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 738 (24/04/2019) - Cost £1

Ched Evans Settles for £800,000 Out of Court Over Lawyers' Handling of Rape Case

Guardian: The Welsh footballer Ched Evans has agreed an out-of-court settlement with lawyers over their handling of a rape case in which he was imprisoned. It is understood to be around £800,000. The former Manchester City and Sheffield United striker went through a five-year battle to clear his name having served two and a half years in prison. He was cleared after an appeal. This month the 30-year-old, now on loan with Fleetwood Town, agreed the settlement with Brabners, the legal firm which he used in the first trial. At the time, he was playing for Sheffield United and was earning a reported £18,000 a week. The case had been due to go before the high court this month. A Brabners spokesman said: "We are glad that Ched Evans has agreed not to pursue this case, which we believe was entirely without merit. Brabners put forward a strong defence of Mr Evans' claim following a thorough process and we were prepared to vigorously defend our handling of the case."

Evans was convicted in April 2012 of raping a 19-year-old in a Premier Inn near Rhyl, north Wales, the previous May. The court of appeal quashed his conviction and ordered a retrial in 2016. Private investigators gathered new evidence and a £50,000 reward was offered for information to help his case. In a rare move, the jury at Cardiff crown court heard from two men who had had sex with the complainant around the time of the rape allegation. The jury of seven women and five men took less than three hours to find Evans not guilty of the charge after an eight-day trial. After the verdict, Evans said he was "overwhelmed with relief". A statement on Evans's website read: "In late 2016 Ched began litigation against his original defence team of Matthew Bennett and Stuart Ripley of Brabners LLP for negligent defence. On Thursday 4 April 2019 Ched accepted an out of court settlement."

CCRC Refer Case of Michael Devine to the Northern Ireland Court of Appeal

Mr Devine was convicted in Belfast Crown Court in February 1981 of ten offences including attempted murder, firearms offences, conspiracy to pervert the course of public justice, and membership of a proscribed organisation. He pleaded not guilty at trial but was convicted and sentenced to 20 years' imprisonment. Later that year Mr Devine began appeal proceedings but abandoned the appeal before the case was heard. He applied to the Criminal Cases Review Commission in 2014. Having reviewed the case in detail, the Commission has decided to refer Mr Devine's case for appeal because it considers that there is a real possibility that the Court will quash the conviction. The referral is based on the cumulative weight of a number of new factors including: • The absence of modern standards of fairness within the police interview process. • The Northern Ireland Court of Appeal's decision in R v Paul Kelly: in which the Court quashed the conviction of Mr Devine's co-defendant. • The Northern Ireland Court of Appeal's decision in the CCRC referral case of R v Patrick Livingstone which casts doubt on the credibility of at least two officers connected with Mr Devine's case. • New expert evidence from a forensic linguist expressing some concerns about disputed statements. • Evidence potentially undermining the credibility of the senior interviewing officer (who also recorded the disputed statements).• Confidential material that is contained within a separate Annex to CCRC Statement of Reasons that can only be provided to the Court of Appeal and Public Prosecution Service of Northern Ireland.

Wayne Bell 29 Years Old Jailed At 17 For Four Years In 2007 Gives Up Hope of Release'

BBC News: A man who remains in prison after he was jailed aged 17 for stealing a bike has given up hope of being released, his family has said. Wayne Bell was given a now-obsolete type of indefinite sentence for robbery in 2007. Now 29, he has suffered a mental breakdown and feels "trapped" after being repeatedly turned down for release, his relatives said. The Parole Board said it was handling cases as quickly as possible. Mr Bell received the Imprisonment for Public Protection (IPP) sentence in 2007 after he was arrested for taking a bike from a boy he assaulted in Withington, Manchester.

He was told he would serve a minimum sentence of four years for the crime. Mr Bell's father, Carl, said his son had gone before the Parole Board every two years but had been denied release for a number of reasons. His son had been unable to access courses to tackle issues including anger management because they were oversubscribed, he said. Mr Bell said his son had been an "easy target" for other inmates which had led to him becoming involved in fights and further hampered his release. "We are all hoping, but Wayne has given up. "He's 29 years old and he's had no life." He said the abolition of IPP sentences in 2012 had come too late for his son and called on the government to release him.

Disciplinary Action For Police Officers Over Shana Grice Murder

Vikram Dodd and Steve Anderson, Independent: Police officers are to face disciplinary charges over the case of a woman murdered after being stalked by her former partner, whose repeated pleas for help instead saw her fined for wasting police time. Shana Grice, 19, had her throat slit in 2016 by Michael Lane, who was convicted of her murder in 2017 and jailed for 25 years. After the murder, Sussex police's handling of the case was investigated by the police watchdog, the Independent Office for Police Conduct (IOPC).

Grice, of Portslade, near Brighton, made five separate complaints against Lane between February and July 2016. The pair had an on-off relationship, but when Grice finished it, Lane slashed the tyres of her car, assaulted her in the street and broke into her home. He also fitted a tracker to her car so he could monitor her movements. Lane was only ever cautioned and never charged with an offence. The judge at the murder trial criticised police, accusing them of "stereotyping" the woman he murdered as she sought protection from the man stalking her.

Sussex police said two police officers, one of whom has retired, would face gross misconduct proceedings next month. It said another police officer faced internal misconduct proceedings. Three other police officers and three members of police staff accepted management advice and further training. In March 2016 Lane chased Grice down the street, snatched her phone and pulled her hair. She complained to police, but when Lane was interviewed he showed police phone messages from her to him that he claimed proved they were in a relationship.

It led to Grice being fined £90 for wasting police time and Lane was released without charge, a decision criticised by the judge at his murder trial, Nicholas Green. "There was seemingly no appreciation on the part of those investigating that a young woman in a sexual relationship with a man could at one and the same time be vulnerable and at risk of serious harm," he said. "The police jumped to conclusions and Shana was stereotyped." Assistant chief constable Nick May said: "We deeply regret the tragic death of Shana Grice in 2016 and are committed to constantly improving our understanding of stalking and our response to it. "When we looked at the circumstances leading to Shana's murder, we felt we may not have done the very best we could and made a referral to the IOPC."

On Tuesday the IOPC ruled on another case involving a woman fearing violence who died after seeking help from Sussex police. Michelle Savage complained to police three times that she feared her life was in danger from her former husband Craig Savage. He eventually shot her and her mother dead in 2018 at their home in St Leonards-on-Sea, East Sussex. A call handler has been given advice, the IOPC said, and the force has been told to make improvements.

In a report published on Wednesday, Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabulary and Fire & Rescue Services tells police across the country they must improve their response to protecting victims of stalking and harassment. The report finds police and other agencies lack a common definition of stalking and that complaints have risen 40%. It says police are not using their powers robustly enough and while progress has been made, more needs to be done. The report said training Sussex police promised to introduce after Grice's case had not been received by most officers, and called for police nationally to make urgent improvements. Sussex police Assistant Chief Constable Nick May said: "The report acknowledges we have significantly improved our understanding of what stalking and harassment is, and what our response should be. It also sets out where there is even more work to do and we accept this."

Lucy Hadley, campaigns and public affairs manager at Women's Aid, said 40% of women supported by domestic abuse services had suffered surveillance, harassment and stalking. "Time and time again we hear from survivors of domestic abuse that the police have not taken their experiences of stalking at the hands of their abusive ex-partner seriously. "We know that controlling and possessive behaviour from an ex-partner is a red flag that [a woman] is at serious risk of fatal violence. "It can be a matter of life or death that the police give the right response in stalking cases. That's why we urge police leaders to invest in domestic abuse and stalking training."

Mentally Ill Criminals to Have Specific Sentencing Guidelines

BBC News: Judges handing sentences to criminals with mental illnesses or learning difficulties will have to follow specific guidelines for the first time. New draft sentencing guidelines are being issued in England and Wales to ensure that courts are fair when deciding how responsible mentally ill offenders are for their crimes. It could see some offenders with mental disorders receive lighter sentences. The draft new guidance from the Sentencing Council for England and Wales applies to offenders who are aged 18 and have conditions such as learning disabilities, schizophrenia, depression, post-traumatic stress, dementia and disorders resulting from drug or alcohol misuse.

It means judges and magistrates would need to consider several questions when determining how much responsibility the mentally-ill offenders bear for their crimes, including: Did the individual's condition impair their ability to exercise appropriate judgment, make rational choices or think clearly? Did they seek help, and fail to receive appropriate treatment or care? Were there any elements of premeditation or pre-planning in the offence? If the offender exacerbated their condition by drinking or taking drugs, were they aware of the potential effects of doing so?

The new guidance does not aim to change sentencing practice but instead provide judges and magistrates with a "clear structure" to follow. And just because an offender has such a condition or disorder does not necessarily mean that they will receive a different sentence, the draft guidance says. It explains: "In some cases the condition may mean that culpability is significantly reduced, in others, the condition may have no relevance to culpability."Judge Rosa Dean, a member of the Sentencing Council, said: "The offender's mental health is just one element that the courts must consider, and the guideline strives to balance the rights and needs of offenders with protecting the public, the rights of victims and families, and their need to feel safe."

And Lucy Schonegevel, from the charity Rethink Mental Illness, said: "This is a big step towards the justice system having a better understanding of mental illness, as it's the first time there will be specific sentencing guidelines in this area." The Sentencing Council said data suggests that people in the criminal justice system are more likely to suffer from mental health problems than the general population. According to a 2017 report, nearly one quarter (23%) of inmates arriving at prison had previously been in contact with mental health services.

A Ministry of Justice spokesman said: "It is vital the courts have clear and consistent guidance in these often complex cases, so that an offender's mental health is addressed and the public kept safe." The draft guidance, which is subject to consultation, must be followed unless a judge or magistrate considers it is not in the interests of justice to do so. It will be used alongside current guidelines, which exist to ensure that sentences are consistent across different courts. The Sentencing Council has a range of guidelines on different factors. Currently, pre-sentence reports are compiled for offenders, which can help the court decide which sentence to pass. Rethink Mental Illness charity says these can include information about mental health problems or drug and alcohol issues, for example.

Russian State Must Address Systemic Problem of Prisoner Transportation

The case concerned complaints brought by seven Russian nationals about the conditions of their transfer between remand prisons and correctional facilities. In Chamber judgment in the case of Tomov and Others v. Russia the ECtHR held, that there had been: a violation of Article 3 (prohibition of inhuman or degrading treatment) of the ECoHR as concerned the conditions of transport of six of the applicants, excluding one pre-trial period for one of those applicants ; a violation of Article 13 (right to an effective remedy) taken in conjunction with Article 3 as concerned a complaint by three of the applicants that there were no effective remedies in domestic law for them to challenge their conditions of transport; and, a violation of Article 6 § 1 (right to a fair hearing) as concerned one applicant, who had not been given the opportunity to present a court claim for compensation for inadequate detention conditions. It also held, unanimously, that the Russian State had failed to comply with their obligations under Article 38 (obligation to furnish necessary facilities for the examination of the case) because it had refused to submit regulations requested by the Court (in application no. 18255/10). The Court found that the violations had chiefly stemmed from the authorities' adherence to outdated standards on prisoner transportation which meant in particular that some detainees had been transported in solid metal cubicles in prison vans, while others had had to travel overnight in train compartments without enough sleeping places. Under Article 46 (implementation) the Court outlined measures for improving what is a recurrent structural problem and gave Russia 18 months from the date of the judgment becoming final to set up effective domestic remedies to prevent similar violations.Start here

Attempt to Extradite Disabled Former Prisoner to Kosovo Would Violate Article 8

There would be a violation of article 8 (right to respect for private and family life) of the European Convention on Human Rights if a man resident in Switzerland, who was convicted of rape and who is now disabled and dependent on his children, were to be expelled to Kosovo, judges in the European Court of Human Rights have unanimously ruled. The case concerned the Swiss authorities' refusal to renew the residence permit of IM (a Kosovar national who has lived in Switzerland since 1993) and the order expelling him from Swiss territory, following his conviction for a rape committed in 2003. IM, whose rate of disability has been assessed at 80 per cent, is currently living in Switzerland with his adult children, on whom he is dependent.

In 2003, IM was convicted on charges of sexual coercion and rape, based on incidents which

had occurred the same year. In 2005 the Court of Appeal, which only considered the charge of rape, reduced the initial sentence to two years and three months' imprisonment, and upheld IM's expulsion from Swiss territory for 12 years, suspended, with a probation period of five years. In 2015, the Federal Administrative Court dismissed an appeal lodged by IM against a 2010 decision to extend the cantonal expulsion order to the whole country, on the grounds, in particular, that the prison sentence of two years and three months which had been imposed on him had clearly exceeded the threshold for admitting a breach of serious endangerment of public order and security.

The ECtHR found in particular that the Federal Administrative Court, when adjudicating in 2015 – more than 12 years after the offence committed by the applicant – had not taken account of the change in the applicant's behaviour or assessed the impact of the major downturn in his state of health on the risk of his reoffending. Nor had the Federal Administrative Court taken into consideration the strength of the applicant's social, cultural and family bonds with the host country (Switzerland) and the country of destination (Kosovo), or carried out a sufficiently thorough analysis of the implications of IM's dependence on his adult children. The domestic authorities had thus conducted a superficial examination of the proportionality of the expulsion order and had failed convincingly to demonstrate that it was proportionate to the legitimate aims sought to be achieved (the prevention of disorder or crime) and necessary in a democratic society. There would consequently be a violation of Article 8 if IM were to be expelled.

'Thought Crime' Terror Laws Come Into Force in Britain

Lizzie Dearden, Independent: New counterterror laws likened to "thought crime" by a United Nations inspector have come into force. A raft of new measures mean people can be jailed for viewing terrorist propaganda online, entering "designated areas" abroad and making "reckless expressions" of support for proscribed groups. The government also lengthened prisons sentences for several terror offences, ended automatic early release for convicts and put them under stricter monitoring after they are freed. Sajid Javid said the Counter-Terrorism and Border Security Act 2019 gives "police the powers they need to disrupt terrorist plots earlier and ensure that those who seek to do us harm face just punishment". "As we saw in the deadly attacks in London and Manchester in 2017, the threat from terrorism continues to evolve and so must our response, which is why these vital new measures have been introduced," the home secretary added.

MPs had urged the government to scrap plans to criminalise viewing "information useful to a person committing or preparing an act of terrorism", which goes further than much-used laws that made physically collecting, downloading or disseminating the material illegal. A report by the Joint Committee on Human Rights said the offence, punishable by up to 15 years in prison, "is a breach of the right to receive information and risks criminalising legitimate research and curiosity".

A United Nations inspector accused the government of straying towards "thought crime". Professor Joe Cannataci said: "It seems to be pushing a bit too much towards thought crime…the difference between forming the intention to do something and then actually carrying out the act is still fundamental to criminal law." Original proposals said people would have to access propaganda "on three or more different occasions" to commit a terror offence, but the benchmark was removed meaning a single click is now illegal.

Assistant Commissioner Neil Basu, the head of UK counterterror policing, previously told The Independent the law accounted for changes in online behaviour. "Five years ago everyone would download stuff and keep it on their hard drive – now they don't," he said in January. The law has been controversial but it has come out of good, practical cases … we're talking about people who are a serious threat here, not people who are researching academics or writing treaties trying to help us solve the problem." Mr Basu said he did not expect "an explosion in arrests and charges" as a result of the changes, which target "precursor offending" to terror attacks. It is now illegal to recklessly express support for, or publish images of flags, emblems or clothing in a way which suggests people are a member or supporter of a proscribed organisation. The law has extended extra-territorial jurisdiction for a number of terrorism offences, including inviting support for a banned group and making explosives. It will also see people entering "designated areas" abroad without a reasonable excuse jailed for up to 10 years. The areas are yet to be defined by the government, but are expected to include territory controlled by terrorist groups and war zones. The Independent understands that because the law exempts people who remain in such areas involuntarily, it cannot be applied to British Isis members captured in Syria. It also cannot be applied retrospectively to hundreds of Isis supporters who have already returned to the UK. Only one and 10 have so far been prosecuted.

The government accepted amendments to create specific exemptions including humanitarian work, journalism and funerals after NGOs raised human rights concerns. The full provisions that have commenced: create an offence of reckless expressions of support for a proscribed organisation; create an offence of publication of images, and a police power to seize items as evidence, related to a proscribed organisation; create an offence of obtaining or viewing terrorist material over the internet; create an offence of entering or remaining in a designated area; amend the offences of encouragement of terrorism and dissemination of terrorist publications; extend extra-territorial jurisdiction for certain offences including inviting support for a proscribed organisation; increase maximum sentences for terrorism offences; make extended sentences available for terrorism offences – ending automatic early release and allowing a longer period on licence; strengthen notification requirements on convicted terrorists, and introduce greater powers to enter and search their homes; extend Serious Crime Prevention Orders for terrorism offences; introduce further traffic regulations; and provide for a statutory review of Prevent

ECtHR Again Rules Ban on Prisoners Voting is a Violation or Their Rights

Leigh Day Solicitors: The European Court of Human Rights (ECtHR) has ruled again that the blanket ban preventing serving prisoners from voting represents a violation of Article 3 of Protocol No. 1 of the European Convention on Human Rights (ECHR) – the right to free elections. Despite finding a breach, the court declined to award any compensation to the affected prisoners who had brought the legal challenge. The ECtHR first ruled that the blanket ban on prisoners' voting was unlawful in 2005. Since then, there have been a series of further judgments, in relation to prisoners being unable to vote in successive elections, confirming the position that the government's continuing blanket ban on prisoners' voting was unlawful.

Despite these judgments, the government has stubbornly refused to amend the relevant legislation, section 3 of the Representation of the People Act 1983, which states that "A convicted person during the time that he is detained in a penal institution in pursuance of his sentence … is legally incapable of voting at any parliamentary or local government election" during the last 14 years. Rather, in November 2017, the government announced a minor policy change that would simply allow prisoners already released from prison on temporary licence to vote. This change is likely to affect less than a hundred prisoners out of a total prison population of approximately 83,000 in the UK. In the current case the seven prisoners were prevented from voting in either the election to the European Parliament in 2014, in the election

to the Scottish Parliament in 2016 or the General Election in June 2017. Sean Humber, a partner in the Human Rights Department at Leigh Day, who acts for one of the prisoners in today's judgment and who has previously acted for over 550 prisoners in England and Wales in successful applications to the ECtHR in relation to being denied the right to vote in the 2010 general election, said: "It is pleasing, but not at all unexpected, that the court has yet again found that the blanket ban on prisoners' voting is unlawful. This government needs to respect the Rule of Law and take urgent action to rectify situations where it is found to have breached the human rights of its citizens. Human rights are not some kind of a la carte menu where you can simply pick and choose the ones you want to obey. My clients are not able to pick and choose the laws they obey, so why should the government?

"We do not consider that the government's very minor policy change in November 2017, that will allow 0.001% of prisoners to vote, is sufficient to end the unlawfulness of their prisoner voting policy. It seems inevitable that this issue will continue to be subject to further legal action until the government makes a meaningful change. Given the government's failure to act on the issue over so many years it is disappointing that the court has again declined to award compensation to those affected. While obtaining financial compensation was never the main reason for my client bringing the action, it seemed to be the only sanction likely to push the government to take the necessary action."

Peter Hitchens' Comments About Jo Cox's Killer Betray a Fundamental Ignorance

A familiar sound for readers of the Mail on Sunday is the deafening cymbal-clash of Peter Hitchens colliding with reality. This last Sunday offered a particular highlight, which, although there is undoubted wisdom in leaving him alone to figuratively wander the 21stcentury in his dressing gown shouting at clouds, cannot pass without comment. Summarised by this tweet: Time to stop pretending that killing of Jo Cox was a political assassination. The killer was plainly seriously mentally ill: he shared his considered view that Thomas Mair, who was convicted by a jury of the murder of Jo Cox MP and sentenced to imprisonment for life, has wrongly been tarred a terrorist. Undeterred by the fact that there was a wealth of evidence before the court which he, as somebody who was not in court for the duration of the trial, has neither seen nor heard, Mr Hitchens, armed with a fistful of second-hand newspaper reports of snippets of the case, assured readers that he, the clear-sighted rationalist, can see the case for what it is: "a tragedy twisted into a bogus 'terror plot'".

The premise of his thesis, as he expanded in a further blogpost on Monday, appears to be twofold. Firstly, it is "absurd" for anyone to claim that Mair was a "rational, coherent political actor", as his actions "predictably achieved more or less the exact opposite of what he supposedly intended – and he would have grasped this in a second had he been in a normal state of mind". Allied to this is the second proposition: in Mair's trial, there was evidence of mental ill health, which was suspiciously omitted from the legal proceedings. "Mair's lawyer said he would not bring his medical history into the case. But why not?" "Why does the authority ignore such vital facts?" he demands, fingers twitching towards the tin foil with millinery intent. "Does the government want to believe, and to spread the idea, that there is some organised Right-wing terror plot?"

We can deal with the first argument swiftly: irrationality and mental ill health are two discrete concepts. The former may be a symptom of a latter, but they are not necessarily linked. Most of the people who cross the threshold of the criminal courts are irrational. I've prosecuted more burglars than I can count who, despite their extensive experience, have still failed to process

that climbing through a broken window is likely to result in your blood being left at the scene. The number of young men who, disqualified from driving and flagged down by the police, decide not to cut their losses and take their dues but instead to lead the police on a merry 90mph pursuit through residential areas and red lights before, inevitably, being caught, adding dangerous driving to the charge sheet – irrational? Tick. Incoherent? Tick. Achieving the exact opposite of what they supposedly intended? Tick. Colloquially they might be said to, in Hitchens' words, be "roaming along the outer frontiers of sanity", but mentally ill? That's something different.

But amateur diagnostics aside, let's consider Hitchens' overarching theory: the suspicious omission of medical evidence of mental ill health from Mair's trial. Referring to comments in news reports, he finds various examples of people claiming to know Mair – none apparently medically qualified – and offering anecdotes and opinions on Mair's mental health. There is also a suggestion that Mair was in receipt of psychotropic medication. From this, Hitchens decries the "puzzling decision to ignore the plentiful evidence of Mair's mental abnormality, reported at so many different times by so many independent people, but not discussed before the jury."

Well this is only suspicious and puzzling if you don't understand the first thing about how a defendant's mental health is relevant in criminal proceedings. And it is regrettable that, given how frequently Mr Hitchens finds novel ways to be wrong about the criminal law, he did not think to ask anybody involved in criminal justice for their insight. Had he done so, he may have been told something along the following lines. Evidence is carefully filtered in every criminal case. The court is only allowed to receive evidence that is relevant. Many defendants in criminal proceedings have lengthy histories of mental health problems. But it is only in a handful of trials that their condition is relevant to the issues that the jury have to determine.

How might mental ill health be relevant? If a defence solicitor or barrister believes that a client may be suffering from mental ill health, they will as a matter of course obtain the client's medical records and commission a psychiatric report. That report may be asked to comment on one or more of a variety of matters. A psychiatrist may be asked to assess whether a defendant is "fit to plead" – legalese for being fit to participate in the trial process. This involves an assessment of whether a defendant can: understand the charges; decide whether to plead guilty or not guilty; exercise his right to challenge jurors (if, say, he knows one of them); instruct his legal representatives; follow the course of proceedings; and give evidence in his defence. If he can't do one or more of those things, and if a judge hearing the evidence of two psychiatrists finds that the defendant can't, he will be unfit to plead. This means that instead of a criminal trial there is a modified process (known as a "trial of the facts"), where a jury decides not on guilt but whether the defendant "did the act". If so found, the court's powers are limited to strictly rehabilitative options.

A psychiatrist may alternatively or as well be asked to opine on whether a defendant has a defence of insanity, defined as: at the time of the committing of the act, the party accused was labouring under such a defect of reason, from disease of the mind, as not to know the nature and quality of the act he was doing; or if he did know it, that he did not know he was doing what was wrong In murder trials, there is also a partial defence of diminished responsibility: Furthermore, if a defendant were not capable of forming the specific intent to kill or cause grievous bodily harm (the mens rea for murder), whether because of a psychiatric condition or because of intoxication, that would also provide a defence to murder.

Finally, a psychiatric report may help with sentence. It may afford mitigation, if the offence was committed against the background of a mental health condition that reduced his culpability. It may make recommendations for particular disposals, such as hospital orders. And it may comment on issues that the court have to consider such as future risk.

Now the headline with all of these is that any such reported obtained by the defence attracts legal privilege. This means that the defence do not have to show anybody else – the court or the prosecution – the contents of the report if they do not wish to. So if a psychiatric report does not help the defence case, there will usually be no point in serving it. Many, many psychiatric reports are prepared for court cases every day and ultimately not relied upon. Often, the conclusion will be, "The Defendant suffers from psychiatric or psychological disorders, namely X, Y and Z, but not to the extent that any of the legal defences apply". Sometimes, worse still, the report will be positively harmful to the defence. "The Defendant expressed no remorse and in my view presents a significant risk of serious harm to the public" is the last thing you want the court to read if you are trying to do the best for your client in mitigation. But, and I will repeat this, the fact that mental health issues were not "discussed before the jury" does not mean that all relevant mental health issues were not considered and dealt with appropriately.

Now we do not know why Mair's lawyer did not rely on medical evidence. But we do know, because the defence barrister told the court at a pre-trial hearing, that Mair had been subject to an assessment. So that leaves us with two possibilities: The defence lawyers considered that the contents of the psychiatric evidence, although perhaps showing that the defendant had mental health problems, did not assist the defence case; The defence lawyers ignored the psychiatric evidence, or negligently failed to appreciate that it was legally relevant and of assistance, and Peter Hitchens, who has never seen the evidence and is not legally trained, has correctly guessed this by piecing together things reportedly said by friends and neighbours.

Mistakes happen, of course. Negligence happens. Lawyers and judges are far from infallible. We see awful cases on appeal where the courts and/or defence representatives failed to appreciate the significance of a defendant's mental health. But there is absolutely nothing to suggest that this is what happened in Mair's case; to the contrary, his highly experienced lawyers indicated to the court that mental health had been considered and was not, for reasons that they do not have to state openly, going to be relevant to the issues the jury had to decide. Nor, from the sentencing remarks, was there any mental health issue relevant to mitigation. You'll note that Hitchens does not suggest in respect of which legal issue – fitness to plead, a defence (and which one) or mitigation – the evidence of mental ill health ought to have been adduced. He just vaguely asserts that it should have been "discussed before the jury", without deigning to tell us to what end.

Hitchens' hang-up appears to stem from the false presumption that because an issue wasn't raised before the jury, it wasn't considered. That is wrong. No such deduction can safely be made. If Hitchens has spoken to those involved in the case, or has somehow seen Mair's medical records or psychiatric reports, he may be onto something. Without any of those, it is nothing more than a conspiracy theory, and, given the imputation that Mair's lawyers have been professionally negligent in service of a government agenda, a potentially libellous one at that.

Despite this all being pointed out to him, by numerous people, Hitchens remains characteristically recalcitrant. He insists that he is not seeking to excuse or defend Mair's conduct, but he remains strangely keen to leverage minimal evidence of mental ill health to distance Mair from the "terrorist" label. The evidence of political motivation behind Mair's actions was abundant, as the sentencing remarks made plain, but Hitchens goes to tortuous lengths to try to rebut this, climaxing with: "To me, his very insistence to police that "I am a political activist" shows that he was nothing of the sort." Or as Brian's followers would have it, "Only the true Messiah denies his divinity."

Quite why Hitchens is so wedded to a thick black line that does not exist – attempting to separate mental ill health and terrorism into mutually exclusive camps – is also a mystery. Why

he cannot accept the proposition that a person can be mentally unwell whilst still capable of committing deliberate and knowing acts of political carnage is as baffling as his determination to cast Mair as a victim of a state fit-up. The whole argument, as with so much of what Hitchens writes, is achingly bizarre. By the time you've finished deconstructing it, you almost forget why you started. Like the time he mistook the origins of the term "county lines" and got himself in a week-long tantrum, his thinking on this issue betrays a millefeuille of irrationality, incoherence and counterproductive reasoning. Hitchens has a term for that, but I expect he would not take kindly to it being applied to him.

New Figures Highlight Gross Injustice Faced by Bereaved Families at Inquests

Source: INQUEST: New figures released today by INQUEST highlight the gross inequality of arms between the Ministry of Justice (MOJ) and bereaved families at prison inquests, in relation to spending on legal representation. In 2017, the MOJ spent £4.2million on Prison and Probation Service legal representation at prison inquests, while granting just £92k in legal aid to bereaved families through the Exceptional Case Funding scheme. The £4.2m from the MOJ is only a partial figure of the total spent on representing state and corporate bodies at inquests, as private prison and healthcare providers, NHS and other agencies are often separately represented.

In February 2019, bereaved families and INQUEST launched the Now or Never! Legal Aid for Inquests campaign calling for automatic non-means tested legal aid funding to bereaved families following a state related death. This followed the decision by the Ministry of Justice to reject widely supported proposals and overwhelming evidence in favour of fair legal funding for bereaved people. One of the reasons cited by the MOJ was cost grounds. INQUEST has written to the MOJ asking them to release their full costings and the evidence submitted to the MOJ's review of legal aid for inquests - and are still awaiting their response.

Rebecca Roberts, INQUEST's Head of Policy said: "Inquests following state related deaths are intended to seek the truth and expose unsafe practices. Yet bereaved families are facing well-funded legal teams defending the interests and reputations of state and corporate bodies, who work together to shut down or narrow lines of enquiry. The limited data available suggests that the Ministry of Justice are signing off a budget for the Prison and Probation Service to spend 43 times more on their own legal representation than is granted via the Legal Aid Agency to bereaved families for prison inquests. These are truly shocking figures and it's no wonder that families feel that the system is stacked against them. The Ministry of Justice must act now to introduce fair legal funding for bereaved families to ensure a level playing field at inquests."

Government Plans For Prison Population - Inefficient, Ineffective, and Unsustainable

The Centre for Crime and Justice Studies has welcomed today's report from the House of Commons Justice Committee on the government's prison planning approach. The report – Prison Population 2022: planning the future – finds that the government's current approach to planning and funding future prison accommodation is inefficient, ineffective, and unsustainable. Centre's Director, Richard Garside, said: I am pleased that the Justice Committee makes clear that the crisis-ridden state of the prison system across England and Wales is the result of political choices, by successive governments and parliaments. The key to resolving the deep crisis in the prison system is to end the unnecessary use of imprisonment, reduce the numbers being locked up and start closing down those old and dilapidated prisons that are not fit for human habitation. In its report, the Justice Committee concludes that England and Wales is 'in the

depths of an enduring crisis in prison safety and decency' and that there is 'a grave risk that we become locked in a vicious cycle of prisons perpetually absorbing huge amounts of criminal justice spending, creating a perverse situation in which there is likely to be more "demand" for prison'. The report calls for a 'refreshed narrative around the use of imprisonment and how as a society we wish to deal with crime… This should include an explicit recognition that social problems cannot be meaningfully addressed through the criminal justice system'.

JusticeWatch: Toppling the Fourth Pillar

No level playing field: Scotland Yard and other state bodies spent 'almost half a million pounds in public money' on lawyers at the Westminster terrorist attack inquest while victims' families were denied legal aid, reported The Times. 'Government agencies spent a total of £493,000 on legal fees whereas the families of the victims had to rely on pro bono assistance or private funding to seek answers to questions about how their relatives died,' it reported. Apparently, the Met spent £207,051.11 on lawyers according to figures obtained under freedom of information laws. The family of PC Keith Palmer, who was murdered while defending Westminster from an armed terrorist, were denied legal aid. His sisters expressed their 'utter shock and disbelief' that the state spent almost half a million pounds in taxpayers' money. 'It sends a clear message that the victims' families' quests for answers into the deaths of their loved ones is just not important. Protecting the establishment is far more important,' they told The Times.

The Law Society's Gazette reported that in 2017 the MoJ spent £4.2m on legal representation for the prison and probation service 'while grieving families received £92,000 through the Legal Aid Agency's exceptional funding scheme'. Inquest told then Gazette that £4.2m was 'a partial figure of the total spent on representing state and corporate bodies at inquests' as private prison and healthcare providers, NHS and other agencies were often separately represented. 'These are truly shocking figures and it's no wonder that families feel that the system is stacked against them,' said Rebecca Roberts, Inquest's head of policy. 'The MoJ must act now to introduce fair legal funding for bereaved families to ensure a level playing field at inquests.'

Toppling the fourth pillar: 'Over the last four decades, Hackney Community Law Centre has enjoyed a pretty good relationship with its council,' I wrote for the New Law Journal. That changed last month after its cabinet voted through a swingeing 45% cut in its £203,000 grant. The law centre's manager Sean Canning pointed out that publicly funded legal advice was 'the fourth pillar of the welfare state'. 'We are deeply shocked and puzzled that this council should be hitting today's custodians of that achievement of access to justice for the poor and vulnerable,' he said. Hackney's local advice sector is to be reconfigured following a two-year review by the council and the introduction of (as a paper presented to its council cabinet terms it) 'a systems-thinking methodology'. 'Curiously, the systems-based approach from Hackney Council belongs to a pre-LASPO era,' I noted. The so called 'Vanguard method' cited by the council dates back to a 2007 report by AdviceUK. The whole point of AdviceUK's report was to identify 'an alternative to the government's untested top-down prescription' of [New Labour's] CLACs (Community Legal Advice Centre) experiment. 'It is depressing to see it dusted down and recycled to justify slashing vital funding from a much-cherished law centre that has been at the heart of its community for four decades,' I argued.

Rough trade: British companies would suffer from a failing criminal justice system as international businesses headed elsewhere, according to Lady Justice Hallett, the vice-president of the criminal division of the Court of Appeal as reported in The Times' Brief. 'For many years those of us who practised in crime were considered the rough end of the trade,' said Hallett. 'But without us the UK could not boast of the quality of its justice system.' Also, the Brief reported that one in 15 junior solicitors was suicidal. 'More than 6 per cent of junior solicitors experienced suicidal thoughts within the past month,' it said. 'The survey found that nearly half of respondents said they had suffered from mental ill-health in the past month – a rise of 10 per cent in a year. But only about 20 per cent of those who said they were suffering from mental health issues said that their employers were aware of their predicament.'

Soldier B' to be Prosecuted Over Derry Teenager's Murder In 1972

BBC News:A former soldier is to be charged with murdering a teenager, who was shot twice in the head in Londonderry during the Northern Ireland Troubles. Fifteen-year-old Daniel Hegarty was killed in an Army operation near his home in the Creggan in July 1972. Last year, the High Court ruled a decision not to prosecute, taken in 2016, was based on "flawed" reasoning. The Army veteran, known as Soldier B, will also face a second charge of wounding the teenager's cousin.

The move has been welcomed by the Hegarty family. The Director of Public Prosecutions, Stephen Herron, informed the Hegarty family of developments at a private meeting. He conducted a review of the case following the court ruling. Mr Herron said he believed the evidence "is sufficient to provide a reasonable prospect of conviction". In reaching the decision, he added that he had taken Soldier B's ill health into consideration. An inquest in 2011 found Daniel Hegarty posed no risk and was shot without warning as the Army moved in to clear "no-go" areas during Operation Motorman. His cousin, Christopher Hegarty, 17, was also shot in the head by the same soldier, but survived. In respect of the older youth, Soldier B will face a charge of wounding with intent.

In a statement, the Hegarty family said: "This has been a long journey. It has taken 47 years to finally get the state to do the right thing. We urge anyone fighting for justice never to give up. We wish Soldier B no ill-will. We just want the criminal trial process to begin."

Decisions on so-called legacy cases: A total of six former soldiers are now facing prosecution over Troubles-era killings. The cases relate to Daniel Hegarty; Bloody Sunday; John Pat Cunningham; Joe McCann (involving two ex-soldiers); and Aidan McAnespie. Not all the charges are murder. The Public Prosecution Service said that of 26 so-called legacy cases it has taken decisions on since 2011, 13 related to republicans, eight to loyalists, and five are connected to the Army.

Zimran Samuel and Krishnendu Mukerjee Reflect on Centenary of Jallianwala Bagh Massacre

On 13th April 1919, 100 years ago today, British troops fired, without warning, on a large gathering of unarmed Indians, in the Sikh holy city of Amritsar. The gathering was in protest against the Rowlett Act, which allowed for the trial of political prisoners without a jury. Official estimates put the death-toll, including children, at 379, but eye-witness accounts put those killed at over 1000, with a similar number injured. The killings, known as the Jallianwala Bagh Massacre, was a blow for the Sikhs who had loyally fought and died in the British army, during the First World War and remains a source of anger even today.

On the 10th April 2019, Theresa May, the British Prime Minister expressed 'deep regret' for the massacre. Her predecessor, David Cameron expressed similar regret on his visit to the Punjab in 2013. However, neither Prime Minister felt it necessary to apologise for the needless loss of life, nor provide any proper inquiry into why it was allowed to happen in the first place. One of the ironies of the massacre was that General Dyer, who ordered the killings, remained unpunished after a show-inquiry. However, Udam Singh, the Indian revolution-

ary who shot and killed the then Lieutenant Governor, Michael O'Dwyer, because of this support for Dyer, was given the death penalty in 1940.

In 2017, evidence emerged that Margaret Thatcher's government had given active support to the Indian government during the 1984 Amritsar massacre, in which hundreds of Sikhs died at the Golden Temple. Demands for full disclosure and inquiry by members of the British-Sikh community go unheeded. Disclosure of Britain's involvement in the torture of Mau Mau rebels in Kenya only came about after litigation, whilst it was public pressure that led to the Bloody Sunday Inquiry about the killings in Northern Ireland.

Britain has a brutal colonial past, but it continues to play a role in funding and assisting of serious human rights violations abroad from funding detention centres in Libya to allowing the use of British arms in the bombing of Yemen. As the current Brexit impasse demonstrates, Britain is no longer the economic or political power that it once was. It does however, have an opportunity to re-invent itself, as a country which fully acknowledges its colonial past and thereby stops history repeating itself through its actions abroad. In order to do this, it needs to provide full disclosure, set up inquiries, make apologies and where necessary pay reparations and prosecute offenders.

The Indian poet, Rabindranath Tagore, who was conferred a knighthood in 1915, returned it in protest at the Jallianawala Bagh Massacre. In a letter to the then, Viceroy of India, Lord Chelmsford, he stated: "The time has come when badges of honour make our shame glaring in the incongruous context of humiliation, and I for my part wish to stand, shorn of all special distinctions, by the side of those of my countrymen, who, for their so-called insignificance, are liable to suffer degradation not fit for human beings". *Britain should do the same.*

Colnbrook (IRC) - Calm, With Caring Staff, But Too Prison-Like

During the most recent inspection in November and December 2018, the IRC held 246 detainees, significantly fewer than around 340 in 2016. Among positive findings, according to Peter Clarke, HM Chief Inspector of Prisons, "it was encouraging to see that whistle-blowing procedures were well embedded and the duty of care that staff have towards detainees was well understood. "Detainees' personal physical safety was generally good and there was a calm atmosphere in the centre."

One of the most significant improvements was in staff-detainee relationships and in respect in general. In the inspection survey, 81% of detainees said that most staff treated them with respect, compared with 54% at the last inspection. Some provision, such as the very good cultural kitchen, had been further improved. Preparation for release and removal had room for improvement but remained a good area overall. The strong welfare team and good involvement by NGOs (non-governmental organisations) in the centre were particularly commendable.

However, inspectors noted some less positive findings: Despite the emphasis the Home Office has placed on an 'adults at risk' policy, there was poor identification of, and therefore uncertain care for, some of the most vulnerable groups. Although care for those at risk of suicide or self-harm was carried out well, self-harm had risen more than threefold since 2016, though the population had fallen. Some elements of security were excessive. The vast majority of detainees attending external escorts were handcuffed without sufficient justification, and detainees on the men's units were locked in cells for long periods. There remained "considerable problems" with deteriorating accommodation and significant investment will be needed to improve the fabric of the centre.

Mr Clarke added that one of the intractable problems at Colnbrook was that, with the exception of the women's unit, the IRC was "largely indistinguishable from a prison, and prisons are rarely suitable environments for immigration detainees held under administrative, as

opposed to judicial, powers. "It was notable that some of the most vociferous critics of the prison-like feel of the centre were the staff who worked there and who, on the whole, did a very good job of looking after detainees with decency and care." Some staff described the "daunting" or "terrifying" impact on new arrivals.

Overall, Mr Clarke said: "The Home Office is planning to build a new centre to replace Colnbrook, and the neighbouring Harmondsworth, when the new Heathrow runway is constructed. It is to be hoped that the design problems of Colnbrook, including poor ventilation and sealed windows, limited outdoor space and exercise yards that would be austere for most prisons, will be avoided in the future. In the meantime, managers and staff were working hard to make improvements within the confines of the current environment and told us that the gaps in the systems for identifying and supporting vulnerable detainees would be quickly addressed."

Chief Inspector Announces New Independent Reviews of Progress in Troubled Jails

HM Chief Inspector of Prisons (HMCIP), Peter Clarke, has announced an important series of new follow-up visits to failing and unsafe prisons designed to give the government an independent assessment of how much progress has been made in improving the treatment and conditions for prisoners. Independent Reviews of Progress (IRPs) will start in April 2019 and reports will be published 25 days after the visits.

IRPs will give ministers independent evidence about how far jails have implemented HMI Prisons' recommendations following particularly concerning inspections. The Justice Select Committee supported this aim, stating that HM Prison and Probation Service (HMPPS) should not "mark its own homework" when reporting on the achievement of recommendations. It is currently envisaged that up to 20 IRPs – short visits of two-and-a-half days – will take place each year. HMI Prisons has secured extra funding from the Ministry of Justice to ensure it can conduct the IRPs in addition to its existing schedule of mainstream inspections of prisons and youth custody facilities in England and Wales.

Prisons will be told in advance they are subject to an IRP, in contrast to the mostly unannounced full inspections. The IRP schedule – along with a very small number of announced full inspections – will be published on the HMIP website once the IRPs have been announced. Prisons subject to the Chief Inspector's Urgent Notification (UN) protocol will be a priority under the IRP model.

Mr Clarke said: "IRPs are an important new area of work for us. They are designed to give the Secretary of State an independent assessment of whether prisons we have found to be unsafe or otherwise failing are getting to grips with our key recommendations for improvement. There are many governing teams and staff working hard in very challenging jails and through our IRPs we will work constructively with them to support the improvements we all want to see."

Independent Reviews of Progress (IRPs) are a new type of prison visit, which began in April 2019. They were developed because Ministers wanted an independent assessment of how far prisons had implemented HMI Prisons' recommendations following particularly concerning prison inspections. IRPs are not inspections and do not result in new judgements against our healthy prison tests. Rather they judge progress being made against the key recommendations made at the previous inspection. The visits are announced and happen eight to 12 months after the original inspection. They last 2.5 days and involve a comparatively small team. Reports are published within 25 working days of the end of the visit. We conduct 15 to 20 IRPs each year. HM Chief Inspector of Prisons selects sites for IRPs based on previous healthy prison test assessments and a range of other factors.

A Space Without Judgement for Casualties of Our Broken Justice System

Abigail Wheatcroft: On a grey and windy Saturday in March, 37 people arrived at the offices of Ropes & Gray law firm in the shadow of St. Paul's Cathedral, London. They came from all walks of life and corners of the country - from Bedford to Barnsley, by ferry and by tube - and on the face of it, had nothing in common. Some came as families, with mums, aunties, grandchildren, and siblings. Others came on their own. Some came with their "chosen" family, as the one they were born into had fallen by the wayside. There were nerves and also warm greetings as name tags were handed out and lunch was eaten. At one o'clock they gathered upstairs, and a sleek corporate meeting room overlooking the drizzled streets of the City of London became a sacred, safe space for a few hours.

This was the second meeting of a group of individuals who have come to refer to each other as the "Bound by Injustice family." They are members of a club no one would ever choose to join: victims of wrongful convictions and their loved ones. The true number of people in this club is unknown - as is the exact figure of prisoners in England and Wales currently wrongly convicted. In fact, many members of the judiciary and the CCRC would not consider their membership to this club to be legitimate. As the criminal convictions that brought them together have not yet been quashed, some would say that they are not victims of a miscarriage of justice. It is this perpetual gas-lighting and disbelief which compounds their isolation and trauma; it is one thing to be married to a convicted murderer, but another to be married to a convicted murderer who did not commit the crime. Expert psychiatrists have compared the psychological damage of a wrongful conviction to that experienced by war veterans or hostage victims, including severe personality changes and chronic psychological trauma. The loved ones - partners, children, parents, siblings, friends - of those who have been wrongly convicted suffer this in silence without access to formal support services.

Our clients' families were going through this alone and we knew that we would never fully understand their experience, which is why we created a space for them to come together. Bound by Injustice was inspired by our Managing Director Suzanne's work supporting the families of the Hillsborough Disaster during the inquests which resulted in justice for the 96 victims. Our first Bound by Injustice (BBI) event in August 2018 far exceeded our expectations and we were humbled by the resilience, strength and compassion of the family members who made the journey to Oxford to be there. With some unable to attend our inaugural event, and those that did keen to keep up the momentum, our second Bound by Injustice event looked to welcome new members into the fold and decide on the next steps for the group. The first event had been one of the highlights of CCA's year, and we were anxious that we would not be able to recreate the magic of that weekend a second time. We need not have worried. The second Bound by Injustice meeting confirmed that this group is not only needed for emotional and practical support, but provides an opportunity to effect real change to our broken criminal justice system. Sessions ranged from a poignant first-person account of wrongful conviction from the journalist and miscarriage of justice survivor Raphael Rowe; a rallying call from BBI member Cookie on campaigning to change the system; and smaller breakout groups on strategic issues for the group - structure, fundraising, campaigning, communications, and emotional wellbeing.

The ideas which emerged from the day were innovative and exciting, and we will be working with the group members over the coming months to develop them into fruition. But it was the conversations throughout the day, and insights into daily life given by the group members which struck me the most. For the BBI family members, traditional prisoner family support groups are of limited value as they do not account for the complex consequences of a wrongful conviction: Your loved one being unable to progress through a long prison sentence and make parole because they will not admit guilt for a crime they did not commit. The social stigma of being associated with someone in prison for conspiracy to supply drugs or murder. Patronising interactions with those who think you should "accept" the offence your loved one is alleged to have committed, and move on with your life. The guilt and powerlessness of not being able to prove your loved one's innocence quickly enough before they miss yet another birthday, Christmas, or death in the family. There are no formal support services or spaces which acknowledge these realities. The family members spoke of isolation and hostility from their local communities. One BBI member could barely speak through tears as she recalled withdrawing behind the curtains and not leaving the house for months after her son was convicted, as she was cast out from the small village they had lived in their entire lives. Another recounted a stranger rolling down the window of a passing car and shouting at her young daughter after her dad was imprisoned.

"Safe spaces" have been mocked in recent times; seen by some as a byproduct of the inability of liberal "snowflakes" to have open discussion without being "triggered." Yet for those who are dealing with the double consciousness of being both a loved one of a prisoner, and the loved one of a miscarriage of justice victim, safe spaces are crucial. BBI members were united in their appreciation of a space where people "spoke their language." Bound by Injustice is a space for these people to share the daily trials of loving someone who has been wrongly convicted - with understanding, compassion, and humour. Partners spoke of maintaining their relationships by making a special effort to mark anniversaries, and speaking on the phone last thing at night. Parents shared tips on how to explain wrongful convictions to younger children, and how to ensure that imprisoned mums and dads have an active role in parenting. Members discussed their experience in the workplace - for many, work was a blessed interlude in their lives where they did not have to share or be defined by their ordeal. BBI members told me at the meeting that they felt immediately understood, not judged, and able to finally relax - freeing themselves from the performances and masks needed to survive day to day life. As one member eloquently put it, "I have a community of people I barely know but I trust."

Titillation Litigation

A 40-year-old man whose parents allegedly binned his pornography collection, worth tens of thousands of pounds, has launched a court case against them. He had previously reported his parents to the police, but prosecutors in the US state of Indiana declined to press charges. He was living rent-free with his parents following a 2016 divorce until his ejection by police following a domestic incident less than a year later. After his parents dropped off his belongings at his new home, he said he noticed his $29,000 (around £22,000) collection of porn films and magazines was missing, WXMI reports. In an email to the man, his father allegedly wrote: "Believe it or not, one reason for why I destroyed your porn was for your own mental and emotional health. I would have done the same if I had found a kilo of crack cocaine. Someday, I hope you will understand." The matter will now be decided by the courts.

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.