly intended by the Parole Board to send a message to the Justice Ministry. That unless post-release life sentence prisoners are "supervised" for a significantly more extended period within parole hostels, and the resources provided for that, then more of them would merely remain incarcerated, regardless of whether they remained a risk to the community or not.

So officially my release was denied after 40 years not because I am considered a risk or danger to anyone, but only because I am now held as a virtual hostage in a conflict between two state agencies.

This amounts to unlawful imprisonment and will now be judicially challenged.

Britain currently has the highest population of life sentenced prisoners in the whole of Europe, and as the social and political climate here becomes increasingly more repressive and retributive that population of the civil dead will continue growing.

John Bowden A5026DM, HMP Warren Hill, Grove Road, Hollesley, Woodbridge, IP12 3BF

The Hard Lessons of Jemma Beale

Simon War: In August 2017, Jemma Beale (27) was convicted and given a ten year prison sentence (of which she will serve half in jail and the remainder on licence), following a trial during which jurors heard that she was a ‘serial liar’, who had falsely accused nine men of raping her on separate occasions, while a further six had supposedly sexually assaulted her. All these bogus allegations were confined to a three-year period, while she was an adult. As a direct result of her lies, an innocent man was convicted of rape and jailed for seven years. Before his conviction was quashed by the Court of Appeal, he had already served over two years in prison, being treated, unsurprisingly, as the lowest of the low: he was a convicted rapist and sex offender. Since his release, he has described graphically for the media how his life has been utterly ruined.

Beale had been supported throughout that case as a victim of sexual violence, whose account must be believed. No doubt there were professionals on hand to give her support, in addition to a police victim liaison officer. In due course she applied for – and received – compensation amounting to £11,000 via the Criminal Injuries Compensation Authority (CICA). Meanwhile, an innocent man, whom she had falsely accused, was rotting in a stinking prison cell, his reputation and happiness destroyed, his life as he'd known it effectively over. And no doubt that would have been the end of the matter had Beale not felt emboldened by her ‘success’. After all, the police had got the result they wanted – the conviction of a dangerous sex offender – and she had pocketed a sum of tax-free money, courtesy of the taxpayer, to spend on whatever she fancied. It’s worth remembering that for some people a lump sum of that size can seem genuinely life changing, especially if they aren’t in regular employment or are living on state benefits.

Jemma Beale, however, was greedy. She was not only hungry for more compensation payments, but she also had a deeply sadistic streak in her nature that led her to revel in the suffering of men she chose as her victims. Psychiatrists and psychologists will no doubt debate whether or not her claims of childhood abuse contributed to her perverted, warped nature, as well as her supposed ‘vulnerability’ as an adult. Whatever the root cause, she set out deliberately to make a series of utterly baseless accusations against other men. Some, she asserted, had raped her. Others subjected her to vile sexual assaults. In every case, her allegations were nothing more than calculated lies.

It was the astonishing volume of these complaints that proved to be Beale’s ultimate undoing. Even police officers who specialise in sexual offences, and who had been indoctrinated during the era of the ‘you will be believed’ policy, imposed from above by former Director of Public Prosecutions (DPP) Sir Keir Starmer and propagated assiduously by his hapless successor Alison Saunders, realised that they had a serial liar and attention-seeker on their hands. Systematically, the whole investigation, which now involved fourteen targets, unravelled and the first innocent victim who'd been jailed saw his rape conviction quashed and he was released from prison (although never from the horrors which he has had to endure). Even so, he must be accounted among the luckiest of the plethora of innocent people rotting in jail, simply because victims of wrongful convictions, especially in cases of sexual offences' prosecutions, are so rarely able to get their appeals as far as the Court of Appeal, let alone being able to clear their names.

Moreover, in the vast majority of such cases, the overarching policy among police and CPS prosecutors is to let sleeping dogs lie. Prosecuting the makers of malicious false sexual allegations is not considered to be ‘in the public interest’. Some excuse almost always seems be found to avoid taking any action, often with an assertion that the liar, fantasist, revenge seeker, fraudster or perjurer suffers from ‘poor mental health’. It is not surprising to me that the police are nearly always reluctant to prosecute liars who have duped them into believing they have been abuse victims because it

is these very liars to whom the police have proffered undiluted support and encouragement throughout the so-called investigation process. I know from first hand experience.

In the specific case of Jemma Beale, however, the CPS did make a decision to charge her and she stood trial and was duly convicted by a jury, despite her stubborn refusal to accept that she had done anything wrong. There was no acceptance of responsibility, nor evidence of any compassion or concern for her many victims.

Importantly, jurors heard and read evidence extracted from her electronic communications, which included text messages, one of which graphically revealed how she was 'glorying' in the suffering of an innocent man she had falsely accused of rape. This fact alone makes it clear why police and prosecutors MUST have access to complainants' communication devices and online accounts. Without the vital evidence of those damning messages, a serial fraudster like Jemma Beale could well have pulled the wool over jurors' eyes and walked out of court free to wreak havoc on further victims.

Court of Appeal: As was her legal right, Beale appealed her conviction and sentence, asserting that ten years was 'unduly harsh'. That appeal was heard this week and the judges of the Court of Appeal rightly rejected her applications. She was properly convicted and her sentence was confirmed. She will remain where she belongs: behind bars for several more years to come and, after her release, will remain under supervision by probation officers until August 2027.

Nevertheless, there has been a concerted effort by Beale's family and others, including journalists, to paint her in a very different light. Articles have been written decrying her conviction and sentencing. She has been portrayed as a vulnerable 'victim' and many column inches have been filled denouncing her prison sentence as 'cruel and unnecessary'. What is noticeably lacking in these protests is any genuine concern for the men whose lives, careers, mental health and relationships Beale has deliberately wrecked.

It gets worse. I recently stumbled across a very professionally produced website, endorsed by members of her family, that continues to proclaim her innocence. This, I suppose, is understandable. Relatives often find it difficult to accept that a loved one could have committed vile crimes. What I found particularly grotesque, however, is that this website names and smears Beale's innocent victims, thus adding to the damage she has already inflicted upon them. If the family of a convicted rapist dared to set up a similar website, naming the victims, I don't doubt for one second that they would be the focus of police attention and would face arrest and possible prosecution. Yet this pro-Beale website continues to peddle her vile lies, despite her conviction and the recent dismissal of her appeal. Will these smears stay online now? Only time will tell.

Although Jemma Beale's case has been reported widely in the media, there has so far been no informed analysis of the lessons that need to be urgently learned. I would suggest that the first issue is just how dangerous the 'you WILL be believed' dogma actually is. Simply accepting as truth any sexual accusation made by any complainant who walks in the door of a police station defies logic to the point of being ludicrous. It certainly flies in the face of established investigative practice of investigating 'without fear or favour' and clearly produces wrongful prosecutions and miscarriages of justice.

Beale's claims should have been thoroughly and impartially investigated from the start. Had this been done, it seems unlikely that her first victim would have lost over two years of his life rotting in a prison cell. These cases have real, human victims. He was failed utterly by the police and the CPS.

The second lesson is the vital importance of police having access to both the complainant's and the defendant's communication devices and online accounts, especially when there is little or no other evidence that an offence has actually taken place. Without such investigation,

vital evidence – such as Jemma Beale's messages expressing her sadistic joy in her vile crimes – would have been lost. Recent calls to block or restrict police investigations on the grounds that it might 'discourage' genuine victims of sexual assault are disingenuous. The only people who are likely to want to keep their communications hidden from police view are liars, fraudsters, fantasists and those bent on revenge.

The third lesson that needs to be emphasised is that when police and prosecutors fail to conduct proper impartial investigations into sexual offences, it empowers fraudsters, liars and fantasists, like Jemma Beale, effectively encouraging them to try it on again and again. During my research into false allegations, I have found such cases, including that of one woman who falsely accused no fewer than seven men – all work colleagues – of rape or sexual assault, while she was working for different firms. In most cases, because the allegations were always set in an office context, each firm's insurer opted to settle her claims quietly, out of court, without realising that she had done it all before. Her anonymity proved very convenient, as well as profitable. She made hundreds of thousands of pounds over the years.

In my own case, the two greedy liars who made false allegations against me had previously been awarded compensation for their claims against another teacher at the same school. Emboldened by their 'success' the first time round, they decided to return to the institutional insurer's 'honey-pot' a second time. They failed when a unanimous jury saw through their tissue of lies in a matter of minutes. However, I am of the firm opinion that, had those lies been believed and I had been convicted, the malicious duo would have pocketed thousands more pounds in undeserved compensation and would then have started plotting to accuse falsely yet another innocent victim.

The fourth lesson is that we need some form of mechanism designed to claw back compensation payments that have been made to individuals – like Jemma Beale – who have been exposed and convicted of perverting the course of justice, perjury or fraud, whether against the CICA or institutional insurers. It is simply outrageous that she has pocketed £11,000 of taxpayers' money without facing the prospect of having to pay back her ill-gotten gains that were obtained by fraud. Other types of criminals, including insurance fraudsters, robbers, drug dealers and embezzlers are regularly slapped with Proceeds of Crime Orders (POCAs), which strip them of their assets and recover monies and property that have been accumulated through criminal activities. Why not the likes of Beale?

The fifth lesson is, whenever a conviction has been quashed in circumstances which make it clear an accuser or prosecution witness has lied on oath, or that trials have collapsed for similar reasons, the CPS should always consider prosecuting, whether the false accuser admits to an offence or not. Of course, there may well be cases where a prosecution genuinely wouldn't be appropriate, but, as Beale's case demonstrates, liars, fantasists and fraudsters can and do inflict appalling damage on their immediate victims and their families, as well as on society as a whole. A failure to acknowledge this undermines our justice system and brings the police and CPS into disrepute. I am still beset with daily outrage that the two scheming liars who dragged me into Ipswich Crown Court, in 2014, have walked away with both anonymity and impunity. How can this be fair and just?

I would also suggest that, where a false accuser has been convicted of making sexual allegations against innocent victims, the courts should impose lifelong orders, giving these wronged individuals retrospective anonymity. Such an order could require the online media to remove or redact the innocent parties published names and give them the same rights as genuine victims of sexual offences. Of course, they would retain the right to waive their own anonymity, if they wished to do so. That would put a stop to websites – such as that being maintained by Jemma Beale's family – continuing to name and smear her many victims online.

By any measure, Jemma Beale is an unrepentant criminal, as was noted by the judges at her unsuccessful appeal. She has caused immense harm to many innocent people and continues to refuse to take any responsibility for her vile crimes. In view of these facts, surely it would be appropriate for her (and others like her) to be included on a national register of serious offenders, who should be obliged to notify the police of their details and movements for the rest of their lives? Otherwise, there will be nothing to prevent her reinventing herself, once she has completed her prison sentence and licence period, and causing misery and havoc once again. That must not be allowed to happen.

Done My Time - Out of Prison But Not Home

After serving 10 years in prison (2/3rd of a 15 year sentence) I was due for automatic release on a 15 month licence on 19th March 2019. During my entire incarceration I have maintained my innocence of the historic allegations for which I was convicted at the age of 69. I am now 79, with serious health problems I didn't have before I was sent to prison.

On the approach to my release date, the Offender Manager stated in his OASys reports that I would reside in approved premises (a hostel) in Leicester city centre, just a bus-ride from my home. This would have meant that I would have the support of my wife and friends as well as access to my GP, dentist, optician - in fact, everything that was in place prior to my imprisonment.

My wife and I own our own home, and we had envisaged that we would be together most of the time, and that I would return to the hostel each night. This, unfortunately, was not to be. In the late afternoon of the day before my release I was told of my licence conditions and was horrified to discover that the approved premises had been changed to a hostel in Wolverhampton, over 50 miles from home. I had to be there by 3pm despite not being released from the prison (25 miles in the opposite direction) until 11am, or I would be in breach of my licence and subject to recall.

I am certain I would not have got to the hostel in time (or even known how to get there) by myself. My wife (also in her 70's and not confident on motorways) drove to the prison, waited over 2 hours for me to be released, drove me to Leicester, then on to Wolverhampton via the M69 and the M6. It was a dreadful journey, both because of the volume of motorway traffic and the fact that we had no idea where we were going. On our eventual arrival at the hostel (only 40 minutes late!) my wife wasn't even allowed through the door but had to get straight back in the car and do the return journey alone. That was on Tuesday. On Thursday, and again on Saturday, my wife travelled to Wolverhampton again as she was worried about me. This time, she came by train to avoid the long drive but with two trains (changing in Birmingham New Street) it's still a 2½ hour journey each way and, of course, we have to consider the cost. She can't do this often. So here I am, stuck in Wolverhampton, where I don't know my way around and have managed to get lost a few times. Considering the Probation Service view me as being a 'risk to the public' how does wandering aimlessly around a strange city, full of many places I am instructed to avoid without even knowing where they are, reduce Risk or integrate me back into society? If they are so worried about Risk why aren't I at the Leicester hostel where I can keep in touch with my wife or, safer still, at home?

The Probation Service would do well to remind themselves of the contents of PSI 12/2015 which covers Licence Conditions and states they should be 'preventative not punitive', 'necessary', 'proportionate' and 'reasonable'. I cannot see that this has been applied in my own case, or how my present situation benefits anyone at all.

In her recent final annual report Dame Glenys Stacey, the outgoing Chief Inspector of Probation, has described the current model as 'irredeemably flawed' and recommends that Probation should, in future, meet the 'reasonable needs of individuals under probation supervision'. I absolutely agree. (Name withheld by request)

UK: Case to Establish Whether US Can Assassinate its Own Citizens

Scottish Legal News: Lawyers for US citizen Bilal Abdul Kareem have filed their response to the government in a case that will establish whether the US can assassinate its own citizens, without telling them why or offering them their constitutional right to due process. Mr Kareem alleges that he was nearly killed by US missiles on five separate occasions in 2016, while working as a journalist in Syria. In June 2018, the US District Court for the District of Columbia held that he could plausibly infer that he had been placed on the 'kill list' and that the government must afford him his due process right to find out why. The government's lawyers subsequently sought to have the case thrown out on the grounds that it would prejudice national security if state secrets were to be revealed at trial. In their response to the government's motion to dismiss, Mr Kareem's lawyers, Lewis Baach Middlemiss and Reprieve, stated: "By invoking the state secrets privilege in the context of designating a U.S. citizen for lethal action, the government seeks to shield itself from all inquiry into the process by which it acts as prosecutor, judge, jury and executioner of plaintiff Bilal Abdul Kareem. "The consequences of this action are too severe, and the right [to due process] too foundational to a constitutional democracy, to allow the government to secretly condemn an American citizen to death". Lawyers for the government previously argued that offering Mr Kareem an opportunity to present evidence that he has been targeted for assassination would in itself constitute due process, but that the government is under no legal obligation to respond. Mr Kareem's lawyers said: "Due process would not be satisfied by limiting the accused to unilaterally contending that he is innocent of unknown charges in the hopes of persuading a silent, opaque coterie of government officials not to kill him." Reprieve's Jennifer Gibson, co-counsel for Mr Kareem, said: "The government's assertion that it has the right to mark its own citizens for death, based on secret information, without affording them the legal protections offered by the Constitution, is chilling. "Denying Mr Kareem his right to meaningful due process, on the grounds of national security, would set a dangerous and terrifying precedent."

Recall, Review and Re-Release of Recalled Prisoners Policy Framework

Governors must ensure that any new local policies that they develop because of this Policy Framework are compliant with relevant legislation, including the Public-Sector Equality Duty (Equality Act, 2010). Audit/monitoring: HMPPS Deputy Directors of Custody and Controllers, the Director of the National Probation Service (NPS) and Youth Offending Teams (YOT) in England and Director of HMPPS in Wales and HMPPS Director of Rehabilitation Services for Community Rehabilitation Companies (CRCs) will monitor compliance with the mandatory requirements set out in this framework. HMPPS contract management will hold providers to account for the delivery of mandated requirements as required in the contract. Resource impact: The requirements laid out are designed to have a minimal impact on resources. They do not place new obligations on prison, NPS, YOT or CRC staff. Rather, the framework confirms existing obligations to ensure a swift and efficient recall and review process.

1. Purpose - 1.1 Determinate and indeterminate sentenced prisoners who are released into the community subject to licensed supervision are liable to be recalled to custody by the Secretary of State where they have breached the conditions of their licence. This framework sets out the mandatory requirements that the National Probation Service (NPS), Youth Offending Teams (YOT), Community Rehabilitation Companies (CRCs) and prison establishments must undertake for all recalled prisoners.

2 Outcomes - 2.1 This framework aims to ensure that there is an effective process in place which: • enables offenders subject to licensed supervision in the community to be swiftly recalled to custody where their behaviour (including where they are out of touch) indicates that they present an increased risk of serious harm (RoSH) to the public and / or an increased risk of re-offending, such that those risks are no longer capable of being effectively managed in the community. • notifies the Police that an offender's licence has been revoked, which provides the Police with the authority needed to apprehend the offender and return the offender to prison custody. • notifies providers of probation services, the Police National Computer Bureau (PNCB) and the relevant local police force that offenders who have not been apprehended within four weeks of their licence having been revoked have been issued with a notification of recall and are therefore liable to be prosecuted for knowingly remaining unlawfully at large. • ensures that clear arrangements are in place for identifying which recalled determinate sentenced offenders are suitable for a fixed term recall. • provides for the review of recalled prisoners' detention to be conducted speedily, efficiently and transparently so that all recalled prisoners are provided with clear timescales for the recall process. • ensures that recalled prisoners are not detained any longer than is necessary to protect the public and prevent further re-offending. • equires a recall dossier to be produced, containing a current assessment of the recalled prisoner and their response to supervision, including events which triggered a request for recall, together with clear and comprehensive proposals for the future management of the recalled prisoner in the community. The Parole Board or the Secretary of State will consider whether or not to re-release the recalled prisoner on the basis of the evidence in the recall dossier.

Hundreds of Metropolitan Police Accused of Sex Attacks Escape Punishment

Will Crisp, Independent: Britain's biggest police force is letting hundreds of officers accused of sex attacks escape disciplinary proceedings that could lead to punishment, The Independent can reveal. Figures obtained by The Independent show that just one in every 18 members of the Metropolitan Police accused of sexual assault is ever subject to formal action against them. Between the start of 2012 and 2 June 2018, a total of 562 officers were accused of sexual assault and only 31 faced subsequent proceedings, according to data released under the Freedom of Information Act. Of those 562, 33 retired or resigned, and one solitary officer was forced to undergo a formal investigation that saw them stripped of their pension. Some 313 of the accusations were made by members of the public, while the remaining 249 came from fellow police staff.

The data, from the Mayor's Office for Policing and Crime, also reveals that between 2012 and 2017, the number of officers accused of sexual assault each year rose by 65 per cent. Reports of sexual misconduct and gender-based discrimination also went up, and there were three times as many sexual misconduct complaints made in 2017 than 2012. A total of 60 officers were accused of gender-based discrimination in 2017, four times the figure for 2012. Sex crime reporting has increased in recent years after decades of under-reporting, partly due to increased awareness in the wake of scandals surrounding Jimmy Savile and Harvey Weinstein, the latter of which sparked the international #MeToo movement aimed at getting victims to come forward.

MPs and UK organisations set up to help victims described the Met figures as alarming, and warned that they pointed to a deep-rooted problem at the heart of police culture in the UK. Rachel Krys, co-director of the End Violence Against Women Coalition, said: "These numbers are very likely to be the tip of the iceberg – sexual violence is already extremely under-reported and the power police officers hold means victims would be even less likely to report. "How can women, who are

the victims of most sexual assaults, feel safe seeking protection or justice from a police force with such terrible levels of complaints against its own officers? And how can we be sure complaints are being taken seriously when it appears little is being done to address the issue internally and formal disciplinaries are so rare? We need an urgent statement from the Metropolitan Police commissioner setting out her response to these findings and what will be done to address them, and the mayor should hold her to account and ensure action is taken. The Met must increase women's confidence that if they choose to report sexual violence they can do so safely, that they will be taken seriously and the full force of the law will be brought against any perpetrator, whoever they are."

The figures come in the wake of a series of alleged high-profile sex attacks carried out by Met officers. In November last year, Police Sergeant Kyle Blood was dismissed from the police service after he allegedly assaulted a sleeping woman on a train before squaring up to passengers who tried intervene. Blood admitted gross misconduct over the incident, but denied touching the woman without her consent. Also in November last year, another Metropolitan Police officer, Adam Provan, was jailed after twice raping a 16-year-old girl. In both of the incidents, victims later said the individuals used their status as a police officer to win their trust. Earlier this year, a Metropolitan Police firearms officer and a detective constable were both suspended over texts that discussed "raping" victims of crime. The material handed over to lawyers included videos from a mobile phone that showed suspects being secretly filmed in custody and a message that described someone as a "hot slag victim of crime".

Jess Phillips: 'What matters more, political power or protecting victims of sexual harassment?' Sara Champion, Labour MP for Rotherham and former shadow minister for preventing abuse, said: "It is shocking to see the number of allegations of sexual assault by officers, and how sharply those allegations are rising in recent years. An allegation does not necessarily mean the offence has been committed, but we all need reassurance that complaints are taken seriously and not swept under the carpet. What concerns me most about the figures secured by The Independent is the number of officers who appear to have quietly slipped away after allegations have been made against them. The Met Police needs to make it very clear that an offence by an officer is never tolerated and that the complaints process is transparent, fair, and actions swiftly taken against perpetrator."

Responding to the figures, MP Maria Miller, Chair of the Women and Equalities Select Committee, said: "Police officers do a difficult frontline job, but have to be held to the highest of standards of conduct at all times. Sexual harassment, abuse and discrimination are all against the law and every police authority should have in place robust and fair ways to consider the evidence and where necessary act without hesitation if there has been wrongdoing. It is not acceptable to ignore allegations. Senior management in all police forces, including police and crime commissioners, should be looking carefully at culture to make sure it is keeping up with the change in attitudes in society more widely."

In response to the figures obtained by The Independent, a Metropolitan Police spokesperson said: "Sexual misconduct and abuse of authority for sexual gain is a national priority and a priority for the Metropolitan Police Service. This priority has been extensively publicised within the service, and we have actively encouraged victims to come forward. This has mirrored a wider awareness of these issues across society, and helps to explain why complaints may have increased. All complaints are thoroughly investigated; the MPS recently established a dedicated discrimination investigation unit to handle such cases. Where evidence of wrongdoing has been identified the MPS deals with officers robustly within the frameworks provided by police regulations and criminal investigations."

There have long been concerns about high levels of sexual harassment in UK police forces.

Last year, Metropolitan Police commissioner Cressida Dick said that she had experienced sexism since taking on the role and described the force as a very male-orientated environment. A survey of 1,800 civilian police staff in England, Wales and Scotland, which was published in August last year, found half of police staff had heard sexualised jokes being told repeatedly at work, and more than a fifth had experienced “inappropriate staring or leering”. Almost one in five had received a sexually explicit email or text from a colleague, one in 25 said they had been pressured into having sex, and one in 12 had been told that sexual favours could result in preferential treatment.

JS and Others) v SSHD (Litigation Friends - Children)

Duncan Lewis: This judgment deals with the principles on the procedural approach of the Upper Tribunal in immigration judicial review proceedings involving an applicant who is a child, specifically when it is necessary for a child to be represented by a litigation friend. It also has relevance to statutory appeals in the First-tier and Upper Tribunal of the Immigration and Asylum Chambers.

All the applicants in the case are children and we represented NL. Although the court stated a litigation friend will only be necessary in the instance that the child is not capable of conducting or giving instructions in relation to the proceedings and that all cases should be fact specific. The court gave the following guidance in paragraphs 84-88 as to when a litigation friend is necessary:

84. Accordingly, as a general matter, we consider that applicants aged 16 or 17 years, without any attendant vulnerability or special educational need or other characteristic denoting difficulty, will be presumed to have capacity and so be able to conduct proceedings in their own right. They will generally not require a litigation friend. This is the position even if they are not legally represented.

85. The appointment of litigation friends for applicants between the ages of 12 years and 15 years inclusive (i.e. 12 and over but younger than 16) will need to be considered on a case-by-case basis and the circumstances which should be considered, but which are not exhaustive, are (a) whether the applicant is legally represented; (see below); (b) whether there is an assisting parent; (c) whether there is a local authority involved (see above); and (d) whether the applicant has any type of vulnerability.

86. If an applicant in this age group is legally represented, the Tribunal will expect the representative specifically to address in writing the issue of whether, in the representative's view, a litigation friend is necessary, having regard to capacity and the position of any parent.

87. Applicants under the age of 12 will normally require a litigation friend.

88. Clearly there may be children over the age of 16 years who do not have capacity and those under 16 years who do. The approach must depend on all the circumstances as to whether to appoint a litigation friend.

The Tribunal further noted that “Ultimately, it is for the Tribunal to determine how best child capacity can be demonstrated [91]." In the case of NL, Olaide Osazuwa (the Solicitor with conduct) filed a witness statement attesting to NL’s capacity. The court pointed out that ‘Where a child is legally represented, it should be for the solicitor with conduct of the case to file a witness statement… attesting to the child's capacity, as in the case of NL.’

In deciding who is to be a suitable litigation friend, the court had regard to the Civil Procedure Rules (CPR) guiding principles. They are: Can he or she fairly and competently conduct proceedings on behalf of the child? Does he or she have an interest adverse to that of the child? The court also pointed out that, where appropriate, the Tribunal may require an undertaking on costs as part of a duty of a litigation friend in Judicial Review proceedings but not in statutory appeals in the First-tier Tribunal and Upper Tribunal. The court further stated that costs should not be a

deterrent to a child accessing justice and ‘all cases will be fact-sensitive as regards costs in addition to the substantive issues.’ [para. 99] The Tribunal will be very unlikely to declare invalid proceedings for those that commence without a litigation friend, except in the instance that the Tribunal later considers they require one. The court indicated that the High Court form of N235 should not be used in Upper Tribunal proceedings. The Tribunal may, in due course, produce its own form, but in the interim an indication should be made on the claim form where a litigation friend is sought. The Secretary of State can also indicate that a litigation friend is required in her Acknowledgment of Service. This case provides clear guidance stating that the Secretary of State is also expected to file in full her Acknowledgment whether or not a litigation friend has been appointed.

US: Tens of Thousands of Old Cannabis Convictions to be Automatically Dismissed

Scottish Legal News: Tens of thousands of convictions for cannabis possession could be dismissed or reduced automatically under a pioneering scheme launched by prosecutors in California. District Attorneys Jackie Lacey of Los Angeles County and Tori Verber Salazar of San Joaquin County have jointly announced their participation in a pilot programme developed by Code for America, a non-profit aimed at helping the public and private sectors use technology more effectively. Up to 200,000 cannabis-related convictions in California are eligible to be dismissed or reduced from felonies to misdemeanours after Californians voted in 2016 to back the legalisation of cannabis for recreational use.However, those with convictions have so far had to apply to remove the old convictions from their records, sometimes requiring the assistance of a lawyer in the process.The new pilot scheme will see the two counties - estimated to have 54,000 eligible convictions between them - pro-actively identify convictions that qualify for resentencing or dismissal under the 2016 referendum. An earlier trial of the technology in San Francisco led to more than 8,000 cannabis convictions being either dismissed or sealed.

District Attorney Lacey, the chief prosecutor for California's most populous county, said: "As technology advances and the criminal justice system evolves, we as prosecutors must do our part to pursue innovative justice procedures on behalf of our constituents. This collaboration will improve people’s lives by erasing the mistakes of their past and hopefully lead them on a path to a better future. Helping to clear that path by reducing or dismissing cannabis convictions can result in someone securing a job or benefiting from other programs that may have been unavailable to them in the past. We are grateful to Code for America for bringing its technology to our office." Jennifer Pahlka, founder and executive director of Code for America, added: "In the digital age, automatic record clearance is just common sense. Thanks to the leadership of District Attorneys Lacey and Salazar, we’ve shown how records clearance can and should be done everywhere."

US Supreme Court Rules Inmate Has 'No Right To Painless Death'

The US Supreme Court has ruled that a convicted murderer on death row in Missouri has no right to a "painless death". The ruling clears the way for the execution of Russell Bucklew, who asked for gas rather than lethal injection, citing an unusual medical condition. Bucklew, 50, argued the state's preferred method amounts to legally banned "cruel and unusual punishment". The 5-4 ruling split along the court's ideological lines.

Bucklew was sentenced to death in 1996 for rape, murder and kidnapping in an attack against his ex-girlfriend and her new partner and six-year-old son. In recent court filings, Bucklew argued that his congenital condition, cavernous hemangioma, might cause him excessive pain if he is put to death by lethal injection. The condition causes blood-filled tumours in his throat, neck and face,

which he said could rupture during his execution causing him extreme pain and suffocation. According to Bucklew, he would feel excessive pain if the state executioner is allowed to use the state's preferred method of a single drug, pentobarbital, applied by needle.

But the Supreme Court's conservative justices said on Monday they considered the legal effort to be a stalling tactic. They said it was up to the prisoner to prove that another method of execution would "reduce a substantial risk of severe pain", but he had not done so. Writing for the majority, Justice Neil Gorsuch noted that Bucklew had been on death row for more than 20 years. "The eighth amendment [to the US constitution] forbids 'cruel and unusual' methods of capital punishment but does not guarantee a prisoner a painless death," wrote Justice Gorsuch, who was appointed by President Donald Trump in 2017. He continued: "As originally understood, the eighth amendment tolerated methods of execution, like hanging, that involved a significant risk of pain, while forbidding as cruel only those methods that intensified the death sentence by 'superadding' terror, pain or disgrace." Liberals on the court, including Justice Stephen Breyer, argued that Bucklew's condition should have allowed for him to be put to death by nitrogen gas, a method allowed in three states. "There are higher values than ensuring that executions run on time," wrote Justice Sonia Sotomayor in a separate opinion, adding that secrecy in the death penalty process has recently yielded different results in two similar cases.

US inmate executed amid imam row: In one case in Alabama, a Muslim man was forbidden from having an imam with him during his execution, but the court halted a similar sentence after an appeal by a Buddhist who wanted his spiritual adviser present when he was put to death. In Justice Gorsuch's majority opinion in the Bucklew case, he referred to those two cases, saying the inmate in Alabama had been given ample time to voice his complaint, but chose to do so only 15 days before he was scheduled to die.

MP's Say, Scrap Prison Sentences of Under a Year'

Justice Gap: MPs have called on the government to consider scrapping sentences of up to a year in a report published this morning on the 'enduring' crisis in our prisons. Over the past 25 years the prison population had grown exponentially from 44,246 in 1993 to 82,384. 'We are now in the depths of an enduring crisis in prison safety and decency that has lasted five years,' the House of Commons' justice committee report concluded. The MPs reported that capacity had not kept pace with the massive population growth, many prisons were now overcrowded whilst the amount spent on prisons had fallen in recent years. 'We conclude that ploughing funding into building prisons to accommodate prison projections is not a sustainable approach in the medium or long-term,' the committee wrote. 'There must be a focus on investing in services to reduce the £15 billion annual cost of reoffending and prevent offenders from continually returning to prison, thereby reducing the size of the prison population.'

The committee recommended that the Government introduce a presumption against short custodial sentences and 'model the effects of abolishing sentences of fewer than 12 months'. 'We are now in the depths of an enduring crisis in prison safety and decency that has lasted five years… . There is a grave risk that we become locked in a vicious cycle of prisons perpetually absorbing huge amounts of criminal-justice related spending, creating a perverse situation in which there is likely to be more "demand" for prison by sentencers in areas where they have less access to effective community alternatives.' 'The Ministry of Justice (MoJ) and Treasury are guilty of a crisis management approach to prisons that has been failing for the past five years,' commented chair of the Justice Committee, Bob Neill MP. 'Throwing money at the prison system to tackle multiple issues takes funding away from external rehabilitative programmes that could stem or reverse many of the problems.'

According to the MoJ, funding for prisons had fallen in real terms from £2.6 billion in 2010–11 to £2.1 billion in 2017–18, a fall of £466 million. The direct cost per prisoner has fallen from £26,801 in 2010 to £24,151 last year. The report quoted an analysis by Julian Le Vay, a former finance director of the prisons service, who found that the MoJ's current ambitions were 'inadequately funded to the tune of £162m in 2018–19, rising to £463m in 2022–23'. Mike Driver, the MoJ's chief financial officer, told MPs that, without securing more money from the Treasury, it would be necessary to reduce the prison population by 'something like 20,000'. 'The thing is that we are not working in an environment that would necessarily allow those very broad assumptions to be deliverable,' he added.

The MPs have called for a 'refreshed narrative' around prisons including 'an explicit recognition that social problems cannot be meaningfully addressed through the criminal justice system'. 'This is not only a moral imperative but also now a financial necessity,' the report added. The justice secretary Rory Stewart MP appeared before the committee to discuss the poor performance of HMP Liverpool. 'We should be deeply ashamed as a society if people are living in filthy, rat- infested conditions with smashed-up windows, with high rates of suicide and violence,' he told the committee. 'We are tough and we are clear on prisoners: if you commit an offence, your punishment is to go to prison. But we do not torture people in prisons through unsanitary conditions, and we must never allow that to happen.' Bob Neill called for 'a serious open public debate about the criminal justice system, the role of prison and its affordability'. 'There must be greater transparency so that everyone can understand the true costs and challenging nature of decisions which need to be made about public spending on prisons and other aspects of criminal justice. This should form the first step of the Justice Secretary's 'National conversation'. These issues cannot be hidden behind the prison gates any longer.

Home Office 'Takes Reigns Off' Stop And Search

Justice Gap: There has been 16-fold rise in the use of 'section 60' stop and search powers by the Metropolitan Police in the last three years. The powers under the Criminal Justice and Public Order Act allow officers to stop anyone in a area without reasonable grounds for suspicion Yesterday (03/04/2019), the prime minister hosted a 'knife crime summit' and the Home Secretary Sajid Javid announced that he would further increase its use by reducing the level of authorisation required from senior officer to inspector and decreasing the degree of certainty required by that officer so they must reasonably believe an incident involving serious violence 'may', rather than 'will', happen.

According to figures released in response to a freedom of information request made by Channel Four News, the use of section 60 has increased exponentially whilst at the same time knife crime offences have also soared. in 2016 there were 442 stop and searches; 1,400 in 2017; and 7,326 last year. Over that period knife crime offences shot up from 11,132 in 2016 to 14,714 in 2018. The section 60 powers were also disproportionately used against Black and Minority Ethnic people. The home secretary Sajid Javid called stop and search 'a hugely effective power when it comes to disrupting crime, taking weapons off our streets and keeping us safe'. He said: 'That's why we are making it simpler for police in areas particularly affected by serious violence to use Section 60 and increasing the number of officers who can authorise the power.'

Earlier this month, the government announced £100 million additional funding to support those parts of the country most badly hit by knife crime increasing policing capacity and establishing multi-agency violence reduction units. The Metropolitan Police commissioner Cressida Dick called stop and earch 'an extremely important power for the police' and said it was 'undoubtedly a part of our increasing results suppressing levels of violence and knife crime'. Nick Glynn, the former College of Policing's lead on stop and search, disagreed. 'If you take off the reigns and reduce oversight and gover-

nance of the use of section 60, then the police will use it loads,' he told Channel Four news. 'They won't use it on the right offenders, they won't necessarily use it on the right offences and they will disproportionately use it against black and Asian people. We shouldn't be surprised by that because we have been here before.' The Home Office also proposed that teachers be held accountable for preventing knife crime. 'It is hard to see how it would be either workable or reasonable to make teachers accountable for preventing knife crime. What sort of behaviour would they be expected to report and who would they report to?' commented Geoff Barton, General Secretary of the Association of School and College Leaders. 'How would they be held accountable, for what, and what would the consequences be? How would the government prevent the likelihood of over-reporting caused by the fear of these consequences? Aside from the practical considerations, we have to ask whether it is fair to put the onus on teachers for what is essentially a government failure to put enough police on the streets.'

Scotland's Prison Suicide Inquiry System 'Not Fit For Purpose'

Libby Brooks , Guardiian: The system for investigating prison suicides in Scotland is not fit for purpose, according to analysis conducted by the parents of a woman who killed herself in the country's only dedicated young offenders institution last year. Linda and Stuart Allan believe their daughter Katie Allan, 21, was bullied by other prisoners at Polmont young offenders institution and repeatedly strip-searched by staff who failed to act on her self-harm wounds. The University of Glasgow student had been jailed for 16 months after she injured a teenage boy while drunk driving. The family published a report on Tuesday that concludes: "The dominant culture within Scottish prisons is that suicide is inevitable." It says this is reinforced by lengthy delays and a consistent absence of constructive recommendations in fatal accident inquiries (FAI), which are mandatory after any death in prison.

The Allans, with the help of the University of Glasgow, where Linda Allan is an honorary clinical professor, reviewed information published by the Scottish Prison Service (SPS) on 258 prisoner deaths between 2008 and 2018, cross-referencing this with causes of death and other information recorded in FAIs, where it was available. They found that as of December 2018, 67 families were still waiting for FAIs to take place, some relating to deaths dating back to 2014, while inquiries into prison suicides took the longest to complete: 25 months on average. The report also found that of 16 inquiries into prison suicides, all related to prisoners who took their own lives within six months of being in custody, with three individuals doing so within 24 hours of entering the prison system. The majority of those had significant mental health needs and more than half had a history of suicide attempts, yet fewer than a third were placed on observations at the time of their death. Nearly half were under 30. The analysis also found that six of these prisoners had no contact with a mental health nurse, although it is policy that every inmate is assessed by a healthcare professional when they arrive. The responsibility for healthcare in Scotland's jails was transferred to the NHS in 2011, with the aim of ensuring vital information about prisoners' mental health needs could be more readily available.

The report raises fresh concerns about the implementation of the SPS's updated suicide prevention strategy, Talk to Me, in particular for at-risk young people, after the outcry last November over the death of William Lindsay, a vulnerable teenage boy who killed himself at Polmont within 48 hours of being remanded despite having been identified as a suicide risk. The Allans' lawyer, Aamer Anwar, said his clients had lost faith in the prison service. "They believe an FAI system is set up to fail families and hide what is truly happening," he said. "Over half of those imprisoned today in Scotland's prisons have definable mental health problems and prison is not fit for purpose for dealing with them." A spokesperson for the SPS said an independent review of mental health care at Polmont would be reporting in the next few months. "Staff take very seriously the responsibility they have to care for those sent to them by the courts," they said. "We are absolutely transparent in recording deaths in custody and publish them on our website when next of kin have been notified, we have done so for many years." A Crown Office spokeswoman said: "The Crown Office and Procurator Fiscal Service [COPFS] is committed to the prompt investigation of deaths, but accepts that in some cases the time taken to complete a thorough investigation has been too long." She said the COPFS was revising its investigation process.

Anti-Fracking Campaigners Win Appeal on the Right To Protest

In a ground-breaking judgment, the Court of Appeal has granted the appeal brought against the anti-fracking protest injunctions obtained by INEOS, ruling that two of the four interim injunctions granted by the High Court are unlawful, and that the two others need to be reconsidered by the High Court. In July 2017, fracking company INEOS was granted an unprecedented injunction against "persons unknown" in relation to eight sites across England. The injunctions prevented a number of protest-related activities relating to the sites, including trespass, interfering with access to the sites and 'obstructing, impeding or interfering with the lawful activities' of INEOS staff and their contractors. It contained the first ever court mandated blanket ban on slow-walking, which has long been a legitimate and legal form of peaceful protest. It also included a very broad injunction restricting protestors' activities in relation to companies in INEOS' supply chain, although those businesses were not themselves bringing any legal claims.

Environmental activist Joseph Boyd, represented by Heather Williams QC and Jennifer Robinson of Doughty Street Chambers with Blinne Ní Ghrálaigh of Matrix Chambers and law firm Leigh Day, had challenged the injunctions in the High Court, alongside fellow campaigner, Joseph Corré, in November 2017, succeeding in removing one of the injunctions at that stage. Both men appealed to the Court of Appeal arguing that the remaining four injunctions granted to INEOS constituted a threat to free speech and to the right to peaceful protest. Today 03/04/2019, the Court of Appeal ruled in their favour. The Court struck out the two injunctions restricting protest activity in relation to areas of the highway and in relation to INEOS' supply change companies in their entirety, holding that the High Court had failed to properly balance the protesters' right to protest against INEOS' commercial interests. In handing down the lead judgement today, Lord Justice Longmore underscored the potentially chilling effects of the injunctions on lawful protest activity. He said: "The citizen's right of protest is not to be diminished by advance fear of committal except in the clearest of cases." [para 42]. The Court also found that the trespass injunctions failed to include an appropriate temporal limitation. It remitted these injunctions to the High Court for reconsideration, having accepted the arguments advanced on behalf of Mr Boyd that the High Court had failed properly to consider the test for the granting of interim injunctions in cases restricting the right to free speech.

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.