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 835 (24/02/2021) - Cost £1

Efforts to Tackle Racism in Prisons Have “Regressed”

Prison Reform Trust: The prison service has “regressed” in its efforts to tackle racial inequality, a leading expert on equality and diversity in the criminal justice system has warned. Writing in the latest edition of the Prison Reform Trust’s Bromley Briefing Prison Factfile, Beverley Thompson OBE, a former senior civil servant and Race Equality Advisor (2004 – 2009) at HM Prison Service, says that “many in the prison service have either lost commitment and direction from their leadership or their organisational expertise and energy is depleted—seeking comfort instead from the dangerous mantra that ‘race has been done’.”

Over one quarter (27%) of people in prison are from a minority ethnic group despite making up 14% of the total population in England and Wales. If our prison population reflected the ethnic make-up of England and Wales, we would have over 9,000 fewer people in prison—the equivalent of 12 average-sized prisons. The economic cost of BAME over-representation in our prison system is estimated to be £234m a year. Black people are 53%, Asian 55%, and other ethnic minority groups 81% more likely to be sent to prison for an indictable offence at the Crown Court, even when factoring in higher not-guilty plea rates. BAME people in prison often report more negatively about their experience in prison and relationships with staff.

In a specially commissioned piece for the Factfile, Ms Thompson charts the complex history of race relations in the prison service over the past two decades, from the murder of Zahid Mubarek at Feltham prison in 2000, which prompted a significant review of prison policy on race relations, through to the publication in 2017 of David Lammy’s seminal review into the treatment of, and outcomes for, BAME individuals in the criminal justice system. Zahid Mubarek was a British Pakistani teenager who was murdered by his cellmate on 21 March 2000 at the Feltham Young Offenders' Institution in southwest London. His murder led to the establishment of an independent inquiry and an ambitious programme of work in prisons to tackle racial discrimination, culminating in the publication in 2008 of the prison service’s race review.

Ms Thompson compares efforts by the prison service to tackle racial inequality in the wake of the Mubarek murder with its current lack of focus on the issue. She highlights the case of Mohamed Sharif, a Muslim prisoner at HMP Bristol in 2014, who was left severely brain damaged following an attack by a white prisoner who had previously told staff he would “only share a cell with a white person who was not homosexual”. This case, she says, “shares striking similarities with the murder Zahid Mubarek.” She concludes: “It is disheartening to see a service which demonstrated such maturity, vision, transparency and commitment to eradicating racism and discrimination, but which unfortunately appears to have regressed. It is only right that we ask, “if not now, when”.

In September 2017, David Lammy published his hard-hitting assessment of institutional racism within the criminal justice system. It uncovered disproportionality at every stage from prosecution through to sentencing and resettlement. The Ministry of Justice accepted all 35 Lammy recommendations and its fundamental challenge that government and criminal justice agencies must either explain the reasons for racial disparity in a particular situation and if it cannot do so, reform the system to eradicate racism. In February 2020, the Ministry of Justice published an update on progress in implementing the Lammy recommendations. Although the update provides comprehensive details on what the government is doing on each of Lammy’s 35 recommendations, it does not include an assessment of the impact of any of this work. For the Ministry of Justice’s efforts to tackle disproportionality to gain proper credibility, this will need to be rectified, especially since we know that, for instance, the proportion of our youth custody population who come from BAME backgrounds has actually increased since the Lammy report was published.

Furthermore, decisions such as that to roll out PAVA spray to all closed adult male prisons, despite clear evidence of the disproportionate impact of use of force on BAME prisoners, undermine the prison service’s commitment to addressing racial disparities. In addition, proposals contained in the government’s sentencing white paper are likely to worsen disproportionate outcomes for BAME individuals. For instance, the Equality Statement acknowledges that the proposal to extend the automatic release point from half- to two-thirds of the sentence will have a disproportionate impact on, “Men, people with a Black or Black British ethnicity as well as younger adult offenders (aged 18-24) and offenders over the age of 50”. But it does not describe the impact on these individuals, nor explain the reasons for the disparities.

Commenting, Peter Dawson, Director of the Prison Reform Trust, said: “There was a time when the Prison Service led the way in its practical actions to tackle race discrimination. Taking the long view, it is clear that other priorities have gradually taken over. But the problems have not gone away. Indeed, in some respects the government is about to make the situation worse, with harsh sentencing proposals which will disproportionately affect young black people. It is time the Prison Service put race equality back at the top of its agenda.”

More Than Four Out of 10 Children In Custody ‘Bullied’ by Staff

Zaki Sarraf, Justice Gap: More than four out of 10 children in custody claimed to have been bullied or victimised by staff with violence reaching ‘an all time high’, according to the latest damning watchdog report published today of experiences in secure training centres and young offender institutions. Charlie Taylor, HM Chief Inspector of Prisons, stated that the findings show a ‘grim’ picture of violence, self-harm, and long periods of children locked in cells.

Although the evidence shows that the number of children in custody in England and Wales had been falling steadily, the experiences of the children that are detained has worsened. Some 44% told inspectors they had been bullied or victimised by other children, and the same proportion reported they had been bullied or victimised by staff. One in four children of children reported that they spent less than two hours out of their room on weekdays which shot up to more than six out of 10 (61%) on Saturdays and Sundays. Over a third of children (35%) said that they had, at some point, felt unsafe.

Taylor stated that violence and self-harm in youth offender institutions ‘remained at or near an all-time high’ and only one institution inspected in 2019-20 was described as ‘sufficiently safe’. According to the report, most children ‘did not feel cared for by staff and many spent long hours locked up in their cells, particularly at the weekend’. Inspectors revealed less than half reported being able to sleep easily and and only 68% were able to shower every day.

The report also discusses how black and minority ethnic (BAME) children, who make up more than 50% of the population in custody, fared less well than their white peers. BAME children were more likely to report that they had been restrained and they were less likely to say that they were cared for in custody or were treated well by the staff. Almost two-thirds of children reported that they had been restrained – 71% of BAME children compared to 59% of white children.

Taylor concluded that the findings of the report show how much work is needed to be done to ensure that children in custody are given the support they need to lead successful, crime-

free lives when they are released. Taylor also remarked that without reductions in violence and restraint, and a greater focus on education and resettlement, the Youth Custody Service will continue to struggle to adequately provide for the children in its care.

Deborah Coles, Director of INQUEST commented: 'This report is a damning indictment of the state of child prisons. Cultures of violence, self-harm and restraint are the daily reality of the life of children behind bars. This is a failing system that has proved itself incapable of reform. That only one institution was deemed safe is shameful and points to the need to stop imprisoning children and investing in child centred community services.'

52 Police Had Contact With Mohamud Hassan Before His Death

Nazia Parveen, Guardian:The police watchdog is facing growing pressure to disclose further information about the arrest of a man who died suddenly after being released from custody, after it was revealed that he came into contact with more than 50 police officers during the final hours of his life. Lawyers have demanded that the Independent Office for Police Conduct (IOPC), which is investigating the contact South Wales police had with Mohamud Hassan, during his arrest and time in custody on the evening of 8 January, share evidence with his grieving family. More than 30,000 people have signed a petition calling on the IOPC to release documents and CCTV footage detailing the contact between officers and the 24-year-old.

Hassan, who was of Somali heritage, was arrested at his Cardiff home on a Friday evening on suspicion of breach of the peace. He arrived at the police station just after 10pm but was released without charge the following morning. Officers said he left custody at about 8.30am. It has now emerged that 52 police officers came into contact with Hassan during the short time he spent in police custody. The information was shared by senior independent investigator Ian Andrews during a meeting with the family and subsequently during a community reference group (CRG) meeting that took place last week.

Lawyer Hilary Brown from Virgo Consultancy, who is representing the family, said Hassan's parents and his family were deeply concerned by the new information provided to them by the IOPC regarding police contact. "They are understandably disturbed by it," said Brown. "There are allegations of excessive force and to hear that Hassan was subject to this level of police contact has been really upsetting and then not to be given any further information about this, the contact, was really difficult and completely unfair." Brown also raised concerns regarding the disclosure of this sensitive information to the wider public during the CRG meeting.

The CRG is a forum to allow community leaders to ask questions regarding the progress of an IOPC case. On this occasion it was held on Zoom, with four local people from the community in attendance, shortly after the IOPC met with the family. "The family did not want the matter to be discussed with anybody else and they were trying to come to terms with this information and were devastated when they heard that this detail of the ongoing investigation had been disclosed during this meeting," said Brown, who has already requested custody records and other documents which would reveal further important details of the police contact. "It seems unfair that information requested by the family has not been forthcoming and yet such sensitive information was revealed to a community group," she added.

Shortly after Hassan's death, South Wales police said they had so far found no evidence of excessive force or misconduct. The force said its self-referral to the complaints watchdog was standard practice following a death after police contact. The IOPC director for Wales, Catrin Evans, said it would look carefully at the level of force used during the arrest and whether proper assessments were made of Hassan before he was released, but added that preliminary indications were that there was no physical trauma injury to explain the cause of death and toxicology tests would be needed.

In response to the latest developments, the IOPC said it was in the course of obtaining accounts from a large number of police officers and staff who may potentially have had some direct or indirect contact with Hassan. Those police personnel included officers who went to his address at Newport Road on the Friday evening, those who were on duty at Cardiff Bay police station over two separate shifts, those who visited the Newport Road property on Saturday evening following his death, as well as others in supervisory positions. "We need to ensure we have spoken to anyone who may possibly have useful information to help us build a picture of what happened, as part of our thorough and independent investigation," the IOPC spokesperson added. Since Hassan's death, his family have paid for a private postmortem examination. The results of this and another public postmortem are expected to be released over the next three months. It is alleged that Hassan suffered a series of injuries during his time in custody.

More Than 213,000 Children at Risk of Serious Violence

Zaki Sarraf, Justice Gap: More than 213,000 children are at risk of being exposed to serious violence with almost four out of 10 living in ten local authority areas. According to a report by Crest Advisory, the local authorities with the highest proportion of children at risk of serious violence were predominately in the north of England, including Middlesbrough which was reckoned to have the highest proportion of children at risk (37% or 4,335 children), followed by Manchester (36% or 15,302) and North-East Lincolnshire (29% or with 3,751). Crest was given anonymised details about victims, witnesses and offenders involved in 18 serious incidents, including two murders and ten stabbings, and then mapped the connections, along with links to schools, colleges and young offender institutions. 'All the 57 young people in the perpetrator group had previously been victims of violence. Moreover, many of them had serious mental health needs and many were not in education, employment, or training—critical protective factors against involvement in violence,' Crest said.

The report found that the police and other agencies lack specialist training in identifying and responding to trauma. The recommendation given was that trauma-informed training should be rolled out across law enforcement and other services who encounter perpetrators or victims of violence. Other key findings from the report showed that schools struggle to manage behavioural problems, leading to exclusions and removal from education. The performance and funding systems for schools do not incentivise schools to use exclusions only as a last resort. The Timpson Review of School Exclusion, published in May 2019 recommended that schools should be made responsible for the outcomes of excluded children. Though the government accepted this recommendation of the Timpson Review, there have been no progress on the issue. According to Crest, there are no figures on the number of children who are at risk of being involved in serious violence either as victims or perpetrators because of deprivation. The report's authors arrive at their 213,000 figure by making three estimates using the 2019 Index of Deprivation looking at the levels of crime in each local area and the numbers of families on low incomes.

Harvey Redgrave, Crest Advisory's Chief Executive, said that the 'report reveals in stark terms why tackling serious violence cannot be seen as purely about policing'. 'A growth in the number of vulnerable young children provides a ready supply of individuals at higher risk of being dragged into violence, whether as perpetrators or victims,' he saud. 'Government needs to focus on doing more to intervene early to tackle the root causes of violence, rather than simply reacting to its consequences.' The report's authors Sarah Kincaid, Jessica Lumley and Dr Molly Corlett explore the issue of vulnerability as a driver of serious violence amongst young people. The study looks at the backgrounds of a group of 57 young offenders and victims of serious violence to explore vulnerabilities that and seeks to 'map connections' with a technique known as Social Network Analysis.

Omar Latif Sues MoJ Over Licence Changes

BBC News: A convicted terrorist who was jailed for his role in an al Qaida-inspired terrorist group is suing the Ministry of Justice (MoJ). Omar Latif, from Cardiff, was one of nine men jailed in 2012 for plotting to bomb the London Stock Exchange. He was released in 2016. The MoJ imposed new conditions on Latif's licence after Usman Khan's murderous London Bridge attack while on licence following his early release. Latif claimed the MoJ acted unlawfully. The MoJ is defending itself against Latif's claim and argues the additional licence conditions imposed on him are lawful. The nine men jailed in 2012, which included Khan, had also tried to raise funds to build a terrorist training camp in Pakistan and recruit British people to attend.

Latif, now 36, was 28 when he was jailed for 10 years and four months for attending meetings with the intention of assisting others to prepare or commit acts of terrorism. Latif was automatically released from prison halfway through his sentence in February 2016, but was recalled to prison the following September over allegations he tampered with his electronic monitoring tag. Latif, who said the damage to his tag most likely occurred when he was playing football, was again released on licence in May 2018 on terms set by the Parole Board.

On 29 November 2019, Khan fatally stabbed Jack Merritt, 25, and Saskia Jones, 23, during a prisoner rehabilitation event at Fishmongers' Hall, near London Bridge, in central London while out on licence. Khan had been released from jail on licence in 2018, halfway through a 16-year sentence for terrorism offences. Five days later, Latif, who maintains he had "no contact" with Khan since they were in the same prison in 2016, was told that "senior officials" at the MoJ had imposed new conditions on his licence. His lawyers say the additional conditions, which prevent him from attending "any meetings or gatherings of more than 50 people", or entering the City of London without prior permission, are unlawful.

At a High Court hearing on Wednesday 3rd February, Dan Squires QC said Justice Secretary Robert Buckland appeared to have "personally" requested additional licence conditions for all terrorist offenders following the London Bridge attack. Mr Squires argued the MoJ "has no power unilaterally to add to or vary conditions on [Latif's] licence without the approval of the Parole Board," meaning the new conditions were unlawful. Latif "had no involvement in, or prior knowledge of, the London Bridge attack" and was "horrified to hear of the attack and the role of Khan in it", Mr Squires said. The hearing before the Lord Chief Justice Lord Burnett and Mr Justice Swift is expected to conclude on Thursday morning.

Anthony Grainger Family to Continue Legal Fight Over Fatal Shooting By Police

Josh Halliday, Guardian: The family of an unarmed man who was fatally shot by police have vowed to continue their fight for answers after the official watchdog dropped its investigation into the operation. Anthony Grainger, 36, was shot through the chest as he sat in a car in the village of Culcheth, Cheshire, by an armed police officer known as "Q9" in March 2012. Detectives believed Grainger and two others were planning to hold up a supermarket and had access to firearms on the evening of 3 March 2012. However, no weapons were found in the red Audi and a public inquiry found Greater Manchester police (GMP) entirely to blame for his death due to serious flaws in its operation.

Grainger's family have expressed their "great disappointment" after the Independent Office for Police Conduct (IOPC) ended its investigation into the senior officers who led the operation due to a failure to obtain "sensitive" material. Former assistant chief constable Terry Sweeney, former superintendent Mark Granby and a former chief inspector, all now retired from the force, were being investigated for gross misconduct regarding their command and control of the operation.

But an IOPC spokesman said its investigation had been discontinued because "some of the material which may be relevant to the decisions to be made at the conclusion of any investigation, and to provide adequate disclosure to the officers, could not be disclosed".

The Grainger family said the investigation had been "doomed from the outset" because the IOPC had not been granted access to the crucial material. The family said that while this material remained secret no one could be fully investigated for the "failings and catastrophic errors" that led to the 36-year-old's death. They added: "It has been left solely for the family to pursue this and our legal team will be challenging the validity of this undisclosed material in the high court next month. We are now nine years on and our legal fight continues to get accountability and answers from GMP as to their failings."

Gross misconduct allegations against Steve Heywood, a former assistant chief constable, were dismissed in June. The IOPC said it had also dropped an investigation into a serving officer for failing to inform his superiors that two of the officers involved in the operation had failed a counter-terrorist specialist firearms officer training course. A third investigation looking at the force's acquisition of a CS dispersal canister, not approved by the Home Office, which was used during the operation is ongoing, the spokesman said.

Compensation Paid to Prisoner for Religious Discrimination

Leigh Day Solicitors: The prisoner, who we have called Mr H, aged 49, was placed in a vulnerable prisoner unit at a prison. A vulnerable prisoner unit accommodates prisoners who need to be separate from other prisoners for their own safety, as they are particularly vulnerable to assault. Mr H is a practising Muslim and wished to observe the Jumu'ah prayer, a congregational prayer which takes place each Friday and an integral part of his Islamic faith. However, the prison would not allow Mr H or any of the other Muslim prisoners on the vulnerable prisoner unit to attend the prison chapel to observe Jumu'ah prayers. Prison managers said it was for their protection from other Muslim prisoners who would be attending the prison chapel to observe the Jumu'ah prayers at the same time.

Mr H asked the prison to make alternative arrangements so that he and the other Muslim prisoners on the vulnerable prisoner unit could attend the prison chapel for the Jumu'ah prayer, either by allowing them to attend at a different time or by providing extra staff when attending at the same time. However, the prison failed to make any alternative arrangements, and also failed to give any adequate explanation, so that Mr H was unable to fully practise his religion for a period of over six months, causing him considerable frustration and distress.

Having complained repeatedly about this, Mr H was eventually transferred to another prison. At that prison, alternative arrangements were already made to allow him and the other Muslim prisoners placed on the vulnerable prisoner unit to attend the prison chapel at a different time so that they could observe Jumu'ah prayers. Mr H instructed the prison team at Leigh Day to bring a claim against the Ministry of Justice for unlawful religious discrimination under the Human Rights Act 1998 and the Equality Act 2010, in respect of the six-month period when he had been unable to fully practise his religion. The Ministry of Justice agreed to settle Mr H's claim and pay him compensation.

Leigh Day prison team solicitor, Benjamin Burrows said: "Despite the law, and the Prison Service's own policies, being clear that prisoners have the right to manifest their religion, this right is increasingly being ignored or undermined in prisons because of reasons of administrative cost or convenience. Given the important part it can play in prisoners' lives and in their rehabilitation, that cannot be allowed to happen unchallenged." Leigh Day's prison team has expertise in discrimination matters based upon a variety of protected characteristics. Please contact the team if you believe that you or someone you know has been subjected to discrimination in prison and you would like Leigh Day to investigate your potential claim.

D and F v Persons Unknown: Anonymity Under the Venables Jurisdiction

Claire Overman, Doughty Street Chambers: Tipples J, handed down on 4th February, granted an order permanently preventing the identification of two young women convicted of murdering Angela Wrightson. Ms Wrightson was murdered in December 2014, in a case that attracted widespread publicity. In 2016, two teenage girls – D and F – were convicted of her murder. The case gave rise to extensive local and national media reporting, given the brutal nature of the injuries inflicted upon Ms Wrightson, and the fact that her killers were young girls. In December 2014, the court made an order under s.39 Children and Young Persons Act 1933 (which at the time applied to criminal proceedings), preventing the identification of the two girls. Unusually, given the "blitz of extreme and disturbing comments" posted on social media by the public during the opening of the first trial in July 2015, an order was also made under s.45(4) Senior Courts Act 1981, directing media organisations reporting on the trial to disable comments on sites reporting on the trial, to stop linking from or to such sites, including social media sites, and to refrain from tweeting about the trial. Despite this, the first trial was discharged on the basis that the extreme social media activity by members of the public meant that the girls could no longer have a fair trial. A modified version of the s.45(4) order remained in place during the second trial.

When the girls were sentenced in April 2016, the media applied to discharge the s.39 order preventing their identification. The application was dismissed, the trial judge making clear that he was satisfied that Article 2 (at least in relation to F) and Article 8 ECHR were engaged given the risk that F and D would self-harm or commit suicide if identified. Orders made under s.39 Children and Young Persons Act 1933 lapse once the individual the subject of the order attains the age of 18 (see R(JC) v Central Criminal Court [2015] 1 WLR 2865, CA). Accordingly, D and F sought a permanent order, against the whole world, that they could not be identified as the murderers of Angela Wrightson (this has come to be known as an order under the Venables jurisdiction, so called after such an order was granted in 2001 to protect the new identities of child killers Jon Venables and Robert Thompson).

The court in this case recognised – as is now established – that the Venables jurisdiction is an exceptional one (at [62]). (Indeed, around this time last year the Court declined to make such an order in the case of DXB v Associated Newspapers Ltd and others [2020] EWHC 134 (QB)). D's and F's case was that, if their identities were revealed, Arts.2 and 3 ECHR would be engaged as they were both vulnerable by reason of a mental disorder and there was a very real risk of self-harm or suicide. As Tipples J noted at [64], this appeared to be the first case under the Venables jurisdiction where the risk of death or serious physical harm came from the applicants themselves, rather than from others. She held that this did not make a difference, and that – pursuant to s.6 Human Rights Act 1998 – the Court was under a duty to take all reasonable steps to exercise the Venables jurisdiction so as to prevent serious self-harm or suicide of a mentally disordered person under the state's care and control (at [69]). She made clear that whether the exceptional jurisdiction should be exercised will depend on the quality of the evidence (applying the established principles as to the threshold required to be reached). She rejected a "floodgates" argument, holding that notoriety was not the justification for the exercise of the jurisdiction in those circumstances (at [75]).

In previous decisions, which included decisions involving exercise of the Venables jurisdiction, different views had been expressed as to whether it is appropriate to consider striking any balance with Art.10 ECHR rights in cases where Arts.2 and/or 3 ECHR are engaged (at [76]). Tipples J determined that, if she found Arts.2 and/or 3 to be engaged, she was bound by the decision of the Divisional Court in RXG v Ministry of Justice [2020] QB 703 (applying A v BBC [2015] 1 AC 588) not to balance these against any countervailing Art.10 rights (at [78]).

Turning back to the facts of this case, Tipples J held that, while it was plain from the evidence that there was ongoing media interest (with inevitable significant media coverage if the girls' identities were revealed), the evidence did not demonstrate convincingly that in those circumstances there was a real and immediate risk of serious physical harm or death to either from third parties, not least given that there were ways of protecting them from attacks by other prisoners (at [88]-[89]). Social media invective, of itself, was not sufficient (at [90]).

However, the medical evidence as to the risk of suicide and self-harm by F was "compelling" (at [92]). Arts.2 and/or 3 were accordingly engaged, and there was no question of this risk being balanced against the media's Art.10 rights (at [93]). This was also determinative of D's claim, given that it was accepted that F would be identified as a result of "jigsaw identification" if D's identity were revealed (at [94]). In any event, the medical evidence convincingly demonstrated that, if D's identity were revealed, there was a real and immediate risk that she would self-harm (at [95]).

Tipples J also considered the position under Art.8 ECHR, in the event that she was wrong to find that Arts.2 and/or 3 were engaged. In this scenario, a well-established balancing exercise needed to be undertaken between the competing Art.8 and Art.10 rights. Despite acknowledging the strength of the Art.10 rights in circumstances where a criminal trial had been held in open court and widely reported (though subject to restrictions on identifying D and F), she held that this was an "exceptional case in which the balance is tipped very firmly in favour of" protecting the girls' Art.8 rights (at [102]). Inevitably, as with other cases that have considered the Venables jurisdiction, this case turns heavily on the facts (and in particular the evidence of likely harm if anonymity were lifted). It nonetheless provides helpful clarity on the (non-)applicability of the balancing exercise where Arts.2 and/or 3 ECHR are engaged.

Nationality Question no Longer Required in all Criminal Cases Before Conviction

Noah Robinson, Justice Gap: Defendants will no longer need to give their nationality at the start of a criminal court case as a result of new criminal procedures rules which make clear that the question will only be asked if someone is convicted and imprisoned. The reform follows a campaign by the not-for-profit criminal defence firm Commons Legal who described thee rule change as a 'positive step towards a fairer, less racist justice system'. In 2017, the Conservative Government under Theresa May passed a law requiring all defendants in criminal cases to declare their nationality in court, under section 162 of the Policing and Crime Act 2017. The move came into force two months after the publication of the Lammy Review, which highlighted 'bias, including overt discrimination, in parts of the justice system'. The law received criticisms from many including David Lammy MP who highlighted how 'some defendants, particularly non-British nationals or those from ethnic minority backgrounds, feel they may…be discriminated against'.

In May 2020, Commons published The State of Innocence, detailing research and investigations into the impact of this policy and assessed its fairness to people of colour, especially non-British nationals. Commons' volunteer court observers found that the practice had 'racialised English courtrooms'. Nine out of 10 legal practitioners surveyed (134 in total) felt that the nationality requirement had 'a negative impact on the perception of fairness in the justice system' and close to seven out of 10 (69%) felt the it had a negative impact on protection against discrimination. The new criminal procedures rules mean that the question will no longer be asked before the conviction of any criminal offence. The reformed rules 3.16 and 3.21 will now only require the identification of 'name and date of birth' instead of "name, date of birth and nationality." David Lammy MP welcomed the move describing the practice as 'unfair, unnecessary and discriminatory' and said that it was 'always wrong' to ask defendants about their nationality before conviction.

Parole Hearings to be Held in Public

Lizzie Dearden, Independent: Parole hearings to decide whether prisoners are safe for release are to be held in public for the first time. The government said a blanket ban on public hearings will end later this year, although the "vast majority" of cases are expected to remain private because of sensitive information. The move will enable anyone to request an open hearing, before the Parole Board decides whether it would be in the interests of justice. Such hearings could be attended by victims, journalists and other members of the public. The Ministry of Justice said that victims and the prisoner will be consulted before a decision is reached. It said the Parole Board was unlikely to agree to a public hearing where it will cause "significant distress" to victims or where the offender's victims were children.

The change was supported in a public consultation that was sparked by the John Worboys scandal in 2018 Revelations that some victims of the "black cab rapist" found out he was to be released from jail through press reports sparked a legal challenge that ended plans to release him. He was later sentenced for four more attacks. Outrage over the fact that some women were not able to make representations to a Parole Board hearing that initially decided Worboys should be freed triggered a wide-ranging review, and moves to make it easier for both victims and prisoners to challenge the body's decisions.

Announcing the latest reforms, the Ministry of Justice said the government wanted to increase public confidence in the parole process and boost transparency. But it cautioned that rules governing what information can be disclosed at hearings are still under consideration as part of a wider review of the system, which will report back in the summer. Many will include medical information and private information relating to victims that could prevent public access. Public parole hearings would operate in a similar way to court cases, with attendees not able to intervene or ask questions.

Lucy Frazer, the justice minister, said the change would be made through new legislation and Parole Board guidance later this year. "The government wants victims to be allowed to attend parole hearings if they wish but we appreciate many would find a public hearing distressing," she added. "Our ongoing Root-and-Branch Review will consider how to achieve victim attendance so that they can see first-hand how decisions have been reached in a comfortable and supportive setting."

Parole hearings are conducted by between one and three trained members, including judges and psychiatrists, who consider evidence and hear the opinions of probation officers and others who have been working with prisoners. The panel then decides whether the risk a prisoner poses has reduced enough for them to be safely managed under licence conditions outside of prison. Since May 2018, victims and the media have been able to request summaries explaining the reasons for decisions from around 8,000 parole hearings held every year.

Boris Johnson Steals the Clothes of Henry VIII

In 1539, Henry VIII gained the right to legislate by decree, enabling him to bypass Parliament altogether. And now Boris Johnson, the man who has already tried and failed to suspend Parliament, is taking further cues on democracy from a Tudor King. On leaving the EU, Henry VIII powers were originally intended to be used narrowly, to make technical changes to the statute book to ensure laws adopted inside the EU made sense outside it. We believe these narrow powers are being abused: Government says it can use them to abolish the entire state aid regime without parliamentary debate. But we think this is constitutionally offensive - and unlawful.

With, as we understand it, no state aid regime in place, without the checks and controls it brings, the door is flung open for Government to provide financial aid that would favour particular industries and companies over their rivals. Given the Government's tendency to benefit donors to the Conservative Party you may well think we need those rules. The scrapping of the state aid regime will be the tip of the iceberg.

The Future Relationship Act, presented to Parliament in the dying days of 2020, contains extraordinarily broad Henry VIII powers. Ministers can now rewrite the rules on everything from your rights at work to environmental protections. In fact, it is no exaggeration to state that any area of law touched on by the EU is now within the purview of Ministers. They can even extend their own powers under the Act.

The stakes could hardly be higher. We believe that the use of Henry VIII powers to scrap the state aid regime is unlawful and we have issued judicial review proceedings. Good Law Project has instructed Hausfeld LLP and leading Counsel Tim Buley QC and Yaaser Vanderman in this challenge. You can read the bundle as filed here. The Government's actions undermine Parliament. We at Good Law Project mean, having previously orchestrated the successful challenge to Johnson's prorogation, to stand guard.

Jolyon Maugham QC, Director of Good Law Project, https://is.gd/dMON42

'I Dread the Phone Call': Families' Fears For Loved Ones in Prison

Eric Allison, Guardian: Diane Coulson has two boxes of memorabilia relating to her daughter. She calls them the good and bad boxes. The former contains letters, photographs and poems she wrote. The bad box holds psychiatric reports and records of the inquest into her death. Emily Hartley was 21 when she killed herself at HMP New Hall, a women's prison in Wakefield, West Yorkshire, on 23 April 2016. She was six months into a two-year-and-eight-month sentence for arson, which she was given after she set herself on fire in an apparent suicide attempt. "Whilst we were shocked to find Emily sent to prison, the one consolation was that we believed she would be kept safe," said a statement from Coulson following an inquest into her death.

Hartley's mental ill-health meant she was put on an ACCT (assessment, care in custody and teamwork) plan, designed to manage those identified as being at risk of suicide or self-harm. An investigation by the Guardian has found a sharp rise in the number of prisoners put on such plans, with the Prison Officers Association raising concerns that its members are insufficiently trained to deal with the scale of the problem. Coulson says the photos of Emily as a youngster show an accurate reflection of her personality; bright, happy and confident. She was talented, enjoying media studies and drama at school, and displaying a way with words in her writing. Her mum says Emily knew she was ill in the years before her death and desperately wanted help. But it was not readily available, if at all. Coulson speaks of spending whole nights in A&E departments waiting to be seen by a mental health nurse. The only other avenue emerged through the police, who would be called in on the occasions when her behaviour raised alarms.

In May 2015, using flammable nail polish remover, Emily set fire to herself and her bedding in her Leeds council flat. After being treated for severe chest burns, she was charged with arson and remanded to New Hall prison, near Wakefield. It was her first time in prison. During the rest of that year, she was treated with anti-psychotic medication and a transfer to a secure hospital was considered. But medical opinion differed and she was deemed fit to plead. In October, the probation service applied for a period back in the community to assess if she would be suitable for a non-custodial sentence and she was released to a hostel in Leeds. The move was doomed to fail. The hostel was in an area Emily had frequented when addicted to heroin and most residents were on hard drugs. On 15 November, she was sentenced to two years and eight months in prison and returned to New Hall.

In the weeks before her death, Emily self-harmed, cutting herself and taking an overdose of another patient's antibiotics. She asked 13 times to be put on antipsychotic medication, but was told it would not help her. Eight days before she died, Emily was found with a ligature and showed a mental health nurse a suicide file with a letter "for who finds me". An inquest into Emily's death concluded the prison had failed to properly implement her ACCT plan and "did not have sufficient training and therefore understanding of [her] condition". "Whilst we can empathise with the difficult and demanding job prison staff have, rigorous adherence to the ACCT process should be paramount," the jury said in a narrative verdict. A Prison Service spokesperson responded to the findings by saying the welfare of those in custody was their "absolute priority". "HMP New Hall has taken urgent action to address the concerns raised, including reviewing care procedures for those most at risk and new suicide and self-harm training for staff," they said.

Number of Prisoners in England and Wales on Suicide Watch Rises Steeply

Eric Allison and Niamh McIntyre, Guardian: The number of prisoners put on suicide or self-harm watch has risen dramatically over the past decade, a Guardian investigation has found, as experts warn the scale of the mental health crisis in prisons has escalated during the coronavirus pandemic. There were 15,615 prisoners put on ACCT (assessment, care in custody and teamwork) plans – which are designed to manage those at risk of suicide or self-harm – during the first half of 2020, only 10% less than the figure for the whole of 2010. Data obtained from the Ministry of Justice reveals that during 2019, the last full year for which figures were available, 27,389 people in prisons in England and Wales were put on ACCT plans.

That is an increase of almost 60% on the 17,314 put on a plan in 2010. The steep rise in numbers comes despite the average yearly prison population having fallen slightly over that period, from 84,725 in 2010 to 82,935 in 2019. Prisoners and prison staff have raised the alarm that the mental health crisis in prisons has been exacerbated by the Covid-19 pandemic, which has led to prisoners being confined to their cells for most of the day, and restrictions on visits and prisoner education programmes.

Mick Pimblett, the assistant general secretary of the Prison Officers' Association, said the prison system was overwhelmed with prisoners with mental health problems. "Although Her Majesty's Prison and Probation Service (HMPPS) have attempted to address the problem by appointing mental health practitioners within prisons, in effect they are just putting a plaster on a broken leg," he said. "Prison officers are given mental health awareness training but this is insufficient for the job that they undertake. Because of this our members are continually faced with violence, self-harm and suicide from frustrated prisoners, which is having an adverse effect on staff mental health."

Figures published by the Ministry of Justice last month showed there were 58,870 self-harm incidents in prisons in the 12 months to September 2020, down 5% from the previous 12 months. That figure comprised a 7% decrease in male prisons and a 8% increase in female prisons. In the most recent quarter, however, there were 14,167 self-harm incidents, up 9% on the previous quarter. That represented a 5% increase of these incidents in male prisons and a 24% increase in female prisons. There were 67 suicides in the 12 months to December 2020 and 85 in the previous 12 months.

Deborah Coles, the director of Inquest, a charity that provides advice and support to families of those who die in custody, said it was important to remember that the high figures for people on suicide and self-harm watch represented "real people in extreme distress". She said: "Prisons generate and exacerbate mental ill-health. At a time of such restrictive and dehumanising regimes this is even more acute."

When the pandemic hit the UK in March, prisons were placed under a severely restrictive regime, which reduced the time spent out of cells to about 30 minutes a day and limited visits from friends and family. In October, the outgoing chief inspector of prisons in England and Wales said locking up prisoners in what amounted to solitary confinement under Covid restrictions risked causing irreparable damage to their mental health. Peter Clarke said the government should see the crisis as a chance to "reset the aspirations for what prisons could be about" and that, despite the pandemic, underlying systemic problems of drug use, violence and self-harm, had not gone away.

Nick Hardwick, the former chief inspector of prisons and professor at Royal Holloway, University of London said the mental health crisis in prisons had two root causes: the deterioration in conditions inside prisons, which he said started with drastic cuts to staffing in the early years of the coalition government and the departure of many experienced professionals; and the fact that those with pre-existing mental health conditions were being given custodial sentences instead of treatment, which itself can be linked to a lack of resources in mental health care. "There is a whole chain of events, which leads to people whose basic issue is a health one, being treated by the criminal justice system," he said. "You've got to look at the issue [of mental ill-health in prisons] from both sides. Why are these people ending up in prison in the first place? Why aren't they getting the care and support they need in the community? And when they do end up in prison – where you've got this difficult volatile mix of prisoners – there are reduced resources available to look after them."

ACCT plans are opened for prisoners who are identified as being at risk of suicide and self-harm, and can be in place for a number of days, or – in some cases – months and years. The plans require staff to take certain measures to ensure someone is safe, including regular observations. Peter Dawson, a former prison governor and the director of the Prison Reform Trust said the fact that the number of ACCT plans being opened was rising demonstrated what "prisons are being asked to cope with". "It's not right to criticise prisons for opening that many plans. But it raises a very serious question about whether we understand who we are sending to prison and the distress that decision creates and the consequences that flow from it." Pimblett said the POA was concerned about whether, with the dramatic increase in the use of ACCT plans, "these processes can be sufficiently followed (particularly at night) when there is simply not enough staff to ensure that effective observations take place".

Responding to the figures on the numbers of people on ACCT plans, a Prison Service spokesperson said: "On average, less than 5% of prisoners were on an ACCT plan at any one time over the past 12 months." They said the number of prisoners placed on suicide and self-harm watch in the whole of 2020 would not necessarily be double the figure for the first six months of that year. They said self-harm remained far too high. "That is why we have trained more than 25,000 staff to help prevent it, provided one-to-one support for vulnerable prisoners, and bolstered security to keep out the drugs that can fuel mental health issues."

John Bowdwn: Harrasment of Welsh Language Speakers Imprisoned in HMP Berwyn

In February the governor of HMP Berwyn, Nick Leader, responded to complaints and concerns voiced by prisoners at the jail regarding it's regime, especially since the imposition of the lock-down. Mr Leader gave a fairly comprehensive response to the complaints, so perhaps he would like to provide a similar response to serious concerns about the treatment of native or first language Welsh speakers imprisoned in HMP Berwyn. These concerns were actually expressed by the House of Commons Welsh Affairs Select Committee and the Welsn Language Committee, as well as the Independent Monitoring Board at HMP Berwyn. Essentially, the concerns relate to the discrimination against native Welsh speakers in the

jail and the harassment and seperation of first language Welsh speakers by staff at the jail. A Welsh language speaker at Berwyn, Rhodri Cynfor ab Eillian, has publicly spoken out about the discrimatory treatment of native Welsh language speakers in Berwyn prison saying "We are being segregated here. people get an IEP (Incentives and Earned Privileges) warnings for speaking Welsh. People have had to wait a month to get letters in Welsh. The prison staff are racist towards Welsh speakers and black people.

It isn't the first time HMP Berwyn, the second largest prison in Europe, has been embroiled in such controversy. In September 2020, the Independent Monitoring Board (IMB) published their annual report on HMP Berwyn. It found: "In terms of the Welsh language, it was noted that some DIRFs (Discrimination Incident Report Forms) submitted concerned prisoners speaking Welsh who could be understood by officers. It was alleged that these prisoners were challenged with a review of their Incentives and Earned Privileges (IEP) status." Native Welsh speaking prisoners themselves have claimed the staff at Berwyn have effectively criminalised the Welsh language by treating it as convict slang intended to disguage and conceal illegal activity amongst prisoners, and therefore a target of disciplinary action.

The Welsh Language Commission said in response to the Welsh language situation at Berwyn: "An individual's right to communicate through the medium of his or her own language, or in the language in which they can best express themselves, is a matter of fundamental justice. We heard that speaking Welsh in prison made life more difficult for a prisoner, and such a situation is not acceptable. I am aware of the recent discussions about the treatment of Welsh speakers at Berwyn and would urge anyone affected by this to contact us to share their experience."

English language speakers at Berwyn are allowed to mix with other English language speakers, yet first language Welsh speakers in Berwyn (of whom many, from Welsh language heartlands and from socially and economically deprived backgrounds, do not have full fluency in English) are not allowed to mix with other Welsh speakers. It is a policy apparently to avoid encouraging a gang mentality. It leaves these prisoners culturally and socially isolated, prone to bullying and discrimination, and thus at increased risk of harm. In addition this means that these prisoners are deprived of fundamental rights in comparison to first language English speaking prisoners, namely Article 8 (right to identify) and article 19 (right to freedom of opinlon and expression) both incorporated into the UK Human Rights Act, and this in a country where their mother tongue has official status.

UUNDOD, the Welsh independence group, and the Prisoner Solidarity Network recently issued a joint statement regarding the persecution of native welsh language speakers in Berwyn jail: "The ongoing harassment and separation of first language Welsh speakers at HMP Berwyn In North Wales received widespread media attention last year after an Independent Monitoring Board report outlined discrimination against native Welsh speakers inside the prison. The IMB, and subsequent accounts, have reported that Welsh speakers have been threatened with sanctions by English speaking guards, denied access to interpreters at disciplinary panels, and been fired from jobs within the prison for speaking Welsh.

Despite official criticisms by the IMB, Welsh Affairs Committee and Welsh Language Committee, we continue to receive grievances from inside the jail. Despite legislation mandating the equality of the English and Welsh languages within the Welsh prison estate, Welsh language speakers have been subject to longstanding discrimination within HMP Berwyn especially. The denial of language rights, it should be said, is far from the only problem at Berwyn. The prison was opened in 2017, allegedly as a flagship model for a new rehabilitative approach to imprisonment, Within less than two years however former governor Russ Trent was suspended following undisclosed allegations

and several former staff members have been prosecuted and imprisoned for their behaviour at work, Conditions have deteriorated further since Trent's replacement by Nick Leader, a figure exposed in 2011 for manipulating prison transfers to evade scrutiny during inspections, leading to the death by suicide of Christopher Wardally in 2009. Since Leader's appointment, Berwyn has experienced the highest growth rates of violence and self-harm in the Welsh prison estate. I'd therefore invite Mr Leader to respond to the above with openness and honesty.

CCRC Refer Colin Norris to the Court of Appeal

On 3 March 2008 Colin Norris was convicted, by majority, of murdering four women and attempting to murder another, by injecting them with insulin. All five women were elderly inpatients on orthopaedic wards where Mr Norris worked as a nurse. Following a detailed review of this complex and difficult case, the CCRC has decided to refer all five of Mr Norris's convictions to the Court of Appeal. Mrs Ethel Hall developed severe hypoglycaemia whilst in hospital and died on 11 December 2002. There is no dispute that she was murdered by the injection of insulin. An investigation concluded that over several months four other elderly female patients in the area had also developed severe unexplained hypoglycaemia and three of them had died shortly afterwards.

Following a 5 month trial in the Crown Court at Newcastle upon Tyne, Mr Norris was convicted of 4 counts of murder and a single count of attempted murder. He was sentenced to life imprisonment with a minimum term of 30 years. The case against him was wholly circumstantial and heavily reliant on expert opinion evidence. A total of 20 experts gave evidence at the trial on a number of complex medical and scientific issues. The prosecution said that spontaneous hypoglycaemia was extremely rare, and it was extraordinary to have a cluster of cases in one place in such a short space of time. They alleged that Mr Norris was present when or shortly before each of the patients became hypoglycaemic, and that his presence was the only factor common to all five cases. Mr Norris denied any wrongdoing and maintained that he had done nothing to induce hypoglycaemia in any of the patients.

Mr Norris appealed against his conviction but was turned down by the Court of Appeal in December 2009. He applied to the CCRC in October 2011. As part of its highly complex review, the CCRC considered new expert evidence presented by Mr Norris's representatives and instructed its own expert to provide a number of reports. The experts agree that the hypoglycaemia in the four patients other than Mrs Hall may be accounted for by natural causes. The new expert evidence has also highlighted several other relevant developments in the understanding of hypoglycaemia, including its prevalence in the elderly and frail, which cast further doubt on the expert opinion relied upon by the prosecution at trial. This new expert evidence explored recent developments in a complex area where scientific understanding is still developing.

As a result of the new expert evidence, the CCRC has concluded that there is a real possibility that the Court of Appeal will decide that that Mr Norris's conviction for the murder / attempted murder of one or more of the four patients is unsafe. As regards the murder of Mrs Hall, the CCRC considers that this conviction depends upon support from the other 4 cases and the prosecution's assertion that no-one other than Mr Norris could have been responsible. In light of the new expert evidence, the CCRC is satisfied that this assertion is now less secure and that, as a result, there is a real possibility that the Court of Appeal will quash this conviction too. In reaching this decision, the CCRC has been greatly assisted by the submissions put forward by Mr Norris's representatives throughout the review.

Mr Norris represented by Messrs Birnberg Pierce, 14 Inverness Street, London, NW1 7HJ.

NI: Fresh Inquest Ordered Into New Lodge Six Shooting

Irish Legal News:Attorney General Brenda King has ordered a fresh inquest into the shooting of six Catholic men in the New Lodge area of north Belfast in February 1973. The British Army initially said all six men had been shot by soldiers, but later said it appeared that loyalist paramilitaries were responsible for two of the deaths. A one-day inquest in 1975 returned an open verdict. The families of the men, John Loughran, James McCann, James Sloan, Anthony Campbell, Brendan Maguire and Ambrose Hardy, have since called for a further investigation into the killings of the "New Lodge Six".

Ó Muirigh Solicitors, which represents Mr Loughran's family, said it had received correspondence from Ms King this morning to confirm a fresh inquest had been directed. Solicitor Pádraig Ó Muirigh said: "The decision by the Attorney General is a significant step forward for the families' campaign for the truth about what happened to their loved one. There has never been anything approaching a proper police investigation into the incident. Whilst there was civilian evidence and forensic reports to contradict the soldier's accounts, these accounts were never put to the soldiers and their accounts were simply accepted without question. The non-compellibililty of the soldiers to give evidence to the Coroner's Court in 1975, the lack of pre-inquest disclosure to the families or their legal representatives and the inability of the Coroner's court to reach 'findings' meant that the original inquests into the death of John Loughran and the other New Lodge Six victims were equally flawed. An Article 2 compliant inquest can provide a scrupulous investigation that results in an evidenced based examination and analysis of what happened in the New Lodge in 1973."

William Macpherson: an Establishment Man With a Sense of Outrage

Hugh Muir, Guardian, https://is.gd/pQAseM: You had to be there. You had to know what life was like before the Macpherson inquiry into the death of Stephen Lawrence, and then after. Before Macpherson, the issue for campaigners, for distraught families and for journalists seeking to do their jobs by throwing light on police misbehaviour towards people of colour, was to prove not just that it was happening but that it was possible. Whenever a voice was raised, it was silenced, by the police and by the media. Victims and their families were rubbished; those campaigners who sought to help them were portrayed to middle England as opportunists and extremists. It took an official inquiry to break through that wall of wilful obfuscation. It took a very conservative judge like Sir William Macpherson of Cluny to make that happen. After the inquiry, the issue facing modern Britain became a different one. We moved from "Does racism exist?" to "How much racism is there?" We moved from "Do the police provide an inferior service to Black Britain?" to "How much worse is it – and why?"

He was not a popular choice. He came to the task with a record of past judgments that led some activists to reject him as too conservative, perhaps illiberal. But as the weeks of his inquiry passed, as the Lawrence's continued their historic campaign, as details emerged of how a grieving family and Duwayne Brooks, a traumatised teenager who saw his friend knifed to death, were treated, as the shoddiness and the apparent indifference was exposed, those of us who sat through the inquiry saw Macpherson move from scepticism to concern, to shock and incredulity. He was always composed, but often his bemusement was clear. He was an establishment man; he believed in the institutions. But he was clearly hearing – from police officers and the long list of witnesses – attitudes and behaviours that outraged his sense of propriety.

We know, from those who sat with him after the hearings – when the judge, a Scottish clan leader, would pour himself and colleagues who indulged, a small whisky – of that quiet outrage and that period of learning. He had parameters. He gave the Lawrence's barrister, Michael Mansfield QC, precious little room to develop the argument that what lay behind the botched police performance was corruption. That was perhaps, too grave a perfidy for him to accept. But his report was a game changer. The condemnation of the police was unprecedented. His assessment of the discriminatory tendencies in a whole range of institutions – a view shaped by the second part of his inquiry when he toured the country – was damning. The effect of that was far-reaching, as bodies and companies scrambled to protect themselves from the very public shaming that befell the Metropolitan police. Once the inquiry was over and the report published, he added little to them. Perhaps he felt he had travelled far enough. Many on the right have still not forgiven Macpherson for not just embracing the term institutional racism – giving the official seal to a term first popularised by the US civil rights activist Stokely Carmichael – but for compounding the offence by offering his own precise definition. Part of that referred to "the collective failure of an organisation to provide an appropriate and professional service to people because of their colour, culture, or ethnic origin".It said that the problem went beyond abuse racial abuse and physical assaults to encompass institutions that by the sum of individual decisions, discriminate as entities. It is that part of his report that provoked the stiffest backlash and continues to describe the toughest challenge. Rather than a resolution, Macpherson lived to see in some respects a degree of backsliding in terms of race relations and the vision he set out, but undoubtedly he helped to shape a new conversation about diversity, about policing and ultimately the expectations there should be in a decent society.

Radical Change Needed in Handling of Rape Cases

Crack teams of specialist police officers are needed to bring rapists to justice and prevent a wholesale collapse of public confidence in the criminal justice system, according to the police lead for rape in England and Wales. Rape prosecutions have fallen to a record low, following a historic collapse in the number of police referrals, charges and convictions in rape cases, which critics argue amounts to the "decriminalisation" of rape. The situation is so dire that a radical reassessment of how sexual assault crimes are dealt with is needed, according to Sarah Crew. "We need to build a specialist capability. Increasingly, with the numbers of cases that are being reported, I think the case for groups of specialists within police forces has become stronger," said Crew, the National Police Chiefs' Council (NPCC) lead for rape in England and Wales.She said her biggest concern was a knock-on effect on public confidence in the criminal justice system. "I consider the impact on individual victims, and that they don't see justice done," she said. "But when … it plays out in the public domain, I do worry about public confidence – not just in policing, but in the whole criminal justice system. And if you can't do it for rape, where the effect is life-changing, you could [ask]: what is the criminal justice system for?" Crew admitted the criminal justice system was failing rape victims and huge progress and expertise in prosecuting sexual violence was lost when specialist teams investigating rape were disbanded during years of austerity.

Serving Prisoners Supported by MOJUK: Derek Patterson, Walib Habid, Giovanni Di Stefano, 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, Warren Slaney, Melvyn 'Adie' McLellan, Lyndon Coles, Robert Bradley, 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 William Kenealy, Glyn Razzell, Willie Gage, Kate Keaveney, Michael Stone, Michael Attwooll, John Roden, Nick Tucker, Karl Watson, Terry Allen, Richard Southern, Peter Hannigan.