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 865 (22/09/2021) - Cost

US: Posthumous Pardons for 'Martinsville Seven' Executed 70 Years Ago

Scottish Legal News: Seven black men who were executed in Virginia for the alleged rape of a black woman 70 years ago have been posthumously pardoned. Governor Ralph Northam said the pardons, which do not address the guilt of the so-called Martinsville Seven, are "about righting wrongs". The pardons recognise that the men were "tried without adequate due process and received a racially-biased death sentence not similarly applied to white defendants", his office said. The men, 18-year old Frank Hairston Jr., 19-year-old Booker T. Millner, 37-year-old Francis DeSales Grayson, 18-year-old Howard Lee Hairston, 20-year-old James Luther Hairston, 19-year-old Joe Henry Hampton and 21-year-old John Clabon Taylor, were executed in 1951. They were all convicted and sentenced to death within eight days by all-white juries. Some of the defendants were impaired at the time of arrest or unable to read the confessions they signed, and none had attorneys present during their interrogation. Mr Northam said: "We all deserve a criminal justice system that is fair, equal, and gets it right – no matter who you are or what you look like. I'm grateful to the advocates and families of the Martinsville Seven for their dedication and perseverance. While we can't change the past, I hope today's action brings them some small measure of peace."

Super Courtroom' to Allow For Trials of up to 12 Defendants

The government has unveiled its first-ever "super courtroom", which will allow up to a dozen defendants to face trial at the same time. The first super courtroom has been created at Manchester Crown Court, which has been revamped to create a space which is three times the size of a normal courtroom. The government said the move will create the space needed to deal with the backlog of multi-hander trials, typically involving gang-related crime, which has built up during the Covid-19 pandemic. The court will continue to make use of remote technology, allowing defendants as well as victims and witnesses to appear remotely by video. Courts minister Lord Wolfson QC said: "This super courtroom is just the latest step in our efforts to tackle the impact of the pandemic on our justice system. "It will get gang-related suspects in front of judges quicker – sending a message to would-be criminals that the justice system stands ready to hold them to account. "We're not stopping here, though, and continue to pursue every option as we reduce delays and deliver speedier justice for victims."

Sally Challen Defence QC Leads Domestic Homicide Review

BBC News: The defence barrister for Sally Challen, who was the first woman to have her murder conviction quashed under coercive control laws, is to lead a review into domestic homicide laws. Challen was jailed in 2011 after she killed her husband with a hammer at their former home in Claygate, Surrey. She walked free in 2019 after lawyers argued she had suffered years of abuse. The government has now asked Challen's lawyer, Clare Wade QC, to examine whether the law should be reformed. It follows an initial review by the Ministry of Justice (MoJ) in response to concerns raised about the minimum term for murders committed with a weapon. The department analysed more than 100 cases and Ms Wade is expected to look at the data in more detail. *'Women 'Choosing to Survive'* - Victims commissioner Dame Vera Baird QC said: "Evidence shows that women are more likely than men to use a weapon to defend themselves against an abusive partner, but this attracts a longer sentence than violence without a weapon. The fear is women - who are themselves victims - are serving lengthy jail sentences for simply choosing to survive." Domestic Abuse Commissioner Nicole Jacobs said: "It is time that we ensured that sentencing for domestic homicides truly reflect the reality and gravity of domestic abuse, which so often follows prolonged periods of abuse." Justice Secretary Robert Buckland QC said: "We want to take a closer look at how the law is working to ensure the public is protected and that sentences reflect the severity of these heinous crimes."

In a landmark appeal in 2019, Ms Wade argued Challen had been a victim of coercive control - a pattern of behaviour that became a criminal offence in England and Wales in 2015. She argued Challen had been driven to kill her 61-year-old husband Richard after enduring 40 years of psychological abuse. After a legal battle that lasted nearly nine years, Challen's murder conviction was quashed and the Crown Prosecution Service accepted her plea of manslaughter by diminished responsibility. Challen walked free from court because of time she had already served behind bars. Following her appointment as independent reviewer, Ms Wade said: "Traditionally, domestic homicide has not been given any special consideration within the way the courts sentence in cases of murder and manslaughter. "Cases where a victim is killed by an intimate partner have not been seen as specialised cases and the domestic abuse which underpins many homicides is still poorly understood. I am delighted therefore to be leading this important review on sentencing in cases of domestic homicide. It is a complex and highly sensitive area which is long overdue."

Inspection of HMP Low Newton Women's Prisons - Disapointing

HMP & YOI Low Newton is a woman's local and resettlement prison that services the courts across a large swathe of northern England. At inspection, it held 229 women with 45 unsentenced and the rest sentenced to anything from a few months to life. The excellent relationships between staff and the women, many of whom have complex needs, have helped to carry this prison through the last, difficult year. It was disappointing that the Listener scheme had been allowed to wither at a time when women needed peer support more than ever. There was a similar anomaly with clothing, where women were able to buy new clothes from the prison shop or choose from an extensive second hand range, while a ban on receiving parcels from home was a source of much frustration, particularly as the reasons for this policy were not clear to the women.

It was very concerning to see that the prison is regularly being used as a 'place of safety' for women with acute mental health difficulties. These women should not be kept in prison where, out of sight, they exist in an environment that does not begin to address their needs. Health care and prison staff do their best to support women who are in profound distress, but they do not have the training, skills or resources to provide for patients who are so unwell. The unintended consequence of the well-intentioned policy designed to prevent seriously mentally ill women from languishing in police cells, has led to the problem being passed onto prisons, which are themselves an equally unsuitable environment. These women should be in hospital where they can be treated, not left in prison where they put an additional burden on already stretched resources. Women attending the health care department for their GP appointments could hear the constant screaming of one of the women. Women continue to be locked in their cells for far too long and leaders must urgently begin to extend significantly the amount of time women are unlocked. There was very limited education provision, meaning that women who need to improve their basic learning, earn qualifications and acquire the skills that will help them to get work when they are released are not getting the help that they need to live safe, crime-free lives. Charlie Taylor, HM Chief Inspector of Prisons July 2021

Police, Crime, Sentencing and Courts Bill

This Bill continues the long legacy of inflationary sentencing proposals in England and Wales begun in the 1990s. Far from being the simplification of sentencing claimed, the Bill adds to the piecemeal and confusing history of sentencing legislation of which the government claims to be so critical. It does so without a coherent philosophy to underpin its approach, and guarantees the continuation of general sentence inflation which has played a large role in destroying the capacity of both prison and probation services to deliver the rehabilitative goals which the government claims to promote.

This risk is acknowledged by the government's own Impact Assessment (IA) of the sentencing proposals, which state that: The longer time spent in custody resulting from abolishing automatic halfway release, SOPC reforms, and reforms to discretionary life sentencing could lead to prison instability as offenders serving the same sentence arriving at different times will face different release points. There is also a risk of having offenders spend longer in prison and a larger population may compound overcrowding (if there is not enough prison capacity), while reducing access to rehabilitative resources and increasing instability, self-harm and violence (paragraph 43).1

Furthermore, the IA acknowledges that there is limited evidence that the combined set of measures will deter offenders long term or reduce overall crime. Therefore, the combined effect of all the measures proposed The IA estimates that the combined impact of the provisions for adults will result in "a total increase in the adult prison population of around 700 offenders in steady state by 2028/29 although this impact will begin to be felt from 2021/22 with just over 200 additional prisoners." However, previous government estimates of the impact of sentencing legislation have proved unreliable. For instance, the sentence of imprisonment for public protection (IPP), which was introduced by the Criminal Justice Act 2003, was estimated to result in an increase of just 900 additional prisoners; but was given to a total of 8,711 individuals prior to its abolition.

The latest prison population projections, which factor in proposals contained in the Smarter Approach to Sentencing white paper,4 estimate that prison numbers will increase by 20,000 to 98,700 by 2026.5 The prison service is emerging out of an under reported operational crisis as a result of the Covid-19 pandemic. At a time when it should be focused on recovery, the Bill will increase prison numbers and add to pressures of overcrowding, making it harder to achieve a safe and purposeful regime focussed on rehabilitation.

To accommodate the projected increase in the prison population, the government has announced that it will build a total of 18,000 new prison places by the mid-2020s. These will be met with the construction of two 1,680 place prisons HMPs Five Wells and Glen Parva which are due to open in late 2021 and 2023, respectively and the construction of four new prisons; the expansion of a further four prisons; and refurbishment of the existing prison estate. 6 However, these plans need to be seen in the context of the struggles of previous governments to meet much more modest prison building targets. A programme to build 10,000 cells by 2020, announced by the government in 2015, delivered just 206 spaces by its original deadline. The majority of the proposals in the Bill relating to serious and violent offences either rely on no evidence to support the claims made for them; or use such evidence as there is selectively and in a way that misleads. Several of its sentencing proposals, for both adults and children, are plainly inspired by exceptional individual cases and fall into the worst category of reactive policy making which has bedevilled the law in this area for several decades.

We have particular concerns regarding Clause 109 which creates a new power for the Secretary of State to refer high-risk offenders to the Parole Board in place of automatic release. Parliament is invited to take on trust that the application of these powers will be rare, but the criteria on the face of the Bill are broad and there is no mechanism to guard against

the abuse of executive power in a matter which properly belongs wholly within the remit of a court. We hope Peers will use the opportunity of the second reading debate to raise concerns about this clause and support amendments in committee to mitigate its worse impacts.

We note the distinction the government makes between the treatment of more serious offences, particularly those of a sexual or violent nature, and other offending. For less serious offending, the white paper preceding the Bill recognised that prison generally reduces the likelihood of people desisting from crime, undermining all the factors-employment, accommodation, family relationships-which contribute to that process. Those elements of the white paper seemed to recognise the importance of an approach which deals with the complexity of the issues which give rise to offending in individual cases, and recognises that the public is best protected when a person is helped to live a crime free life altogether. The evidence to support that approach, much of it compiled by the Ministry of Justice itself, is solid and persuasive. 8

In relation to the treatment of young adults, by contrast, both the white paper and the Bill ignore evidence which the government has previously acknowledged as persuasive. And specific proposals on the treatment of children fail in key respects to observe the policy test which the white paper itself sets, that the welfare of the child should be the primary consideration. The treatment in the overarching equality statement accompanying the Bill of the discriminatory impacts of its proposals for people with protected characteristics, and Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic individuals in particular, falls far short of the duties placed upon it by law.

Imprisonment for Public Protection (IPP): Despite significant concerns we have relating to the majority of the provisions of the Bill, it nonetheless represents an opportunity to mitigate the detrimental impact of the indeterminate sentence of Imprisonment for Public Protection (IPP) - described by Lord Brown in the foreword to a recent PRT research report on IPP recalls as "the greatest single stain on our criminal justice system".9 We hope Peers will use the second reading debate to highlight concerns regarding the ongoing injustice faced by thousands of people serving IPP sentences and their families, with a view to supporting amendments for reform in committee. The IPP was introduced through the Criminal Justice Act 2003 and intended to apply to dangerous people convicted of violent and sexual offences who did not merit a life sentence. People would serve a minimum term in prison (their tariff), during which time they would undertake work to reduce the risk they posed. Once their tariff expired, the Parole Board would review their case. They would only be released when their risk was considered manageable in the community. People released on an IPP remain subject to recall indefinitely. If they are returned to prison, they must remain there until the Parole Board is satisfied that custody is no longer necessary for public protection. Ten years after their initial release, they can apply to have their licence terminated.

Soon after the introduction of the IPP problems with the sentence emerged. In practice, the IPP was often given to people convicted of low-level offences. The criminal justice system was ill-equipped to deal with the large number of people receiving IPPs. There were insufficient spaces on offending behaviour programmes for people to reduce their risk of reoffending and the Parole Board was overstretched, meaning people remained in prison long after their tariff expired. The criteria for the IPP were tightened in 2008, and the sentence was abolished in 2012 by the Legal Aid, Sentencing and Punishment of Offenders Act. However, people sentenced to an IPP continue to face the same release requirements, remain on licence indefinitely, and are subject to indefinite recall.

A total of 8,711 IPP sentences were issued. On 30 June 2021 there were still 1,722 people in prison serving an IPP.10 Almost all (96%) people still in prison serving an IPP sentence have passed their

tariff expiry date-the minimum period they must spend in custody and considered necessary to serve as punishment for the offence. 269 people are still in prison despite being given a tariff of less than two years-most of these (207 people) are still in prison over a decade after their original tariff expired.11

There remains a growing problem of IPP recall. On 30 June 2021 there were 1,332 people back in prison having previously been released - an increase of 213% in the past six years.12 Those recalled must again convince the Parole Board that they are safe to be re-released. Recalled IPP prisoners who were re-released between July 2019 and June 2020 had spent on average 18 and a quarter months in prison post-recall."

PRT's research report on IPP recalls found that IPP prisoners' life chances and mental health were both fundamentally damaged by the uniquely unjust sentence they are serving. Arrangements for their support in the community after release did not match the depth of the challenge they faced in rebuilding their lives outside prison. Risk management plans drawn up before release all too often turned out to be unrealistic or inadequately supported after release, leading to recall sometimes within a few weeks of leaving prison, and for some people on multiple occasions. The process of recall also generated strong perceptions of unfairness.

Transform Justice -Swipe Right to Plead Guilty

Does it matter where and how someone pleads guilty or not guilty to a crime? The government is proposing that defendants should have the “option” to plead guilty or not guilty online ie on a computer or mobile phone. They are reviving a proposal first put forward in the 2017 Prisons and Courts Bill and abandoned due to the election that year. (We have published a briefing on this and other criminal justice proposals in this new Judicial Review and Courts Bill). The online plea proposal assumes that entering a plea is a purely administrative hearing – that people know if they are guilty or not. But, in fact, deciding whether someone is guilty of a crime can be very complicated. Is the charge the right one? Has all the evidence been disclosed? Does the defendant have a viable defence? Is the prosecution in the public interest? Does the defendant understand what credit they would get if they pleaded guilty? What sanction and criminal record might the defendant get if they plead guilty? All these questions may need to be discussed before the defendant enters their plea, preferably with their lawyer but, if unrepresented, with the court staff and judge. The government is proposing that the plea should merely be a tick in an online form, with the box ticked by a lawyer for more serious cases.

Transform Justice have a number of concerns about online pleas: The opportunity to challenge the charge may be lost or delayed. We don’t have a US plea bargaining system, but defence will often seek to get the CPS to change the charge – on the basis of the evidence. Revisions to charges prompt more guilty pleas and make for a more efficient system. But if pleas go online this conversation between defence/defendant and prosecution may never happen. This may leads to court delays and to miscarriages of justice where unrepresented defendants accept an inappropriate charge with a higher tariff.

Will unrepresented defendants have any idea what to plead? Transform Justice’s research on unrepresented defendants in the courtroom suggested many don’t understand the nuances. They sometimes plead guilty when they have a viable defence, or not guilty when the evidence against them is overwhelming. In the courtroom they won’t get legal advice but they will get guidance from human beings – the legal advisor, the prosecutor and the bench. Documents published with the bill imply that only those accused of non-imprisonable offences will be able to enter a plea unrepresented, but the bill itself seems to allow unrepresented defendants to plead to any crime online.

Children will be allowed to make online pleas, as long as their parent or guardian is aware. But all children who are charged with crimes are vulnerable and recent evidence suggests that they are particularly susceptible to pleading guilty when they are innocent or when they have a viable defence. They need expert legal advice before entering a plea, and their lawyer needs to discuss the case with the YOT and the prosecution. The Youth Court is the best venue for discussion prior to the plea hearing.

If pleas are entered online, disabled defendants may suffer discrimination – partly through not being identified, partly through lacking reasonable adjustments. The majority of those charged with criminal offences are not currently screened/assessed for health or mental health conditions. Yet many of defendants will have hidden or unidentified disabilities, which may affect their ability to understand and process legal concepts in the absence of reasonable adjustments. There is no provision in the bill for screening by health practitioners and all the onus for identification of these hidden disabilities is put on lawyers. Great though defence lawyers are, this is unrealistic and unreasonable. The plea hearing is a critical moment in any case and is currently an open hearing, accessible to victims, witnesses, the press and the public. Putting pleas online will close down justice. Reading minimal information about a case online is not the same as sitting in court and hearing about it. The financial prospects for the Ministry of Justice are grim and online pleas will save millions. But at what cost to justice?

Julie Hambleton Slams Cops After Being Cleared of Lockdown Breach

Richard Vernalls & Charlotte Paxton, MSN News: A Birmingham pub bombings campaigner has been cleared of breaching lockdown rules - after a rally was held to commemorate the anniversary of the IRA blasts. Julie Hambleton, whose older sister Maxine was killed in the 1974 bombings in the city, wept and embraced her three co-defendants in the dock. She later accused West Midlands Police of trying to 're-traumatise' the families of the bombings. All four had stood trial at Birmingham Magistrates Court, accused of taking part in a gathering outside West Midlands Police HQ on November 21 last year. The event was the 46th anniversary of two devastating IRA bomb blasts in the city, which claimed the lives of 21 people. As leader of the Justice 4 the 21 (J421) group, which has campaigned to bring the perpetrators to justice, Miss Hambleton was part of a motor rally organised to commemorate the day. Miss Hambleton and her co-defendants had denied any wrongdoing at the event, held amid the second national lockdown when gatherings of "more than two people" were banned. The 58-year-old, of Crossway Lane, Kevin Gormley, 53, of Beacon Road, Michael Lutwyche, 54, of Hayes Grove, and John Porter of Corner Way, 59, all in Birmingham, were prosecuted after refusing to pay fixed penalty notices issued by the West Midlands' force. It had been alleged by prosecutors there was a "clear and deliberate" breach of the rules after 15 to 25 protesters, including all four defendants, got out of their vehicles at the end of the rally, outside the force's Birmingham HQ.

But clearing the defendants after a two-day trial, District Judge Shamim Qureshi said the protest had happened against a national backdrop of changing lockdown regulations concluding that "frankly, most of the the country was confused". The judge pointed out the right to protest had been discussed by MPs at the time, with lawmakers told that right still "absolutely" existed. He said the defendants' case had "boiled down" to whether they had acted without "reasonable excuse" as set out in England's national Covid regulations in force at the time. He added that there were "important" points in the case, including the fact protesters "never planned to get out the cars" and the fact demonstrators were only outside Lloyd House for a few minutes, and had been "peaceful".

Judge Qureshi also said he made "no criticism of the decision by the police not to engage

with people there", after it emerged officers had not warned any demonstrators outside Lloyd House they faced being fined. The judge added: "Everybody knew it was going to finish, all any conversations would have done was simply drag things out, tempers could have boiled over. The interference with the street by coming out of the cars was minimal. "It was for a few minutes but purposeful; a purpose by Kevin Gormley to act as a marshal and by Julie Hambleton to encourage people to leave and thank them. The court sees nothing wrong in anything the four defendants did and therefore the court considers they fall within the reasonable excuse defence. The four defendants are therefore found not guilty of the offence."

Speaking after the verdicts, Miss Hambleton said she was "relieved that Judge Qureshi, has seen sense, basically". She thanked her legal team for making the group's case " during this traumatic hearing ". The Crown Prosecution Service proceeded with its case after a "careful" review of the facts, the court heard during the trial, and only after the four refused to pay fines issue by West Midlands Police. Miss Hambleton said: "I do wonder if the senior management of West Midlands Police are trying to find as many ways as they can to try and re-traumatise the families of the Birmingham pub bombings. Because that is exactly how it feels and how it looks to many, many people. We did everything right, we behaved, our supporters always behave with dignity and respect out of the memory of our loved ones, which the judge acknowledged. There's never been any trouble yet we are hauled before the courts for quite literally remembering our dead. Today is a great day for - amazingly - justice.

"As John (Porter) rightly pointed out this is the first time we have won something on behalf of Justice for the 21 - but this isn't the justice that we are actually seeking in the long term. However, it is the beginning and hopefully not such a long road until we find the end where truth, justice and accountability is." On hearing that a fifth person had paid their fine after attending Lloyd House during the rally, the judge asked the CPS lawyer in court to "speak to police and reconsider the fine", adding it would be a "severe injustice" for the penalty to stand, given the acquittals. At one point on the first day of the trial, Judge Qureshi, addressing a West Midlands Police officer giving evidence, had contrasted the force's decision not to fine any of the thousands who attended the city's Canon Hill Park in breach of the Rule of Six in March 2021 with those on trial. He asked: "I'll tell you how it looks... it seems a bit of an easy target so was there any need to prosecute in this case?" Chief Inspector Richard Cox replied: "A decision was made above me that it was appropriate, proportionate and necessary."

Lynette White Murder: Cardiff Five Were victims

Paul Heaney, BBC News: Members of the so-called "Cardiff Five" should be "recognised as victims", a senior police officer has said. John Actie, Ronnie Actie, Stephen Miller, Tony Paris and Yusef Abdullahi spent time in prison after being falsely accused of murdering 20-year-old Lynette White in Cardiff in 1988. Former Chief Constable of South Wales Police Matt Jukes said he was "sorry for the effect on their lives". He was speaking on a BBC documentary about the case, A Killing In Tiger Bay. It has been described as as one of the biggest miscarriages of justice in UK legal history. One of the three surviving members of the Cardiff Five, John Actie, thanked Mr Jukes for speaking "brilliantly and truthfully" and said they were "the words we wanted to hear years ago".

Speaking as the chief constable of South Wales, before moving to become an Assistant Commissioner in London, Mr Jukes said there was an "enormous responsibility of transparency" over the case. "I joined the police force in the mid-90s, so it was after a series of miscarriages of justice, of which this case was one. I have to recognise that the Cardiff three and the five originally arrested as victims. It's a time for listening but also a time for acting, a time for the whole of the public sector and the whole of wider society to recognise that racism is still very real in

our communities. The disadvantage experienced through the criminal justice system by black communities is real and present and stands to be addressed... and I know will remain a huge focus for South Wales Police. I'm sorry for the effect the actions that South Wales Police collectively and the criminal justice system had on the Cardiff three, on the five who were arrested,"

Lynette White was found stabbed more than 50 times in a flat in Cardiff docklands on 14 February 1988. Despite detectives stating they were looking for a white suspect, five black and mixed-race men were later arrested and charged with her murder. After 19 interviews by officers, a false confession was obtained from Stephen Miller, Ms White's boyfriend. The first trial of the five men stopped after the judge in the case died during proceedings. After two years in custody, John and Ronnie Actie were cleared by a jury at a second trial. But Stephen Miller, Yusef Abdullahi and Tony Paris were found guilty, sentenced to life, and became known as the Cardiff Three. After a huge campaign, in 1992 the Court of Appeal ruled a gross miscarriage of justice had taken place. Judge Lord Justice Taylor said that short of physical abuse, it was "hard to conceive of a more hostile and intimidatory approach by police officers, during the interview of Stephen Miller".

Under interrogation Stephen Miller admitted to the killing and named others as being responsible. "Why did I accuse innocent men? That's something I have to take to my grave with me," Mr Miller told the documentary. I'm a 22-year-old sitting in a police station, and they put me in this room and they just started flinging things at me - allegation after allegation - I mean it was so intense. I was a sorry soul - I think if they'd said God was in there with me, I'd have said yes. I felt like a prisoner of war. They just took me off the streets, and told me I done this."

The real murderer, Jeffrey Gafoor, was jailed in 2003 thanks to DNA evidence. In 2011 police officers involved in the original, flawed investigation were put on trial for alleged corruption. They denied the charges. The £30m case collapsed due to missing paperwork which was said to have been shredded, although it was found just weeks after the trial ended. Ronnie Actie was found dead in 2007 and friends said he struggled to cope after time in prison. Yusef Abdullahi died in 2011. Tony Paris lost his father just weeks before he was freed by the appeal court in 1992. He told the programme: "That's what killed my old man, they took his boy away, said he did something he didn't do, and we know it." Mr Paris said he too was pleased that a senior police officer was now describing him and the four others as victims. "It's important, 30 years down the line, because although we've had apologies before, now the whole world can see we are innocent and we are victims,"

Police officers involved in the original investigation declined to take part in the programme. Mr Jukes said the "question of accountability" in this case lay with "the organisation and its senior leadership". "It is of course important to say that there were lots of other people tragically affected by this case - individuals who were involved in the investigation, individuals who were witnesses. "The organisation, its professionalism, its candour is different now than it was. "I think every age has its own challenges, and our expectations now about the way we conduct ourselves and our investigations are not only so very different but they're also exposed to so much more scrutiny. "It's a real cause of sadness that Lynette's name gets used as shorthand for this case and it's easy to forget that a young woman's life was lost."

Responding to Mr Jukes' comments, John Actie said: "I really appreciate that Matt Jukes has said these things... I'd like to say thank you very much." Mr Actie said that he hoped the documentary would show people in the UK and across the world "exactly what went down" and highlight the wide-ranging, long-term effects on those involved. "This is something where we can go 'look - sit up and watch it' and you judge yourself. "The truth is important - the truth will set your free - and freedom is priceless. You can't buy your freedom."

Open Letter to Boris Johnson - Sack Cressida Dick Immediately

We write to you as a group of concerned individuals seeking urgent and long-overdue reform of policing, the police complaints system and, in particular, the Metropolitan Police Service (MPS). Our stories and individual experiences are very different, but we have all been victims of the incompetence and malpractice which pervades the leadership of the MPS. This included racial discrimination, systemic corruption and the reckless and unjustified harassment of innocent people. After decades of equivocation and inertia, we are calling for immediate and decisive action from your administration. We have - reluctantly - become public figures as a result of our experiences, but we are determined to use our voice to push for reform. This is the only way to restore confidence in our capital's police service and to ensure that these injustices cannot be repeated.

First, there must be accountability. Ager decades of investigation and numerous independent, judge-led inquiries, the scale and exact nature of the failures within the Metropolitan Police Service have become a matter of public record. Yet, not a single individual has been held accountable for this catalogue of errors. Dame Cressida Dick, who has presided over a culture of incompetence and cover-up, must not have her contract extended and must be properly investigated for her conduct, along with her predecessors and those in her inner circle, who she appointed and who have questions to answer. She should be replaced by an appointee from outside London via a truly independent and transparent process.

Second, there must be an oversight. A system that allows the police to set the parameters of the inquiries into their own misconduct, as was and is the case after Operation Midland, is self-evidently broken. The Independent Office for Police Conduct (IOPC), which is supposed to oversee complaints against the police, is demonstrably unfit for purpose as it is currently structured. A functional governance system must be established, led by a credible and legally-trained individual, and they must be given the powers to investigate and hold the police services to account; the IOPC must themselves be properly accountable to the Home Secretary with an independent oversight mechanism.

Lastly, we would like to request an urgent meeting with yourself and the Home Secretary to discuss these matters and ensure that meaningful reform is delivered within a reasonable timeframe. We share a collective concern that the leadership of the Metropolitan Police Service will continue to act as though they are above the law and that the general public do not have a viable means of recourse. We are confident that these issues can be addressed through a constructive dialogue. As Prime Minister, you have the opportunity to begin the process of change, an improvement which will restore trust in our police services.

Signed: Alastair Morgan, Baroness Lawrence, Paul Gambaccini, Michael McManus, Nick Bramall, Harvey Proctor, and Lady Brittan

"Behaviour Courses Make Little Difference to Reoffending Rate"

Inside Time: Offending behaviour courses offered in prisons make little difference to participants' chances of reoffending after release, an analysis has concluded. Researchers at Oxford and York universities examined the results of large-scale experimental studies from around the world which compared the reoffending rates of prisoners who participated in courses and those who did not. Pooling the results of the studies, the researchers found that courses led to a reduction in reoffending which was too small to be statistically significant. They said: "We report modest effects, at best, for psychological interventions delivered in prison." Findings of the analysis, which the researchers claimed was the first of its kind, were published in August in the prestigious journal Lancet Psychiatry, in a paper titled "Effectiveness of psychological interventions in prison to reduce recidivism: a systematic review and meta-analysis of randomised controlled trials".

Some previous research has found that prisoners who take courses are significantly less likely to reoffend. However, the authors of the Lancet paper dismissed most previous studies because they involved too few prisoners or were not randomised controlled trials. Although they started off by locating 6,345 previous studies, only 14 were judged reliable enough for inclusion in the final analysis. The authors wrote: "Widely implemented psychological interventions for people in prison to reduce offending after release need improvement. Publication bias and small-study effects appear to have overestimated the reported modest effects of such interventions, which were no longer present when only larger studies were included in analyses." Whilst the authors conducted an international search for relevant published studies, the majority of the most robust research was from US or Canada.

In England and Wales there are 21 accredited programmes approved by the Correctional Services Accreditation and Advice Panel for use in prisons. In some cases, programmes have been approved for use by the Panel before trials were carried out discover their impact on reoffending rates. Around 5,000 prisoners a year complete offending behaviour programmes, and Parole Board decisions on whether or not to release indeterminate-sentenced prisoners are often based heavily on whether or not they have "demonstrated a reduction in risk" by completing programmes.

Death of 18 Year Old Charlie Todd at HMP Durham Was Misadventure

An inquest has concluded that the death of 18 year old Charlie Todd was misadventure, and that he did not intend to take his life. Charlie was found unresponsive on 2 September 2019 at HMP Durham. The inquest heard he was being held in the Care and Separation Unit (segregation) at the time of his death and had been transferred there just 6 hours before he was found having ligatured. Charlie had been remanded to HMP Durham in April 2019, and was awaiting sentence for burglary and motoring offences. He was also awaiting trial for a wounding matter (section 18). After his death the latter charges were dropped against others accused. Had he simply been sentenced for the outstanding offences, his sentence would have been between one to two years' custody, possibly suspended.

On reception at HMP Durham, Charlie disclosed that he had self-harmed in the months before his arrival and had a history of depression. He was also prescribed antidepressants. However, he reported no current thoughts of suicide or self-harm, and did not at that time wish to be referred to the mental health team. Prison staff told the inquest they had no concerns about Charlie's mental health, and that he presented as 'smiley' and 'happy', including in the days prior to his death. Prisoners are assigned key workers who are meant to see them weekly and get to know them. Charlie had a good relationship with his key worker, but had not seen him in seven weeks. Charlie was not being monitored for suicide or self-harm risk (under an ACCT) at the time of death.

On 2 September, Charlie was taken to the segregation unit for a disciplinary hearing regarding possession of illicit substances. He told the adjudication hearing he was holding the drugs for other prisoners, not himself, and would like to be moved to another wing. However, he pleaded guilty and was punished with loss of earnings and privileges, and five days of cellular confinement in the segregation unit. Being segregated is known to increase a prisoner's risk of suicide and self-harm, and prison policy states a healthcare professional must screen people within two hours of being segregated to assess their suitability and risk. On 2 September, the nurse did not undertake the required face to face assessment but made an assessment based on her previous knowledge of Charlie, because she said she did not believe he was at risk. She told the inquest this was "a mistake".

Prison officers told the inquest that the segregation unit should have four staff, but often only had two or three and would loan staff from other wings. One said that "on a day to day basis, no one [was] in charge", with senior officers only occasionally coming to the unit. Officers were required to check on people in segregation at least hourly, but told the inquest that in practice this didn't always happen due to staffing levels. Having arrived in segregation at 10am, Charlie was last seen by prison staff at 2.22pm as part of a roll check. Staff did not check him again until 4.05pm when they found him hanging from a ligature point. Attempts to resuscitate were unsuccessful.

The inquest heard some evidence of an apparent belief among prisoners at Durham that the way out of segregation was to self-harm to get back to the wing. The inquest also heard suggestions from Charlie's brother that he himself had done this in another prison, after a lengthy period of segregation, and was subsequently moved – an example that Charlie was apparently aware of.

Since 2015 there have been 42 deaths of men at HMP Durham, of which 17 were reported by the prison to be self-inflicted. The most recent prison inspection in September 2018, a year before Charlie's death, found issues with safety and a lack of action on recommendations following previous self-inflicted deaths. The coroner is considering making a report to prevent future deaths, but has asked for further information from the prison on various aspects around checks on prisoners and emergency codes when seeking an ambulance response.

Misconduct in Public Office – ECtHR Reviews Foreseeability of Common Law Offence

Joanna Curtis, UK Human Rigts Blog: On 6 July 2021 the European Court of Human Rights (ECtHR) published its judgment in the case of Norman v UK (Application no. 41387/17). The case concerned Mr Robert Norman, an officer at Belmarsh prison, who in 2015 was convicted of misconduct in public office for passing a variety of information to a tabloid journalist in exchange for money. The ECtHR found that, in Mr Norman's case, the offence itself did not constitute a breach of Article 7 ECHR (no punishment without law): Mr Norman's conduct was sufficiently serious for it to have been foreseeable that it would constitute a criminal offence. The ECtHR also found that the newspaper's disclosure of Mr Norman's activities to the police, and his subsequent prosecution and conviction, did not breach his rights under Article 10 ECtHR (freedom of expression).

On around 40 occasions between 2006 and 2011 Mr Norman passed information about Belmarsh prison to the journalist Stephen Moyes, in exchange for payments totalling £10,684. The information covered a variety of topics and led to numerous articles in the Daily Mirror and the News of the World. Examples include: the suspension of the prison chaplain for inappropriate behaviour with other prisoners; violent prisoners being transferred to open prisons as a result of overcrowding at Belmarsh; and the transfer to the prison of what was believed to be Jamie Bulger's killer, John Venables. Mr Norman requested that a number of the payments be made by way of cheque made out to his son.

In 2011, in the wake of the press phone hacking scandal, the police launched a criminal investigation known as Operation Elveden into allegations of inappropriate payments by journalists to public officials. As part of this investigation, Mirror Group Newspapers ("MGN") provided details to the police of Mr Norman's information-sharing activities and payments. Mr Norman was subsequently tried and convicted of misconduct in public office and sentenced to 20 months' imprisonment. Mr Norman's appeal was dismissed in the Court of Appeal (R v Norman ([2016] EWCA Crim 1564) and he was refused permission to appeal to the Supreme Court. Article 7 of the European Convention on Human Rights reads: No one shall be held guilty of any criminal offence on account of any act or omission which did not constitute a criminal offence under national or international law at the time when it was committed. […] It is implied under Article 7 that the law in question be foreseeable:

an individual should be able to know from the wording of the law, if need be with appropriate legal advice, what acts and omissions will make him criminally liable. The leading modern case defining the offence of misconduct in public office is the Court of Appeal's decision in Attorney General's Reference (No 3 of 2003) ([2004] EWCA Crim 868). This was the leading case at the time when Mr Norman carried out his offences. In that case, the Court of Appeal set out the elements of the offence as follows: (1) a public officer acting as such …; (2) wilfully neglects to perform his duty and/or wilfully misconducts himself …; (3) to such a degree as to amount to an abuse of the public's trust in the office holder …; (4) without reasonable excuse or justification. Mr Norman's application under Article 7 ECHR relied on the third element of the offence, the "seriousness test". In Attorney General's Reference (No 3 of 2003) the Court of Appeal set out the following factors to be considered in relation to the seriousness test: (a) that the threshold is a high one; (b) the motive with which a public officer acts; (c) the consequences of that action; and (d) that the misconduct must be of such a degree so as to be calculated to injure the public interest (paragraphs 56-59 of Attorney General's Reference).

After Mr Norman's conviction the Court of Appeal decided a further key case on misconduct in public office: R v Chapman and others ([2015] EWCA Crim 539). In that case, the Court of Appeal expressly stated (by way of example) that a public officer holder's receipt of payment in exchange for information would constitute harm to the public interest (paragraph 36 of R v Chapman). Mr Norman argued, however, that the seriousness test remained too vague as to be lawful. Mr Norman said that at the time he passed information to Mr Moyes, the specific guidance given in R v Chapman had not been foreseeable and he could not have foreseen that he would be subject to criminal prosecution. He relied on comments made by the Law Commission in 2016, which said that: The lack of comprehensive guidance as to what makes misconduct "serious" … is particularly difficult in terms of making decisions as to where the line should be drawn between disciplinary and criminal proceedings. Law Commission's Consultation Paper No. 229 of 5 September 2016 (Reforming Misconduct in Public Office) and the seriousness threshold – that the offence amounts to an 'abuse of the public's trust' – is highly subjective and difficult to apply. This has led to concern that the offence is being pursued in some circumstances that are not sufficiently blameworthy so as to justify criminal consequences.

Law Commission's final report and recommendations on Misconduct in public office, published on 4 December 2020. The ECtHR held that, on the facts of Mr Norman's case, Article 7 ECHR was not breached. It said that the guidance in Attorney General's Reference (No 3 of 2003) was sufficient for the applicant to have foreseen that his conduct could constitute a criminal offence. It said the fact that Mr Norman was paid for the information he provided pertained to his motive for acting. It said that his attempt to conceal the payments, by asking for some of the cheques to be made out to his son, showed that he was well aware that what he was doing was wrong and that the receipt of money might play a role in any subsequent investigation into misconduct. According to the domestic courts, Mr Norman's leaks, and their scale, had led to serious consequences including the demonisation of prisoners, suspicion falling on innocent members of staff, general enmity and mistrust within the prison, and the undermining of public confidence in the prison service. The ECtHR said those conclusions were neither unforeseeable nor surprising. It said that although the Law Commission's final report notes concern over the application of the seriousness threshold, the ECtHR did not consider Mr Norman's case to be sufficiently borderline so as to render his prosecution and conviction unforeseeable. There was no breach of Article 7.

Article 10 (freedom of expression) Mr Norman argued that (a) the disclosure of his name by MGN to the police, and (b) his prosecution and conviction, breached his rights under Article 10 ECHR to freely provide information to the press. The ECtHR declared the first of these grounds inadmissible because disclosure by MGN could not be attributed to the UK state. Although MGN's likely motive was the avoidance of prosecution at the corporate level, such a motive did not mean that the police had put undue pressure on MGN to make the disclosure.

Regarding Mr Norman's prosecution and conviction the ECtHR found, as it had in relation to Mr Norman's Article 7 application, that the offence of misconduct in public office was sufficiently prescribed by law and was sufficiently clear and foreseeable in the circumstances of Mr Norman's case. Applying Article 10, the ECtHR found that Mr Norman's prosecution and conviction pursued legitimate aims (including the protection of the reputation or rights of others and the prevention of the disclosure of information received in confidence) and were necessary in a democratic society. The ECtHR dismissed Mr Norman's argument that his disclosures had been in the public interest. The UK courts had found no public interest in the majority of that information, nor had they found Mr Norman to have been primarily motivated by public interest concerns. He had not attempted to disclose the information via official channels or via his trade union, as he might have done had the public interest been his sole concern. The trial judge had noted that Mr Norman was motivated by money and by a strong dislike of the prison governor. Conversely, there was a strong public interest in prosecuting Mr Norman due to the scale of his breach of duty, the harm he had caused, and the fact that he did it knowingly. There was therefore no breach of Article 10.

Commentary: Some will say that the ECtHR's judgment will have a chilling effect on free speech in the UK. The concern is that individuals working in public office will be less likely to provide information to journalists, and that this will ultimately damage press freedom. It is clear that Article 10 protects journalists from being compelled by the state to disclose their sources (see ECtHR's Article 10 Guidance Note). But Mr Norman's case is the first time that the ECtHR has considered the applicability of Article 10 to individual sources where a newspaper voluntarily discloses the source's identity. On this question the ECtHR's judgment is clear: Article 10 offers no protection in this circumstance. The risk therefore persists that media corporations may disclose their sources to avoid potential liability for systemic malpractice at a corporate or senior level.

A key factor in Mr Norman's case was the fact that he received payments for the information he provided. It is by no means uncommon for journalists to make payments to their sources, and some would argue that such payments are necessary in order to facilitate access to information. However, given the Court of Appeal's comments in R v Chapman and the weight given by the domestic courts, and now by the ECtHR, to the payments received by Mr Norman, the position appears to be that any payment received by a public official in exchange for information is likely to constitute criminal conduct. This is in line with the zero-tolerance approach under bribery law, so is perhaps unsurprising. Other factors of note in Mr Norman's case are that (a) he provided a variety of information on a range of topics, and (b) he was said to have mixed motives for providing that information. Although Mr Norman was found to be motivated by money and by dislike of the prison governor, the trial judge did acknowledge that he had genuine concerns about the manner in which the prison was run and that this was a motivating factor. Regarding the information itself, the courts held that in the majority of what Mr Norman disclosed there was no public interest. This implies, however, that it was in the public interest to know some of the information.

Currently the consideration of public interest seems to fall primarily within limb (d) of the factors set out in Attorney General's Reference (No 3 of 2003) (reasonable excuse or justification). In its

proposals for reforming the offence, the Law Commission advocates introducing a specific defence of public interest, with the burden of proof on the defendant on the balance of probabilities (Final report dated 4 December 2020, paragraph 5.99-5.131) The Law Commission suggests that the test be: (a) whether it was in the public interest for the information disclosed to be known by the recipient; and (b) whether the manner of the disclosure was in the public interest (i.e., could the public official have used any alternative channels). But even this proposal does not provide much real clarity. Two issues arise from the facts of Mr Norman's case, which remain unanswered:

Firstly, it is conceivable that it could be in the public interest to know that there are widespread systemic problems in a public service, even if it is not necessarily in the public interest to be informed of each instance in isolation. It is not clear what weight should be given to a cumulative public interest in information disclosed in a piecemeal way. Secondly, during a course of conduct spanning several years, at what point does the conduct become foreseeably criminal? It seems that we must expect public office holders to (a) be able to discern what information a jury is likely to consider is "in the public interest" and what is not, (b) identify whether the public interest in making the disclosure outweighs any harm that may be caused, and (c) be willing to disclose information for no motive other than the public interest. Society places a degree of trust in its public officials, and arguably it is the responsibility of any official to make a careful assessment before breaching that trust. But even if Mr Norman had had the benefit of legal advice when making some or all of his disclosures, could that really have provided sufficient foreseeability as to whether the public interest was being served?

At a glance, the decision in Norman v UK might be taken as the ECtHR giving the green light to the offence of misconduct in public office in its current form and it is possible that any process for reform may be delayed. However, the decision in Norman is only that on the facts of that case is Article 7 not offended. As the ECtHR said: The Court does not exclude that there may be cases in which, given their specific facts, prosecution and conviction for misconduct in public office were arguably not foreseeable. Isn't this tantamount to a conclusion that the offence is in fact not compliant with Article 7 or Article 10?

Death of Chronically Ill Prisoner at HMP Addiewell Could Have Been Avoided

A sheriff has determined that the death of a prisoner in Scotland's only privately-run prison could potentially have been avoided were it not for defects in the prison's then-current system of working. John Smith died as a result of heart and lung disease on 20 April 2019 in his cell in HMP Addiewell. It was known to the prison service that he suffered from a number of conditions including severe chronic obstructive pulmonary disease and he had returned to the prison from hospital the day before his death. The deceased was imprisoned in HMP Addiewell after being convicted of historic lewd, indecent, and libidinous practices and behaviour in January 2019. Prior to trial he had been diagnosed as having severe chronic obstructive pulmonary disease, a low BMI, prostate cancer, and hyperinflated lungs consistent with COPD. It was prognosed by the examining doctor that his chances of surviving the next 4 years were approximately 18%.

It was noted by the sheriff that Sodexo, the operator of HMP Addiewell under contract to the Scottish Ministers, implemented its own policies in relation to the operation of the prison. On admission to prison in March 2019 it was recorded in the prison's records that the deceased suspected asthma, COPD, dependence on a wheelchair, low vision with cataracts, impaired hearing, prostate cancer, poor mobility, and frailty, and he was placed on the prison's suicide prevention policy until 22 March 2019.

Government: Discrimination Against Black People and Travellers 'Objectively Justified'

Lizzie Dearden, Independent: Discrimination against black people and Gypsy, Roma and Traveller communities in a controversial suite of new laws is "objectively justified", the government has claimed. Home Office documents published on Monday 13th September 2021, admitted that different groups would be disproportionately impacted by measures in the Police, Crime, Sentencing and Courts (PCSC) Bill. They include enhanced stop and search powers and the criminalisation of "residing on land without consent in a vehicle". The Home Office admitted that proposed Serious Violence Reduction Orders (SVROs), which would allow police to stop and search people based on their previous offending history without the "reasonable grounds" currently required, would disproportionately affect black people. But its equalities impact assessment added: "Any indirect difference on treatment on the grounds of race is anticipated to be potentially positive and objectively justified as a proportionate means of achieving our legitimate aim of reducing serious violence and preventing crime."

The Home Office cited 2018 statistics showing that murder rates were four times higher for black victims rather than white victims, and that the proposals aimed to reduce "violence amongst those most likely to be involved". "If the benefits of the policy were to outweigh the costs, as currently estimated, this policy would have an overall positive impact and be objectively justified," the document added. Several criminal justice organisations and charities raised concerns about SVROs in an official consultation, and police figures show that black people are already nine times more likely to be stopped and searched than white people. Liberty said the law "effectively creates an individualised, suspicionless stop and search power, entirely untethered to a specific and objectively verifiable threat" and would "compound discrimination". Government proposals state that courts will be able to impose SVROs after any offence "in which a knife or an offensive weapon has been involved", regardless of whether it was wielded by that person. The Lammy Review drew attention to the racial impact of "joint enterprise" prosecutions, which can see several people jailed over a stabbing carried out by one attacker. Labour MP David Lammy condemns controversial policing bill in impassioned speech

Criminal Justice Alliance group said there was "inadequate evidence of effectiveness" of SVROs, warning that they could disrupt rehabilitation and damage trust in the police. They are one of several measures in the PCSC Bill that have met widespread opposition on human rights and discrimination grounds, although it passed all stages in the House of Commons unamended and will be debated in the Lords on Tuesday. Several clauses target Gypsy, Roma and Traveller communities, by creating a new criminal offence of "residing on land without consent in a vehicle", and broadening police powers to seize caravans and other property. The government's equalities impact statement said: "There is no direct discrimination within the meaning of the Equality Act as the law will apply equally, regardless of any protected characteristic … any discriminatory impact for those of a particular race or ethnicity will be indirect." The document admitted the policy "may place those from Gypsy, Roma and Traveller communities at a particular disadvantage", but added: "It is our view that any indirect discrimination towards the above communities can be objectively justified."

The government claimed it recognised the right to follow a nomadic way of life but said the proposed laws would "apply to anyone who resides or intends to reside on land illegally". It said the plans were a "proportionate means of achieving the legitimate aims of prevention and investigation of crime and the protection of the rights of others, notably those of the occupier and the local community". The document said the use of the powers would be "discretionary and an operational matter for the police". Earlier this year Martin Hewitt, chair of the National Police Chiefs' Council (NPCC), said police leaders had not requested a change to the law and believed current powers to be sufficient. He told a parliamentary committee: "The fundamental problem is that there is an insufficient provision of sites for Gypsy Travellers to occupy. That is what then causes the relatively small percentage where they end up in unlawful encampments." Mr Hewitt said police leaders had concerns about the proposed powers, and how they could draw police further into "very difficult situations".

In response to the equalities impact statements, the Liberty charity said the government's plans would criminalise Gypsies and Travellers and cause the "harassment" of black people and other groups. Jun Pang, policy and campaigns officer, told The Independent: "The government's attempt to justify proposals it admits are discriminatory is an insult to the millions of people who will be affected by the policing bill. "The government admission that these proposals are discriminatory means they shouldn't see the light of day, let alone be made into law. With the bill in the House of Lords this week, Peers must protect our rights and reject this bill."

Foot Fetish Man Avoids Jail for 1,263 Nuisance Calls to NHS 111

Tim Wyatt, Indpendent: A foot fetishist who made more than a thousand calls to the NHS's 111 service to ask the call handlers about their feet has been convicted and fined. Richard Cove, of Boundary Road in Worthing, admitted making malicious communications at Worthing Magistrates' Court after police had discovered he had repeatedly rung up the free health advice line to indulge his fetish. He was given a suspended 16-week prison sentence and ordered to carry out 200 hours unpaid work and pay £2,000 compensation to the NHS. The South East Coast Ambulance Service NHS Foundation Trust (SECAmb), which runs the 111 phone line in the region, said Cove's 1,263 phone calls over two years had cost the NHS almost £22,000. Cove was caught after a member of the public made a complaint in 2019 to NHS 111 reporting they were repeatedly contacted by the service despite having never rung the number. SECAmb then discovered a nuisance caller had been regularly phoning NHS 111 but using a false name and faked ailments, some of which had led to NHS 111 clinicians making return calls or even sending out ambulances. In many of the calls, the caller would pretend to be an elderly woman and talk about their own feet, before going on to ask the NHS 111 handler on the other end of the line about their feet. PC David Quayle from Sussex Police said: "Police enquiries identified the offender's phone number and arrested Cove at his home from where he had been making the calls on his landline. "He admitted making all the calls and that they were all for his own enjoyment. He said he had a sexual foot fetish which he indulged during most of the calls." David Davis, SECAmb's head of integrated governance, said Cove's calls had not only distressed his 111 staff, but also tied up their time when they could have been helping people with real medical problems.

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, 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