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 750 (17/07/2019) - Cost £1

Manchester Police Killing of Anthony Grainger - Violation of Article 2 the Right to Life

Over two years on from the closing remarks in May 2017 and seven years since his death, the report of the Anthony Grainger Inquiry has today been published. Anthony, a 36 year old father of two, was unarmed and sat in a parked car in Culcheth near Warrington in Cheshire, when he was shot dead by an armed police officer during a 'hard stop' operation.

The Judge found that the Force were "to blame" for Anthony's death, and a catalogue of errors meant that the police operation violated Article 2 - the right to life. The police failed to ensure that an accurate intelligence picture was produced, and there were multiple serious errors in the briefing of the firearms officers and the planning and execution of the operation.

Commanding officers bore the brunt of the critical findings that four officers - including two commanders and a firearms Tactical Adviser - were not professionally competent at the time and should not have been part of the operation, that command logs had not been completed contemporaneously and had been made up after the botched operation, and that the hard stop tactic was seen as the natural conclusion of the deployment of the officers rather than a high risk option of last resort.

The Report found that officers had misled the Inquiry when giving evidence and GMP had previously misled the Crown Court when it was prosecuted for Health and Safety offences which were stayed. The shooter, known by the cypher Q9, had not only been led into error by the inaccurate and misleading intelligence briefing, but he had also taken account of inaccurate and unfounded anecdotal accounts given to him by other officers. Q9 was particularly criticised for asserting in evidence that he would not do anything differently if presented with the same situation.

The family and Gail Hadfield Grainger, Anthony's partner, are now calling on the Crown Prosecution Service to review the case and charge GMP with Corporate Manslaughter, and officers with attempting to pervert the course of justice with respect to the criminal trial. The process has taken more than seven years, largely due to the lack of candour by GMP who were also criticised in the Report for serious disclosure failings and an institutional inability to accept any failings This Report is yet further evidence of the urgent need for a statutory duty of candour which would have required GMP to have exercised candour and been honest about what really happened, including their own shortcomings, in the immediate aftermath of the death. To this end INQUEST has been a strong supporter of efforts by victims of a number of disasters to bring the Public Authorities (Accountability) Bill into law. This is only the second time a public inquiry has been established following a fatal police shooting, in place of an inquest, after the Azelle Rodney Inquiry which concluded in July 2013.

Gail Hadfield-Grainger, Anthony's partner, said: "It has taken seven years but some justice has been done today for Anthony. This devastating report shows that Anthony's death was caused by a litany of catastrophic failures by Greater Manchester Police in 2012. It could and should have been prevented. It also exposes, that even now in 2019, Greater Manchester Police is unfit to control firearms operations. This is a scandal, which places other lives at risk. I have waited seven years for an apology from the Chief Constable. I am still waiting. The Home Secretary set up this inquiry and this shocking report demands his immediate attention. He needs to explain to the public what he is going to do to make it safe for armed police to be deployed on the streets of Manchester. I ask the Home Secretary to sit down with me and other bereaved families to see what can be done to save lives."

Deborah Coles, Director of INQUEST said: "This report is an exposition of failures by GMP, leading to the needless death of an unarmed man. The evidence heard demonstrates the urgent need for culture change in police forces nationally, particularly amongst firearms officers, who must be open to scrutiny. Openness and honesty by the police in relation to Anthony's shooting could have saved time, public money, and significant pain for the family. Previous deaths have revealed serious failings in operational planning and yet recommendations for change have been systematically ignored. The failure to hold the police to account for lethal force breeds impunity. We hope today's conclusion leads to full accountability of those responsible. The rule of law must apply to the police, including at a corporate level, in order to prevent abuses of state power."

Tony Murphy of Bhatt Murphy, solicitor to Gail Hadfield-Grainger, said: "This is a landmark report for armed policing in this country. The scale of institutional incompetence uncovered by this inquiry within Greater Manchester Police, reveals evidence of corporate manslaughter in relation to fatal police shooting of Anthony Grainger. We call on the Director of Public Prosecutions, Max Hill QC, to urgently review this evidence with a view to instituting criminal proceedings against Greater Manchester Police as a body corporate for manslaughter. The Independent Office for Police Conduct is already reviewing this evidence in order to decide on gross misconduct proceedings against the shooter Q9 and against senior officers."

Westminster Commission to Look at Role of the Miscarriage Of Justice Watchdog

Nicholas Reed Langen, Justice Gap: A cross-party group of politicians has launched an inquiry into the miscarriage of justice watchdog following 'serious misgivings' from lawyers, campaigners and academics about its ability to deal with cases of alleged wrongful convictions. The all party parliamentary group on miscarriages of justice (APPG) has today announced the establishment of a body which will look at the performance of the Criminal Cases Review Commission (CCRC). The APPG's Westminster commission has the responsibility for 'investigating the ability of the criminal justice system to effectively identify, rectify and prevent miscarriages of justice'.

As has been reported extensively on the Justice Gap, concerns over the performance of the CCRC have mounted since it referred just a dozen cases to the Court of Appeal in 2017 and only 19 cases in 2018. There has also been concern over the CCRC's success rate. Its 20 year average was 67%, and so more than two-thirds of referrals were overturned; however, as the number of referrals crashed, so has its success rate to just 46% last year. The CCRC is also in the grips of a funding crisis. When the Commission was set up up in 1997, its budget was £7.5m and it dealt with 800 cases a year. This compares to funding of just £5.45m last year with applications running at an average of 1,500 a year.

The new Westminister Commission will assess the body's relationship with the Court of Appeal, and whether the test used for referring cases places too high a burden on those appealing their conviction. It will also consider the current remit and funding of the CCRC, and if issues and failings within other parts of the criminal justice system are preventing the CCRC from exercising its mandate fully. The first session of the Commission, chaired by Baroness Stern, who has a background in penal reform, and Lord Garnier QC, the former Solicitor-General, is scheduled for Monday 15th July. Oral evidence is due to be given by the CCRC, with the Commission now accepting written submissions from relevant parties.

Given that there are serious misgivings expressed in the legal profession, and amongst com-

mentators and academics, about the remit of the Criminal Cases Review Commission (CCRC) and its ability to deal with cases of miscarriages of justice, and given that perceptions of injustice within the criminal justice system are as damaging to public confidence as actual cases of injustice, the Commission will inquire into: 1.The ability of the CCRC, as currently set up, to deal effectively with alleged miscarriages of justice; 2. Whether statutory or other changes might be needed to assist the CCRC to carry out its function, including; (i) the CCRC's relationship with the Court of Appeal with particular reference to the current test for referring cases to it (the 'real possibility' test); (ii) the remit, composition, structure and funding of the CCRC; 3. The extent to which the CCRC's role is hampered by failings or issues elsewhere in the criminal justice system; and make recommendations.

All Fair In Love And Law: No Duty to Inform the Opposing Party of its Mistakes?

Number 5 Chambers: The recent decision of the Court of Appeal in Woodward v Phoenix Healthcare Distribution Ltd [2019] EWCA Civ 985 provides an important clarification as to whether lawyers have a duty to inform the opposing party of their mistakes when conducting litigation. The claimant appealed against a decision which overturned an order made by Master Bowles to retrospectively validate service of the claim form under CPR r.6.15(2) on the defendant's solicitors, who had not notified the claimant that they were authorised to accept service.

The claimant issued the claim form on 19 June 2017, the day before the expiration of the limitation period on 20 June 2017. Pursuant to CPR r.7.5(1), the claim form had to be served no later than midnight on 19 October 2017. On 17 October 2017, two days before the expiry of the time allowed for service, the claimant sent the claim form, particulars of claim and a response pack by first class post and email to the defendant's solicitors. The defendant's solicitors were not authorised to accept service. They had not notified the claimant that they were so authorised, nor had the claimant asked them. The defendant's solicitors took instructions and decided that they would not inform the claimant that service had been invalid until after the expiry of the deadline.

On 20 October 2017, the defendant's solicitors duly notified the claimant that they were not authorised to accept service. The claimant took immediate steps to comply with service and the necessary documentation was properly served on the defendant by courier, first class post and email just after 11am on 20 October 2017, 11 hours after the deadline. The claimant successfully applied for retrospective validation of service pursuant to the court's discretion under CPR r.6.15(2). Master Bowles held that the defendant had an obligation to the Court under CPR r.1.3 to give effect to the overriding objectives rather than indulging in "technical game playing". This decision was reversed by HHJ Hodge on appeal.

Judgment: The Court of Appeal unanimously dismissed the appeal of HHJ Hodge's decision. LJ Asplin made the following findings in her judgment: The Supreme Court in Barton v Wright Hassall LLP [2018] UKSC 12 was clear that there is no positive duty to advise an opposing party of its own error. This finding was therefore inconsistent with Master Bowles reasoning that there had been a breach of CPR r.1.3 occasioned by the failure to warn. Further, Denton v White[2014] EWCA Civ 906 did not apply to the issues raised here. The comment at paragraph 41 of Denton v White that it was "wholly inappropriate" to take advantage of an opponent's mistake was directed at inappropriate resistance to applications for relief from sanctions which are bound to succeed and was made in a different context.[1]

The defendant's decision to accept the advantage given by the claimant's failure was not "technical game playing". The defendant solicitors had acted legitimately by taking its client's instructions on how to proceed and deciding not to notify the claimant before the deadline.

The situation could be distinguished fromAbela v Baadarani [2013] UKSC 44 as the defendant's solicitors had not contributed to the claimant's error or tried to obstruct service.

The claimant had courted disaster with its last-minute approach to service. LJ Asplin affirmed Lord Sumption's comments in Barton, that such an approach "can have only a very limited claim on the court's indulgence". The claimant should have served the claim form and sought an extension of time for service of the particulars of claim. There was far more leniency in the rules relating to an extension compared to the rules regulating service. It had been unreasonable for the claimant to risk failing to comply with the deadline by delaying service to such an extent.

Observations: The judgment is a reminder of the importance of ensuring absolute compliance with the rules on service, particularly where a limitation deadline is approaching. It is always a risk to rely on the Court to correct errors, even if the failure to comply appears to be merely technical. Prompt service of the claim form and particulars of claim will find favour with the Court as the claimant's dilatory approach to service was an important factor in the Court's decision. It is important to note that the situation is no more lenient when dealing with a litigant in person. Although Woodward v Phoenix did not concern a litigant in person, the Supreme Court in Barton clearly stated that the defendant was under no duty to warn the claimant litigant in person that service was invalid.[2] The fact that there had been time for the defendant to warn the claimant of its error, unlike in Barton, did not impose a duty on the defendant to do so. The judgment, however, leaves the door ajar on this issue as LJ Asplin notes that: "the position may well be different if there is a substantial period before the expiry of the limitation period".[3]

Glenanne Murder Gang: Court of Appeal Rules Investigation Must be Held

BBC News: A full, independent investigation into alleged collusion between the security services and the Glenanne gang must be held, the Court of Appeal has ruled. The Glenanne gang was a 1970s loyalist paramilitary unit which has been linked to about 120 Troubles-era murders. Members included Ulster Volunteer Force (UVF) paramilitaries as well as some serving police officers and soldiers. The court ruled victims' families had a legitimate expectation an independent investigation would take place. Lord Chief Justice, Sir Declan Morgan, warned the PSNI's new Chief Constable Simon Byrne that if he "unduly delays in appointing independent officers" to oversee the new investigation into alleged collusion, he would be "at risk of further proceedings" from victims' relatives.

The Glenanne gang was based at a farm in Glenanne, County Armagh, in the 1970s. Its members are suspected of involvement in about 90 attacks during the Troubles, including the 1974 Dublin and Monaghan bombings, which killed 33 people, and the 1975 Miami Showband Massacre targeting one of Ireland's best-known showbands. The gang was also implicated in fatal bombings at the Step Inn pub in Keady, County Armagh, and the Hillcrest Bar in Dungannon, County Tyrone.

An investigation into alleged security force collaboration with the gang was started by the now defunct Historical Enquiries Team (HET). However, the HET was later abolished and the report, thought to be 80% complete, was shelved. Families argued they were promised an investigation. Initial legal proceedings against the PSNI were taken by Edward Barnard, whose 13-year-old brother Patrick was killed in the Hillcrest Bar bombing. The boy was one of four people to die in the no-warning explosion on St Patrick's Day, 1976. Five years later, Dungannon UVF member Garnet James Busby received a life sentence after admitting his role in the bombing and other terrorist offences.

Friday's Court of Appeal ruling upholds a previous court's decision that had been challenged by the former PSNI Chief Constable, Sir George Hamilton. Sir George had argued that the Hillcrest Bar bombing investigation met the "gold standard" of human rights obligations by

securing a conviction. He also argued that the HET review into the bombing had identified no security force collusion with the killers. But Mr Barnard's lawyers told the Court of Appeal a number of promises meant there was a compelling case for producing an overarching report on alleged collusion. They claimed off-duty police officers and soldiers were connected by weapons to the "extraordinary pattern" of loyalist killings.

Delivering judgment in the appeal, Sir Declan upheld the finding that police representations amounted to a procedural legitimate expectation. But because the Hillcrest Bar killings occurred 24 years before the Human Rights Act came in to force, the court said there is no Article 2 duty to complete such an investigation. Deciding not to make an order compelling police to act, Sir Declan instead ruled there had been a breach of Mr Barnard's legitimate expectation that independent officers would analyse the HET database for any wider collusion between paramilitaries and security forces in the Glenanne gang murders.b

Eight Out of 10 Suspects Identified by Met's Facial Recognition 'Innocent'

Sapan Maini-Thompson, Justice Gap: New research into the Metropolitan police's use of facial recognition technology has found that more than eight out of 10 suspects (81%) flagged by the system are innocent. Commissioned by Scotland Yard, the authors of the report surmise that without explicit legal authorisation, it is 'highly possible' that the 'live facial recognition' trial process would be held unlawful if challenged before the courts. The technology allows for the real time biometric processing of video imagery in order to identify individuals. Its use raises various human rights concerns. For example, the Surveillance Camera Commissioner has noted that the significant future capability of facial recognition software may be even more intrusive on the privacy of citizens than aspects of covert surveillance.

The anti-surveillance group, Big Brother Watch, moreover, has compared the use of facial recognition to a large-scale identity check, equivalent to checking papers or fingerprinting at physical checkpoints. Between 2016 and 2019 the Met conducted a total of 10 test deployments, trialling facial recognition. Written by Professor Peter Fussey and Dr Daragh Murray from the University of Essex, the report evaluates the accuracy of the technology at recognising the faces of individuals recorded on watchlists. They find that facial recognition matches are verifiably correct in less than one-in-five instances.

Human rights law requires that any interference with individuals' rights be in accordance with the law, pursue a legitimate aim and be 'necessary in a democratic society'. As established in S and Marper v UK – a case concerning the retention of DNA, fingerprints and cellular samples – police forces must 'strike the right balance' between the pursuit of a policy aim and interference with individual rights. Because facial recognition involves biometric processing, it relates to data protection and the right to private life. The report finds that the implicit legal authorisation claimed by the Metropolitan police for the use of facial recognition – coupled with the absence of publicly available, clear, online guidance – is likely inadequate when compared with the 'in accordance with the law' requirement. Of the legal sources cited by the Met, only the common law and the Protection of Freedoms Act 2010 could potentially establish an implicit legal basis for the technology. Legal ambiguity in turn diminishes the 'foreseeability' of how facial recognition technology is utilised.

In response, Duncan Ball, the Met's deputy assistant commissioner, said that they were 'extremely disappointed with the negative and unbalanced tone of this report.' 'We have a legal basis for this pilot period and have taken legal advice throughout,' he said. 'We believe the

public would absolutely expect us to try innovative methods of crime fighting in order to make London safer.' Facial recognition technology may also fall short of being 'necessary in a democratic society'. As established by the Surveillance Camera Commissioner's March 2019 guidance on 'Police Use of Automated Facial Recognition Technology with Surveillance Camera Systems', the Met must prepare impact and risk assessment documents. In the view of the report's authors, however, these have been inadequate. There has been a lack of effective consideration on alternative measures and the criteria for including 'wanted' persons on watchlists contains 'significant ambiguity'. Reduced clarity risks eroding public trust, says the report.

As the European Court of Human Rights recently held in Big Brother Watch v UK, the law must be sufficiently clear such that the public know when and how public authorities are empowered to use surveillance methods. Despite the Met's claims that the deployments were on a trial basis, there was in fact no clear distinction between the research objectives of the trial and the operational use of the technology. Professor Fussey and Dr Murray wrote: 'Treating live facial recognition camera avoidance as suspicious behaviour undermines the premise of informed consent.' 'The arrest of live facial recognition camera-avoiding individuals for more minor offences than those used to justify the test deployments raise clear issues regarding the extension of police powers and of "surveillance creep".'

Public concerns over discrimination in both the technical performance and police deployment of LFR is further widespread. Earlier this year, for example, San Francisco banned the use of facial recognition technology by city government agencies. The report contends that the prohibition on discrimination requires that police forces take active measures to ensure rights compliance. The policy and campaigns officer at human rights group, Liberty, Hannah Couchman said that it would 'display an astonishing and deeply troubling disregard for our rights if the Met ignored this independent report and continued to deploy this dangerous and discriminatory technology'. The authors further argue that the use of facial recognition technology may have a 'chilling effect' on democratic participation whereby individuals refrain from lawfully exercising their democratic rights because of a fear of police monitoring. This potentially inhibits their right to freedom of expression. The first court case against police use of facial recognition began in May in Cardiff. According to Liberty, the South Wales force will use facial recognition at the Wales National Air show this Saturday in Swansea.

Police Use of Child Spies in Criminal Gangs Lawful, High Court Rules

Owen Bowcott, Guardian: Police recruitment and use of child spies to penetrate "county lines" drug gangs and other criminal or terrorist organisations is lawful, the high court has ruled. Rejecting calls for extra safeguards when handling underage informants, Mr Justice Supperstone acknowledged they were more vulnerable than adults but dismissed claims that their human rights were being breached. The case was brought by the charity Just For Kids Law which argued that regulations governing recruiting and deploying children as covert human intelligence sources (CHIS) do not contain "adequate safeguards".

During the hearing last month, Caoilfhionn Gallagher QC, for the charity, said the government believed there was "increasing scope" for using children as informants because they were increasingly involved in serious crimes, both as perpetrators and victims. Gallagher said the use of children in investigations and prosecutions of serious offences such as terrorism, county lines drug offences and child sexual exploitation, raised "serious concerns" about their safety and wellbeing.

But, delivering judgment on Monday, Supperstone concluded that the scheme was lawful.

He said: “In my judgment, there is no unacceptable risk of breach of the … rights of a juvenile CHIS inherent in the scheme. “I reject the claimant’s contention that the scheme is inadequate in its safeguarding of the interests and welfare of juvenile CHIS.” The judge also found that it was “not irrational” for the scheme to ensure that an appropriate adult was provided for those aged 15 and under but not for those aged 16 and 17. Supperstone said his conclusions had been “reinforced” by confidential material he had seen.

Responding to the ruling, Just For Kids Law’s chief executive, Enver Solomon, said the decision was disappointing and the charity was considering its options and continuing to crowdfund the legal challenge. Solomon added: “The judgment acknowledges the ‘very significant risk of physical and psychological harm to children’ and a variety of dangers that arise from their use as covert informants in the context of serious crime. “We remain convinced that new protections are needed to keep these children safe. The reaction we have had shows that despite the ruling, there is widespread concern among the public about the government’s policy.” The security and economic crime minister, Ben Wallace, said: “The court recognised that the protections we have written into law ensure the best interests, safety and welfare of the child will always be paramount. “Juvenile CHIS have been used fewer than 20 times since January 2015 but they remain an important tool to investigate the most serious of crimes. They will only be used where necessary and proportionate in extreme cases where all other ways to gain information have been exhausted.”

Khalid Ahmed Qassim v Donald J. Trump

The United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit has granted a Guantanamo Bay detainee’s appeal against the denial of his habeas corpus petition, in a significant case about the due process requirements of a fair hearing. The appellant, Mr Qassim, is a Yemeni citizen who has for over 17 years been detained at Guantanamo Bay by the United States authorities. In the wake of Rasul v Bush 542 US 466 (2004), in which the Supreme Court of the United States held that the federal habeas statute applies to foreigners detained at Guantanamo, Mr Qassim filed a petition for habeas corpus. His case was, however, stayed until 2017, pending the determination of other cases regarding the procedural framework for the litigation of such petitions. The hearing at first instance proceeded on the footing that binding precedent established that Mr Qassim had no right to due process. The government sought to justify his detention by reference to material that was disclosed to neither him nor his lawyers, and the District Court denied his petition on that basis. The Court of Appeals rejected the premise that Mr Qassim has no right to due process, and held that Boumediene v Bush 533 US 723 (2008) establishes that he and other foreign detainees at Guantanamo must be afforded a habeas process that ensures “meaningful review” of their detention. The case has been remitted for the District Court to determine what process is required to ensure such a meaningful review on the facts of the case, and thereafter to consider the substantive petition.

Children ‘Blighted With Criminal Records’

Aaron Walawalkar, Human Rights News: A charity has warned that children in care are in danger of being criminalised as figures reveal that police were called to some residential homes more than 200 times last year. Figures released today (July 8) by charity the Howard League for Penal Reform reveal that police forces were called out to children’s care homes almost 23,000 times last year. The charity argues that police are being called out to matters they would not ordinarily be involved in, were the children staying in a family home.

In one case, a boy known only as Eddie tells of being arrested and prosecuted for assault after his care worker discovered he was self-harming. He had been moved around seven different homes throughout his teenage years after being assaulted by one of his mum’s boyfriends, and received no mental health support. Jodie, not her real name, went into care aged 15 and had been a victim of child sexual exploitation. She attended a Pupil Referral Unit and was the victim of bullying and had been involved in fights with other children that had led to police being called. A third case is of Sophie, who was placed in a children’s home in a rural village located an-hour-and-half’s-drive from home. “It was kind of like I was stuck in the house and couldn’t really do nothing,” she said. I just started smashing cups and plates and didn’t really know what else to do, because no one was really listening to how angry I was.” She added: “I smashed all the cups and they called the police.” The data was revealed through a request under the Freedom of Information Act sent to police forces across England and Wales. Five police forces reported having a home in their area that had called them more than 200 times – Derbyshire (267 call-outs), South Yorkshire (253), Humberside (235), Suffolk (209) and Northumbria (207). Most forces reported having been called out more than 100 times by individual homes.

Frances Crook, the charity’s chief executive, said: “A child living in residential care has more often than not experienced a range of problems early in life, from acute family stress to abuse and neglect. These children need nurture and support, not repeated contact with the police and criminalisation. “But our research shows that some children’s homes are picking up the phone again and again over matters that would never involve the police if they happened in a family home. “While the figures we publish today show there is some way to go before the police and children’s homes properly understand the scale of the problem, official figures from the Department for Education suggest the efforts of the Howard League and others are now having an impact. “We need to see everyone build on this, with more action to stop children in residential care having their lives blighted with a criminal record.

Homicide Kills Far More People Than Armed Conflict

UN News: Some 464,000 people across the world were victims of homicidal violence in 2017, more than five times the number killed in armed conflict over the same period, UN researchers said on Monday 08/07/2019). According to a study by the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC), Central America is the most dangerous region to live, where the number of homicides – or unlawful killings - rises in some “hotspots”, to 62.1 per 100,000 people. The safest locations are in Asia, Europe and Oceania (Australasia, Melanesia, Micronesia and Polynesia), where murder rates are 2.3, 3.0 and 2.8 respectively – well below the 6.1 global average, the UN agency’s Global Study on Homicide 2019 shows. At 13.0, Africa’s homicide rate was lower than the Americas (17.2), which had the highest percentage in 2017 since reliable data-gathering began in 1990, UNODC said, while also pointing to significant data gaps for some African countries.

Organized crime accounts for nearly one in five murders. One constant since the beginning of this century is the link between organized crime and violent deaths, according to the report. Crime alone was responsible for 19 per cent of all homicides in 2017 and caused “many more deaths worldwide than armed conflict and terrorism combined”, said Yury Fedotov, UNODC Executive Director. Like violent conflict, organized crime “destabilizes countries, undermines socioeconomic development and erodes the rule of law”, according to UNODC, while Mr. Fedotov insisted that unless the international community takes decisive steps, “targets under Sustainable Development Goal 16 to significantly reduce all forms of violence and related death rates by 2030 will not be met”.

Young men at highest risk in all regions. From a gender angle, the UNODC report also finds that while girls and boys aged nine and under, are more or less equally represented in terms of victim numbers, in all other age groups, males make up more than 50 per cent of the toll, according to data from 41 countries. In all regions, the likelihood of boys becoming victims of homicide increases with age, while those aged between 15 and 29 are at the highest risk of homicide globally. In the Americas, for instance, the victim rate among 18 to 19-year-olds is estimated at 46 per 100,000 – far higher than for their peers in other regions, while firearms are also involved "far more often" in homicides in the Americas than elsewhere, the UN report maintains. "High levels of violence are strongly associated with young males, both as perpetrators and victims," the report says, "So violence prevention programmes should focus on providing support to young men to prevent them from being lured into a subculture of… gangs (and) drug dealing."

Femicide 'too often ignored'. While women and girls account for a far smaller share of victims than men, they continue to bear "by far the greatest burden" of intimate partner and family-related homicide, the report finds, adding that more than nine in 10 suspects in homicide cases are men. "Killings carried out by intimate partners are rarely spontaneous or random," Mr. Fedotov said, noting too that the phenomenon is often under-reported and "too often ignored". In a bid to help Governments tackle homicide, the UNODC report identifies several drivers of the problem, in addition to organized crime. They include firearms, drugs and alcohol, inequality, unemployment, political instability and gender stereotyping.

'Targeted' anti-corruption policies needed. The study also underlines the importance of addressing corruption, strengthening the rule of law and investing in public services – particularly education; these are "critical" in reducing violent crime, it insists. Highlighting the report's broad scope – which covers everything from lethal gang violence involving firearms to links with inequality and gender-related killings - Mr. Fedotov maintained that it "is possible" to tackle the threat from criminal networks with "targeted" policies. These include community engagement and police patrols, as well as policing reform, whose aim is to strengthen trust in officers among the local population.

For those young men already caught up in criminal gangs, they need help "so that they can extricate themselves" through social work, rehabilitation programmes and awareness-raising about non-violent alternatives. These efforts could be more effective if they took place in "certain countries in South and Central America, Africa and Asia" and "even in countries with high national rates of homicide", the report insists. "Killings are often concentrated in specific states, provinces and cities," it says. "Bringing down overall homicide rates depends ultimately on tackling lethal violence in these 'hotspots'". Although the UNODC study shows that the number of homicides increased from almost 400,000 in 1992 to more than 460,000 in 2017, it explains that the actual global rate has declined (from 7.2 in 1992, to 6.1 in 2017) when measured against population growth.

Tim Henrik Bruun Hansen v. Denmark

The applicant, Tim Henrik Brun Hansen, is a Danish national who was born in 1965. He is currentlyserving a sentence at Herstedvester Institution (Denmark). The case concerned his complaint about the lack of an external medical opinion in a 2015 High Court decision to keep him in Herstedvester Institution, where he had been held since 1997. Mr Hansen was found guilty in 1996 of deprivation of liberty, attempted rape in particularly aggravating circumstances and abandoning a 10-year-old girl. He was subsequently transferred to Herstedvester Institution. He has several times requested release or a more lenient sentence. Based on medical reports by Herstedvester Institution experts, the requests were refused owing to a

risk of his committing similar crimes unless he agreed to chemical castration, which he refused. A new request for release was brought before the courts in 2014 and it was again rejected at first instance by the District Court. Mr Hansen appealed, arguing that an external medical opinion was needed as his case had reached deadlock as the institution was insisting on chemical castration prior to his release but he refused on health grounds. He relied on Article 5 (right to liberty and security) of the European Convention on Human Rights and the Court's case-law in H.W. v. Germany and Ruiz Rivera v. Switzerland. The High Court upheld the safe custody measure in January 2015, stating also that the submissions under Article 5 of the European Convention could not lead to a different finding and citing a Supreme Court case on that matter in its conclusions. Proceedings for his release also took place in 2016 and when they went to appeal the High Court sought an external opinion from the Medico- Legal Council. The appeal court subsequently maintained his placement in the institute.

The applicant complained that the High Court's decision of January 2015 to maintain his sentence of safe custody, without hearing an external medical expert, had breached his rights under Article 5 § 1 (a) (right to liberty and security) of the Convention.

Nigh Impossible' for Victims of Wrongful Conviction to Access Police Material Post-Conviction

Will Bordell, Justice Gap: It is now 'nearly impossible' for the victims of wrongful conviction to access material held by the police that might assist their appeal, according to the chair of the all-party parliamentray group on miscarriages of justice. The Labour MP Barry Sheerman raised the issue in Parliament last month when he asked the justice secretary what steps the Ministry of Justice was taking to improve the post-conviction disclosure regime.

Five years ago the Supreme Court rejected a challenge to the police's refusal to disclose forensic evidence that could have helped to overturn Kevin Nunn's conviction for murdering his ex-girlfriend, Dawn Walker. The court's view was that the duty of disclosure post-conviction was largely curtailed by the need to preserve the 'finality of proceedings' in the public interest and it was for the Criminal Cases Review Commission (CCRC) to act as arbiter as to whether it was appropriate to seek disclosure in a particular case.

As has been reported on the Justice Gap, campaigners believe that the ruling has left those seeking disclosure in a 'Catch-22' – i.e., to make a successful request for evidence, they need to argue that such evidence is likely to demonstrate innocence. However, the only way to establish such knowledge is by accessing the evidence in the first place. According to a new article published in the International Journal of Law, Crime and Justice by Louise Shorter, the journalist who runs the charity Inside Justice, and Professor Carole McCartney of Northumbria University's school of law, Nunn has created an environment where getting access to case materials is a 'lottery'. 'Not only is permission required of the investigating force,' they write, 'who may not be motivated to facilitate the re-opening of a case they consider closed […] but decisions are made on a piecemeal basis, sometimes even exhibit by exhibit.'

In the five-year period since Nunn, campaigners and journalists seeking disclosure have found their efforts increasingly thwarted. According to the Criminal Appeal Lawyers Association, the police and CPS had 'always co-operated with such requests up until the time of the Nunn case'. The report also quotes from a submission coauthored by the Centre for Criminal Appeals and Cardiff Innocence Project to the House of Commons' justice committee's 2018 inquiry into disclosure (here) in which they argue that that CCRC's reviews were 'no longer sufficient to reliably identify miscarriages of justice resulting from disclosure fail-

ings'. 'It is the defendant or would-be appellant to whom the right of access to post-disclosure should apply,' they argue. 'This right should not be denied because of the existence of an arm's length body subject to the vagaries of government funding levels. In addition, defendants who have not been able to find grounds for appeal without further disclosure are almost never eligible for the CCRC's assistance.' According to the two groups, even 'highly specific requests' for material from the police and CPS (e.g., unseen CCTV footage, identity parade documentation, and details of unfounded allegations) are 'normally turned down'.

The report highlights the case of Victor Nealon who spent 17 years in prison before having his conviction for attempted rape overturned as an example of the CCRC's reluctance to take a proactive role. Nealon had volunteered for a DNA test at his very first police interview. He made two earlier applications to the CCRC in 1999 and 2002. On both occasions, the group agreed to investigate his case and, on both occasions, Nealon called for the watchdog to carry out a DNA test. In its 2002 decision not to refer the case, the CCRC said that it was not its policy to carry out 'speculative tests'. Nealon blames the group for him spending an additional ten years in prison because (in his words) it 'accepted at face value evidence given by the police that examinations had been carried out in respect of forensic evidence'. Richard Foster, chairman of the CCRC, wrote to Nealon in 2014 acknowledging that the group 'could and should have identified there were forensic opportunities that had not been explored'.

Shorter and McCartney argue that the problems have been compounded by the 'widespread ignorance' of the post-conviction disclosure requirements. Just two of the 43 police forces in England and Wales correctly identified the current retention policy in response to freedom of information requests. That national policy is found in the Code of Practice contained in the Criminal Procedure and Investigations Act 1996. It gives guidance about the recording and retention of unused prosecution materials both during proceedings and after conviction. In response to Barry Sheerman's question last month, Edward Argar MP said that the MoJ had 'no plans' to review the post-conviction disclosure regime.

Teenager Who Died Of Meningitis Was Seriously Failed by HMP Doncaster Healthcare Staff,

Jordan Hullock, a 19 year old from Leeds, died in June 2015 whilst a prisoner at HMP Doncaster. An inquest has today concluded, with the jury finding his death was by 'natural causes' and that there were serious failures and shortcomings in his care in the days leading up to his death. Jordan's family describe him as funny and daft, a typical 19 year old with a caring and loving nature. He had never been in prison before. HMP Doncaster is run by the private company Serco, with healthcare provided at the time by Nottinghamshire Healthcare NHS Trust. Jordan was remanded to HMP Doncaster on 1 June 2015. Jordan soon began complaining of feeling unwell at the prison. From 12 June, he developed headaches and was soon unable to get out of bed, eat, or drink without assistance. His cellmate helped him drink and carried him to the toilet. Prison officers alerted healthcare staff on several occasions, as Jordan was experiencing dizziness, headaches and chest pains. Healthcare staff attended numerous times but often failed to take observations. Where observations were noted, a high temperature and low blood pressure were recorded but not acted on.

On the 18 of June, Jordan's cellmate was released, leaving him alone for hours on end and unable to care for himself. Jordan had a GP appointment booked the following day but did not attend. No GP was asked to visit the cell. Despite concerns from other prisoners and prison staff, Jordan's condition declined to the point of verbal unresponsiveness. On various occasions

after this, healthcare staff attended and noted issues with his health, including again recording low blood pressure and a high temperature, and that Jordan looked severely unwell, but still no action was taken. On the morning unlock of 23 June, staff found Jordan's body and cell were covered in faeces, due to the fact he had become incontinent. Healthcare staff were called but did not arrive until the afternoon and then would not enter the cell until Jordan and the cell were properly cleaned. Delays in sourcing the equipment for this (until around 6.30pm) meant Jordan was left in the contaminated cell, unchecked by healthcare and in his own faeces, for at least ten hours. At this point, Jordan had to be physically carried to the shower block but was unable to wash himself. Another prisoner and prison officer attempted to assist, but Jordan collapsed in the shower blocks. Healthcare staff were urgently called, but on arrival failed to take his blood pressure or temperature and completed the assessment after only eight minutes. The senior nurse, leaving Jordan on the floor of the shower block, then advised officers to return Jordan to his cell. The nursing assistant present was not content with this, and took it upon herself to return and try to assist further. Jordan gulped down the water she gave him, having not had fluid since 21 June, and urgently ate the breakfast bars she offered. She and the prison officer who assisted then left Jordan alone, where he collapsed again and was left on the floor for a further ten minutes before an officer arrived to carry him back to his cell, unable to walk unsupported.

The following morning (24 June) Jordan was found on his cell floor having collapsed again. Healthcare staff attended and again found incontinence. A nurse escalated concerns, and arrangements were made for Jordan to finally see a GP by 2.45pm. After seeing the GP, Jordan was urgently transferred from prison to hospital. Although his mother had contacted the prison on numerous occasions prior to and when Jordan had been hospitalised, she was not told where he was until the following day when he had already been placed in an induced coma. Jordan died six days later on 30 June.

The inquest jury concluded that Jordan's death was by 'natural causes', with the medical cause of death relating to Bacterial Meningitis, pneumonia and his existing heart condition (Aortic Stenosis). The jury narrative said that further steps ought to have been taken by prison healthcare staff and prison officers to try to ensure that Jordan was seen earlier by a GP. They also commented that, "The facts show serious failures in the medical attention given to the deceased following his collapse on 23 June and prior to being seen by the doctor on 24 June 2015." The jury recorded that, during the course of the inquest, Nottingham Healthcare NHS Foundation admitted there were "shortcomings in the standard of physical healthcare provided" to Jordan between 17 and 23 June 2015, as a full set of physical observations and a full clinical assessment was not completed or recorded, and the indicators of physical illness were not acted upon. The jury further commented that, though the evidence did not sufficiently allow them to determine whether this contributed to his death, there were both shortcomings in care over the period described by the NHS Trust, and "serious failures" from 12 to 24 June 2015.

Marie Hullock, Jordan's mother, said: "Not being informed of our child's admission to hospital denied us of the chance to say goodbye. We cannot believe the inhuman and degrading treatment he received while in Doncaster prison. Four years on we are still devastated and angry that we have lost our loving son. We have persisted with this battle to try to get some answers and justice, not only for Jordan losing his life, but for the days and days of suffering he endured whilst he was ridiculously poorly in HMP Doncaster. Even after this long inquest we do not feel satisfied with the outcome, though we are truly grateful for the jury's carefully considered conclusions.

We feel people need to be punished for their behaviour and actions towards Jordan. Many

failings have been admitted by Nottinghamshire NHS Trust and the individual nurses. What we really wanted was admission as to why certain people did not comply with the requirements of their job, including prison management. We understand the staff may have had high workloads, but we truly feel many had an uncaring nature towards Jordan, as I assume they do towards all prisoners. We hope that the individuals involved have considered their actions and inactions towards Jordan for the past four years, and are faced with guilt and regret. Those who failed him so terribly should not be allowed to nurse again. On the other hand, we would like to thank the very few people that did try to help Jordan. Even if it cannot be proven, we 100% believe that Jordan would still be with us now if he had received the care he needed sooner."

Deborah Coles, Director of INQUEST, said: "Jordan was in need of urgent physical healthcare but instead was dehumanised and ignored. The serious failures in care resulted in him being left to deteriorate in his cell, dependent on another prisoner for his basic needs. Like too many deaths in prison, Jordan's death was far from natural and should have been prevented." In their investigation following his death, Elizabeth Moody the Deputy Ombudsman at Prisons and Probation Ombudsman commented: "This is a sad and disturbing case in which no one took responsibility for ensuring that Mr Hullock received urgent medical attention as he became seriously unwell. It is unacceptable that any prisoner, and particularly a vulnerable young man, should have been treated in such an uncaring manner, allowed to deteriorate in full view of staff and to spend his final days in appalling conditions before he was finally, belatedly, sent to hospital."

Ruth Bundey, of Harrison Bundey solicitors who represent the family, said: "The image of Jordan, left motionless over days in his cell behind a locked door, unable to reach his bell or water tap, and gradually losing the power of speech, is like something out of the dark ages. There can be no excuses for the lack of care afforded to him and the neglect of his needs. His family has sat through horrendous evidence with huge dignity."

Theresa May to 'Simplify' Funding for Inquests

The prime minister has committed to 'simplify' the funding regime for legal aid for bereaved families in inquests. In response to a question by the Conservative MP Alex Chalk made in relation to two constituents who were relatives of one of the victims of the London Bridge attack, Theresa May said her government were 'committed to simplifying the process for applying for exceptional case funding'. Helen Boniface and Yasmin Waljee OBE of Hogan Lovells last week on the Justice Gap that argued that legal aid must be available as of right and raised the case of Kirsty Boden and Alexandre Pigeard. Alex Chalk also drew attention to Kirsty Boden. 'Despite the fact that at least one of the terrorists' families received legal aid for representation at the inquest, none of the victims' families did,' the MP for Cheltenham said during prime minister's question time. 'Does my right hon. Friend think that we need to look again at the entitlement to legal aid for inquests, so that those people who wish to ask questions about what happened to their loved ones are not left to fend for themselves?' 'One of the many lessons to be learned though is that legal aid must be available as of right for bereaved families at terrorism inquests. Even though these inquests have just concluded, the Government has still not decided whether to grant bereaved families Legal Aid. The only thing they have said is that 'the wider public interest is not served by families having representation'. This seems extraordinary. As both lawyers and engaging our innate humanity we cannot understand this.' Helen Boniface and Yasmin Waljee OBE More than 10,000 people have now signed up to a petition launched last weekcalling for legal aid for inquests launched by the Kirsty Boden's partner James Hodder.

Fairer Prisoner Incentives to Encourage Rehabilitation

A new prisoner incentives system has been launched (11 July 2019), aiming to improve relations between offenders and officers, encourage rehabilitation and allow governors to deal with local challenges. • Evidence shows incentives more effective at improving behavio • More flexibility for Governors to meet local challenge • Latest measure to drive offender rehabilitation The new Incentives Policy Framework will provide overall consistency while giving Governors greater flexibility to tailor programmes that address the specific situation in their prison. Among the new initiatives is the removal of the low 'entry' level of privileges which was felt to effectively punish new prisoners and create an adversarial relationship with staff from the outset. The revised scheme has been developed following consultation with prison Governors and other stakeholders. It is built on evidence that shows positive reinforcement is much more effective at shaping behaviour than punishment, while also encouraging lasting behavioural change and rehabilitation. For those who don't follow the rules or engage, however, a strict system of adjudications ensures that Governors are able to act swiftly. Punishments range from the removal of privileges to harsher measures such as prosecution and additional prison time. Justice Secretary David Gauke said: This new framework gives Governors the tools to set clear behavioural standards for prisoners – enhancing their ability to maintain stability while steering offenders away from a life of crime. Under the changes being introduced, the new system also: • Retains the three privilege levels: basic, standard and enhanced, but removes 'entry level', which Governors say is bureaucratic and penalises prisoners who are new - setting up an adversarial relationship with staff from the outset • Emphasises that staff should consistently use verbal reinforcement for good behaviour and challenge poor behaviour outside formal reviews • Requires Governors to immediately review prisoner incentives after single serious incidents of bad behaviour with a strong presumption that such incidents lead to downgrade • Gives Governors the freedom to increase the amount of time out of cell for recreational activities or exercise alongside education and work programmes • Prisoners that behave well and engage in meaningful activities such as education and employment programmes could receive privileges such as more time in the gym or additional visits • Establishes local 'incentive forums' – comprised of staff and prisoners – to review the fairness and effectiveness of the policy locally, delivering on recommendation 24 of the Lammy Review • Will retain sensible limitations on Governors' freedoms, so that, for example, no paid-for TV channels or other inappropriate incentives are permitted.

Miscarriage of Justice Compensation Fight to Go to ECtHR

The legal fight on behalf of two wrongly convicted men for compensation for a total of 25 years behind bars is to go to Strasbourg. The latest development was announced at the launch of the latest issue of Proof magazine at the National Union of Journalists last night. Sam Hallam and Victor Nealon will take their test case to the European Court of Human Rights. In January this year, the UK Supreme Court ruled that the 2014 regime which significantly narrowed eligibility for compensation for victims of miscarriages of justice was compatible with the presumption of innocence guaranteed under the European Convention of Human Rights, by Article 6(2). The pair had been denied compensation by Chris Grayling during his controversial tenure as justice secretary under the coalition government's Anti-Social Behaviour, Crime and Policing Act 2014 passed by the then home secretary, Theresa May.Under the new arrangements, to be eligible for compensation you now have to demonstrate your own innocence 'beyond reasonable doubt'. It is a hurdle that reverses the presumption of innocence, and is almost impossible to surmount in the absence of DNA evidence. Nealon had his conviction for attempted rape overturned after DNA evidence pointed to another attacker.

According to the human rights group JUSTICE who intervened in the case, that ruling appears to depart from the case law of the European Court of Human Rights. The new regime defines a 'miscarriage of justice' as occurring when a new or newly discovered fact demonstrates that the person did not commit the offence. 'It requires the person to prove, for the purposes of com-

pensation, that they were innocent,' explains JUSTICE. 'Of course, once a conviction is quashed, an individual should be presumed innocent, as they have no longer been proven guilty. Requiring an individual to prove innocence reverses this fundamental rule of justice, placing a near impossible burden on the applicant for compensation.' The group points out that 'a further difficulty' is that the Court of Appeal does not consider whether the appellant is 'innocent; but whether the conviction was 'unsafe'. 'This is because the justice system determines guilt rather than innocence,' the group says. 'This area of law needs urgent and serious overhaul by Parliament to ensure that where miscarriage of justice occurs, there is appropriate reparation. People who have served years in prison and had their convictions quashed deserve support to try to rebuild their lives. This includes not only compensation but readily available and suitable accommodation, financial allowances, psychological treatment and a review of what went wrong. Justice's director, Andrea Coomber. The reform has virtually stopped money being paid out to victims of miscarriages of justice. There have been only five payouts in the last five years and not a single person last year. By contrast, between 1999 and 2004, there were 162 successful applications.

Speaking at the launch of Proof last night, Mark Newby, Victor Nealon's solicitor explained that an application had now been made on behalf of the two men to the Strasbourg court. 'How we treat the wrongfully convicted says everything about the sort of society we want to be,' he said. 'It should not be forgotten that the hurdle to even quash a wrongful conviction is set impossibly high and for those who have climbed that mountain it is just wrong to ask them to then scale the same mountain again and prove to the government beyond reasonable doubt that they are innocent.'

Innocent – but not innocent enough - 'A miscarriage of justice is not a one-off event. The correct anal- ogy is not so much a car crash, but a serial motorway pile-up. First, they are failed by the criminal justice system – in itself, often a serial failure involving police, prosecution, courts and their own lawyers – with devastating consequences for not only their lives but the lives of their loved ones as well. Then they are further failed by a penal system that uses the denial of privileg- es and parole to punish them for maintaining their innocence. Then, after all the wasted years, their trauma (and it is almost always traumatic) is compounded by the extreme reluctance of the courts to correct the original wrong. Finally, if their conviction is overturned then, like Sam Hallam, they are undoubtedly innocent – and yet not innocent enough.'

Scotland: One Third of Miscarriage of Justice Applications Made by Sex Offenders

Kapil Summan, Scottish Legal News: Almost a third of all applications ever made to the Scottish Criminal Cases Review Commission (SCCRC) were lodged by people convicted of sex crimes, a new report shows. The SCCRC is a public body established in 1999 that reviews alleged miscarriages of justice in relation to conviction, sentence or both. In total, the SCCRC has reviewed more than 2,600 applications and has referred 140 cases, an average of seven per year, back to the High Court for further consideration. Of the 127 cases already decided at appeal, 83 have been successful, with 44 convictions quashed and 39 sentences reduced over the SCCRC's 20-year history. Compared with the system operated by the Scottish Office, there has been an increased referral rate of 2,500 per cent. The SCCRC's report, which features data from the two decades since its inception, shows that applicants in 361 applications, or 13.8 per cent of the total, had been convicted of rape. Applicants in 398 cases, or 15.2 per cent of all applications, had been convicted of sexual offences other than rape. Five hundred applications, 19.1 per cent, were made by people convicted of murder. The single largest ground of review lodged by applicants was for defective representation, which has accounted for 506 cases over the SCCRC's 20-year history, or 19.5 per cent of the total. There have, however, been only 11 referrals made by the SCCRC to the High Court on the basis of defective representation. Almost a third of applications, 18, in sentence-only cases, were referred back to court on the basis the sentence given by the judge was inconsistent with precedent, while 24 were referred on the ground the punishment part had been improperly calculated. Thomas Ross QC told Scottish Legal News: "The case of Anderson, decided in December 1995, established 'defective representation' as a competent ground of appeal in Scots law. Back in 1995, it was easy to appreciate that a miscarriage of justice could arise where the accused had been represented by a lawyer who fell below the standard expected of a reasonably competent practitioner. The Anderson case did, however, give rise to concerns that 'defective representation' would become of ground of appeal of 'last resort' – where there were no other grounds of appeal, and indeed no proper basis for the claim of defective representation. This report provides material that allows us to consider whether those fears were justified. These figures suggests that the quality of representation provided by modern practitioners is regularly assessed objectively and enjoys a pass rate of 98 per cent. Trial lawyers in Scotland should be proud of that statistic."

Out With the Old, In With the New

Raquel Alexandra Christodoulou Pires: Older prisoners are the fastest rising group within the prison population. Despite this, no inquiry has been made into addressing their individual needs. When compared to younger prisoners, the needs of older prisoners are significantly different upon release into the community. Statistically, the elderly cohort are the least likely group to reoffend, however, they are equally unlikely to find employment, and many are released with no place to stay (referred to as No Fixed Abode).

My research focuses on male elderly prisoners ranging from ages 50 to 90 and is aided by first-hand interviews with prisoners themselves, as well as a wide variety of professionals within the criminal justice system. Intermittent support is comprised of several reviews of Her Majesty's Prisons visited throughout the UK, and by statistics (and the lack thereof) published by the Ministry of Justice surrounding those issues unique to elderly inmates.

Thus far, extensive evidence has been found in the failure of UK's Victorian-built prisons to provide a suitable physical environment for elderly prisoners and its additional lack of consideration for those with mobility issues. These findings are not only practical and important but are capable of resolve. It is hoped that this research will provide a platform from which action may be taken towards improvement on behalf of this cohort who are deeply underrepresented within the prison estate. It is proposed that elderly prisoners are incorporated within the modern prison context and its need to move away from the current notions of Victorian imprisonment ideology.

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.