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 593 (28/027/2016) - Cost

CCRC Refers Murder Conviction of Deborah Mccarthy-Winzar to Court of Appeal

Ms McCarthy-Winzar pleaded not guilty to the murder of her husband, Dominic McCarthy, when she stood trial at Birmingham Crown Court in July 2000. She was convicted on 19 July 2000 and sentenced to life imprisonment. On 31st January 1997 Mr McCarthy had been found unconscious and profoundly hypoglycaemic. He was taken to hospital for treatment but did not regain consciousness and died on 9 February 1997. Hospital laboratory tests revealed that Mr McCarthy had had a very high insulin level and an unmeasurable level of c-peptide. The prosecution case was that Mr McCarthy's hypoglycaemia must have resulted from being administered a large dose of insulin, and that Ms McCarthy-Winzar alone had the opportunity to administer this. In addition, she was a nurse and had access to insulin, and the skills to inject it. Ms McCarthy-Winzar denied any wrong-doing at all, stated that she had a happy marriage, and maintained that her husband must have died of natural causes. Ms McCarthy-Winzar appealed against her conviction, but the appeal was dismissed by the Court of Appeal on 20 December 2002. She applied to the Commission in June 2005. The Commission has conducted a wide range of enquiries during its extensive review of this case. Numerous experts have been consulted in what has been a highly complex review, exploring the latest developments in the relevant science. As a result of its enquiries, the Commission has decided to refer the case to the Court of Appeal. The Commission considers that new opinion evidence from medical experts gives rise to a real possibility that the conviction will be quashed.

A Clash of Conviction by Bob Woffinden Circa May 2005

Dee Winzar is serving life for the murder of her husband. The prosecution case was simple: he was killed by a lethal injection and she was the only one who could have done it. But was it really murder? Bob Woffinden investigates The first catastrophe happened at 3.15pm on October 26 1984 when Nic McCarthy was knocked off his motorcycle and left trapped under a London bus. He spent the next six months in hospital. The lower half of his body was paralysed; he would spend the rest of his life in a wheelchair. While still in hospital in Stanmore, north-west London, Nic (short for Dominic) married his girlfriend, Deborah Winzar - Dee - whom he'd met while both were training to be nurses. McCarthy was 22, Winzar 20. They approached McCarthy's situation with positive thinking: October 26 was the day he hadn't died.

Family and friends were impressed by his resilience. His doctor, David Roberts, described him as "always cheerful ... a real survivor". McCarthy took a social work degree at what was then Hatfield polytechnic. He developed a keen interest in the rights of the disabled, and became a senior social worker at the Kingfisher Centre in Peterborough for those with physical and learning disabilities. He was "full of enthusiasm" and "extremely intelligent", said one friend; "the sort who could get on with anybody", added another. Nadine Jay, a colleague, described him as "a very special presence. He was independent and very determined. You'd see him in his wheelchair, carrying bags of shopping in his teeth."

When the insurance details from the accident were finalised in March 1991, the settlement from London Transport turned out to be much greater than expected. McCarthy received £620,000. He and Winzar could afford not only to move into a large house in Stonely, Cambridgeshire, but to adapt it to suit his needs (for example, a lift was installed). There were frequent barbecues for friends. Yet McCarthy and Winzar continued to live on their incomes, and he gave money and loans to family members. A much-loved son was born in 1993. Childminders who sometimes looked after him reported that McCarthy and Winzar were very caring parents who displayed "great interest in their child's welfare". A keen supporter of West Ham, McCarthy regularly attended football and rugby matches. He went to many rock concerts, sometimes with Winzar, though often not, as her taste did not always coincide with his. In just a few weeks at the end of 1996, when Winzar's spare time was in any case taken up with a middle management diploma course, he'd been to Mazzy Star, Jools Holland, Sheryl Crow and Sting concerts with Nadine Jay and other friends. At the start of 1997, friends said, McCarthy and Winzar were "their usual bubbly selves". McCarthy was leading a full life. Although his weight had reached about 20 stone, he was doing weight-training to strengthen his upper body. He'd just put through an application for lottery funding for Huntingdonshire's Disability Information Service. It was awarded £80,000. "This project was Nic's baby," said the chair of the service. "He was full of it." He had tickets to a Suzanne Vega concert in Cambridge, and he was going to the Ireland-England Five Nations rugby match in Dublin.

The second catastrophe befell the family on January 31 1997 - McCarthy was found in bed in a coma. He died 10 days later. And on July 19 2000, Winzar was convicted of her husband's murder and sentenced to life imprisonment. McCarthy and Winzar's young son had lost not one parent but both. For seven years from 1990, Winzar, who is now 40, was a senior ward sister at Kettering general hospital. She is the youngest of five children whose father was an RAF navigator stationed at bases throughout the world. One day in 1972 he telephoned to say he would not be coming back. By that stage, only two children, Dee and her sister Alison, were still at home in Bingham, just outside Nottingham; the others were starting careers or at university. Her family all believed Winzar to be innocent, but their trust in British justice was as ingrained as their distrust of the British media. Their faith was not immediately undermined by the verdict: they assumed the case would be remedied at appeal. But it wasn't (first appeals are rarely successful) and the family has finally, reluctantly, decided to go public.

There were blue skies in Derbyshire the day I visited Winzar in prison. She is tall and handsome. It is easy to picture her as a nurse: one can imagine her combining compassionate concern with brisk efficiency. Perhaps in her own case, though, there has been too much detachment in the face of suffering. She has tried to remain aloof from her fate, and seems to have worried more about how her plight would affect others (in particular, her family) than about how to redress her situation. She accepts she was mistaken in keeping silent. "To anyone in my position now," she says with rare emotion, "I would say, 'Talk to everybody, your family, friends, everyone, hold a press conference on the steps of the police station, invite everyone in. Only the prosecution benefits from silence." Even now, though, she is adamant her story must be told properly - and, especially, that McCarthy should be portrayed not as a helpless victim, as the prosecution characterised him, but as she knew him in life. "He was a big man with a huge personality," she says. "I loved him and would never have tried to harm him. I would certainly never have put my son at risk - as he could have been, through being in the house when Nic was taken ill. "The facts are so simple," she continues. "I left home. Nic was alive, albeit feeling drowsy. By the next morning, he had suffered an irreversible illness at home in bed. And that's it. All the character assassination that was to follow is just inconceivable."

Winzar has a sort of mild rock'n'roll free-spiritedness that seemed to count against her at the trial. She was astonished at the way small character traits were seized upon. The press reported that she wore "a lime green summer jacket" for the final day of the trial, as if that were evidence of guilt. When McCarthy died, she covered all the mirrors in the house. It's an old Jewish custom. She isn't Jewish and explained: "I just did it out of respect for Nic." For the prosecution, however, it was evidence of something close to weirdness. And hadn't she murdered him for his money? Set aside the innuendo and a different picture emerges. She had married McCarthy after his accident when there was scant hope of a massive compensation settlement. She had cycled to work every day when they couldn't afford a car so she could support him through his four-year degree course. She had been a Samaritan for 12 years. She was about to become a surrogate mother for a childless couple. In the end, all this counted for nothing.

On January 30 1997, Winzar went to a leaving party for the junior doctors on her ward with Mary Newell, a colleague. As her shift the next day would start at 7am, and as she would have a drink at the party, Winzar decided not to travel back to Stonely (about 30 minutes' drive away) and arranged to stay overnight at Newell's. That day, McCarthy, who had lately got over a bout of flu, felt cold and tired; a colleague advised him to go home, though he worked until 5pm as normal. In phone calls that evening, he told his two brothers and his mother he was "extremely tired" and would turn in early. Because of her concern for him, Winzar was late leaving home and didn't arrive at Newell's until after nine. At 9.30pm, her colleague's husband drove them to the party. They left at around 1am, returning to Newell's at around 1.30am, and stayed up talking, Newell estimated, for up to 90 minutes. Winzar left without waking her hosts. At 7am sharp she was back on her ward and in good spirits, according to colleagues, laughing about the party that had wound up only a few hours earlier. From just before 9am she began phoning McCarthy to see how he was feeling. Getting no response, she became anxious, especially after finding out their son had not been dropped off at kindergarten. Jane Lancaster-Adlam, who ran the kindergarten, offered to go round to the house. There was no reply, but she managed to speak to the little boy through the letter box and persuade him to pass through the keys. She found McCarthy upstairs on his bed, and phoned their GP, Dr Roberts, who arrived soon after 10am and called an ambulance.

Lancaster-Adlam noticed that the television was on, and Roberts noted additional points of interest: that McCarthy's catheter bag was "bursting full" (Winzar, who soon arrived from Kettering, emptied it); and that he had vomited. McCarthy vomited again when the ambulance crew moved him. He then had a fit in the ambulance on his way to the nearest hospital, Hinchingbrooke, in Huntingdon. McCarthy was suffering from hypoglycaemia, or low blood sugar, one of the possible causes of which could be the administration of insulin. A hospital team of five carried out a standard procedure called a "log roll", to check for signs of trauma or other clues to assist diagnosis. One of the things they looked for was an injection site; there was none. A CT scan carried out at 2pm showed that McCarthy's brain was swollen. He was put on life support but, on February 3, a consultant told the family that only a miracle could save him. He died six days later. Immunoassay tests on a sample of McCarthy's blood were conducted in Professor Vincent Marks's laboratory at the Royal Surrey county hospital in Guildford. These showed elevated insulin levels and low C-peptide levels. When insulin is made within the body, an enzyme called C-peptide is proportionately produced. Accordingly, one inference from the presence of significant insulin and the absence of C-peptide is that the insulin in the body has been introduced externally rather than naturally produced.

The coroner ordered the cancellation of the funeral arrangements to allow a second post-mortem to take place. This was conducted by the pathologist Dr Nat Cary. "There is no doubt that insulin was exogenously administered," he wrote, adding: "Detailed inquiry should be carried out to establish the circumstances." McCarthy was buried on March 5. There had been no defence postmortem. How could there be? There were no criminal proceedings under way, and so no defence team. Yet whenever a pathologist sparks off a criminal investigation, as Cary had surely done, it is arguable that the coroner should, as a matter of course, ensure that a defence post-mortem could be undertaken. Winzar was charged with McCarthy's murder on January 30 1998 - almost a year to the day after he was found in a coma. The trial did not begin at Birmingham crown court until June 7 2000, more than three years after McCarthy's death. Winzar was on bail throughout that time - but she recalls the period as "the most destructive of sentences". All she could do was wait; she had been instructed not to talk about the case with anyone. "That further increased my sense of isolation," she says, "and made me appear distant and secretive." The prosecution case was that the immunoassays provided conclusive proof that the insulin had been administered externally. There was no suggestion that McCarthy had done this himself, or that anyone else had done it, and therefore Winzar was guilty. Throughout, the alternative view of the defence has been that McCarthy died of natural (albeit unascertained) causes.

At trial, the crown produced various pieces of speculation and suspicion. On two occasions, on February 2 and 4, the Imed pump infusing sedative into McCarthy in hospital may have been tampered with. Again, the prosecution asserted, Winzar must have been responsible: she was trying to finish him off. The defence countered that such suggestions were implausible. On the first occasion Winzar was accompanied by her brother-in-law, Dr Russell Boyd, who is a hospital consultant. The second incident occurred the day after the family was told that McCarthy would be unlikely to survive - so, if murder was the intention, what would have been the point? In any case, hospital staff were aware not only that the machine could be accidentally turned off but that, even if it were, it didn't greatly matter. "I would not expect the switching-off of the Imed machine to cause any significant physiological disturbance," stated one consultant anaesthetist, "even to a critically ill patient." The judge commented: "It does make you wonder if there is anything in this at all."

It is hard to think of a motive for the alleged crime, although the prosecution counsel, Stephen Coward QC, floated a few ideas. Nadine Jay had denied any suggestion of an affair with McCarthy, yet in cross-examining Winzar, Coward asked the defendant, "So what do you think was going on between Nadine Jay and Nic?" The defence pointed out that although McCarthy had visited her flat, the last time it was not Jay but her flatmate, Claire Fixter, who had invited him. "So was it Claire then?" Coward asked. At one point Winzar referred to Roberts as "David". Coward responded: "Ah, David, is it? David? I see, I see" - as if it were surprising that Winzar, a health professional whose husband required constant medical treatment, should be on first-name terms with the family doctor. So the only evidence supporting the suggestion that McCarthy had been injected with insulin was provided by the immunoassays. Were these tests accurate and reliable? One man who had serious doubts was Professor Marks. He had set up the laboratory in which the tests were conducted, had developed the tests in question, and had been the world's leading authority on hypoglycaemia since writing the standard textbook on it in 1965. He had also been an important defence witness in the world's most celebrated case of alleged poisoning by insulin: the Claus von Bülow case (in which von Bülow was acquitted at a retrial of the attempted murder of his wife, Sunny).

Although initially satisfied with the test results, Professor Marks later came to the conclusion the evidence didn't stack up. McCarthy had not displayed the characteristic symptoms of insulin poisoning. "I have always worked on the principle that you never rely on one laboratory result when it does not fit the clinical picture," he told the court. Among the particular features that concerned Marks was McCarthy's vomiting. "Vomiting is common in all types of hypoglycaemia, except that due to insulin, where it's as rare as rocking-horse dung," he said. "The tests are exquisitely sensitive, but there are possibilities of interference, from what are known as insulin antibodies, and you can get misleading results." Essentially, he and his colleague, Dr Derek Teale (who was giving evidence for the prosecution) tried to impress upon the court that they ran a clinical laboratory. "That is what the NHS pays for, and what the NHS gets," Teale emphasised. "It does not pay for, and does not get, a forensic laboratory." Injecting McCarthy would not have been straightforward. He would certainly not have been a passive victim. Although he had no feeling in the lower half of his body, he would react to what would normally be pain and, for example, would kick out. (The only sedatives in McCarthy's body were those administered by the ambulance crew.) He also had sufficient upper-body strength to fight off an assailant and, if attacked, could have used the phone to summon assistance. (Anyone injected with insulin will remain conscious for about 20 minutes.) There was no insulin site, no needle or syringe that had been used for insulin injection, and no evidence of insulin in the house. Yet, said crown experts, "that does not rule out insulin injection".

This habit has crept into the courts in recent years. Medical experts have been giving testimony along the lines of, "There is no evidence that x happened, but this does not mean that x didn't happen." Many lawyers believe that scientific experts should be restricted to the evidence and refrain from adding speculative riders - if there's no evidence, there's no evidence, full stop. You only need to apply the technique to other circumstances - "There's no evidence that Princess Diana was murdered, but that doesn't mean she wasn't"; "There's no evidence that Lord Lucan is living in Huddersfield, but that doesn't mean he isn't" - to see how potentially prejudicial such reasoning can be. As if things weren't difficult enough, just after the defence case had started, Winzar's QC, Steven Kay, suffered a double bereavement, his parents dying within days of each other, and had to withdraw. His junior took up the reins.

After five weeks of evidence, Mr Justice Owen began his summing-up on Wednesday July 12. By the time he completed it the following Tuesday, the transcript ran to 324 pages. Much of it was concerned with abstruse scientific arguments. I've read hundreds of summings-up over the years, but this is the most impenetrable I have seen. "You may have thought you were out of your depths," the judge himself said to the jury, adding: "Certainly I am willing to confess that I thought that myself." We do not know what the Birmingham jury made of all this, but when the trial resumed after a weekend break, the judge conceded that some of his summing-up had not gone well. It "looked very good on paper," he said, "but I am now convinced it was a mistake and I can only apologise to you for that. All you can do is to do your best. If it does not work out, it does not work out, and I am sorry it did not."

In fact, there were at least four controversial aspects of the summing-up. The density of the scientific detail was merely the first. A second concerned the way the judge alluded to the defence arguments. He said the case had been "made more complicated inevitably by the need felt by the defence to test evidence". He added, "Nobody can criticise the defence for querying everything. It makes it very difficult for the jury ... If they did not do it, they would be failing in their duty, so we have to put up with it." The judge also appeared to be less than impressed by

Professor Marks, the main defence witness. "I am not meaning to be censorious," he said, "but you may have thought that some of the questions he was asked he did not answer. But then, that is the way of the world and you should not hold that in any way against him."

Mr Justice Owen then told the jury they did not have to provide a verdict of which they were "certain", merely one of which they could be "sure". Leaving aside the semantics of this ("sure" and "certain" are regarded as synonyms in most dictionaries), the attempt to draw a distinction might raise a specific difficulty in a court case already riven with disputes about the difference between clinical and forensic proof. It may have appeared to the jury that a lesser test needed to be applied. In the end the jury convicted and Winzar was sentenced to life imprisonment. Hooper, her barrister, wrote that he had "an unease about the verdict that I have never felt in a previous case". Murder by insulin poisoning is very rare for one notable reason - the victims seldom die. The crown case was fundamentally illogical. Winzar, they'd argued, had murdered McCarthy, emphasising that she was a nurse and so knew about insulin. But if she knew about insulin, she'd have known that glucose treatment in the first six hours generally brings patients round. And who had raised the alarm? Winzar had. Another reason the defence team was left smarting was that they felt deprived of the opportunity to prove Winzar's innocence. There had been no defence postmortem. Nor was McCarthy's blood ever properly analysed (by the time it was tested, the hospital had pumped his body full of antibiotics). The most crucial point, however, was that the original pathologist had not retained the brain for examination.

Some samples of brain tissue were available, but Dr Jennian Geddes, consultant neuropathologist at the Royal London hospital, commented that the samples selected were not ideal. Nevertheless, she said, had the prosecution case been correct, she would have expected to find some evidence of hypoglycaemic brain damage, but she could find none. (She did see signs of hypoxia - a shortage of oxygen - which could account for the swollen brain on the CT scan.) At appeal, the three judges criticised the prosecuting QC for his comments about Nadine Jay, Claire Fixter and Dr Roberts. They described these as "regrettable"; there was "no evidential foundation for them" and they "should not have been made". They also rebuked the trial judge for suggesting that those in court had to "put up with" the defence mounting its case. "That was inappropriate language," ruled the judges. They also acknowledged that Mr Justice Owen's "technique" in dealing with Professor Marks's evidence "did differ to a certain extent from that which he adopted [for] the other experts."

The court of appeal accepted that, despite the police's thorough examination of Winzar's character and background and her relationship with McCarthy, no reason could be offered as to why she might have wanted to kill him. "The reality is that the prosecution could not identify any motive," the judges affirmed. Ultimately, however, they determined that the test results were accurate, and so the conviction was safe. More remarkably, they appeared to have telescoped the crown case. At trial, the prosecution had been vague, arguing they could not say whether the injection had been administered the evening before or in the morning. Now, the appeal court judges decided that if McCarthy had been given a massive insulin injection by Winzar before she left, he would not then have been able to hold telephone conversations with his family. For these and other reasons, they decided the possibility of Winzar having administered the injection in the evening was "so unlikely that [it] can safely be ruled out" - it must have been in the morning. According to the judges, Winzar "must have left the Newells' house some time after 3am, driven to her home, given the injection, and driven back to the hospital in time for work at 7am."

There is a body of factors suggesting that this is improbable. First, despite painstaking

inquiries, Cambridgeshire police have been unable to find any evidence to support it. Second, the time period, barely four hours, appears to rule it out, especially when coupled with the evidence that Winzar had been to bed. Mary Newell stated that the bed had been slept in; as an experienced nurse, she added, she could tell a slept-in bed when she saw one. Then there is the evidence from the scene. The television was on; McCarthy was found in a sort of sitting-up position, indicating he had not settled down to sleep; and his catheter bag was "bursting full". Normally, McCarthy awoke during the night to empty the bag; the judge had even described this point as "one of the few things perhaps which is accepted as certain in this case". So the available evidence suggests that McCarthy lapsed into unconsciousness shortly after getting on to the bed the previous night. McCarthy was paraplegic and obese; he had a catheter that routinely caused infections, and he'd complained of fatigue on the night he collapsed. Could he have died of an overwhelming infection? Winzar's legal team believe that McCarthy's death should be regarded simply as "unexplained". One day, perhaps, the answer may be found. "The answer lies out there," Winzar said to me, "out there in the world of emails and medical reports." Michael Field, her solicitor, has submitted her case to the criminal cases review commission and is hopeful that, in due course, it will be sent back to appeal again.

A year after Winzar's last appeal, the appeal court ruled in the Angela Cannings case that where a body of medical opinion held that natural causes of death could not be excluded, prosecutions for murder should not even be started unless there was "additional cogent evidence". There is none in the Winzar case. The Cannings judgment referred to infant cot-death cases; but for the helpless child in those cases, substitute the supposedly helpless adult here.

The fallacy at the heart of the prosecutions of mothers like Cannings for the deaths of their children was this: since the deaths were unexplained, murder was the only explanation. That was the most unscientific of approaches. Although science had not produced the answer, that didn't mean there wasn't one. Natural causes are always more likely than unnatural ones. Mistakenly assuming otherwise has had devastating consequences.

So Where Now For The Government's Prison Reform Agenda?

Rob Allen, Justice Gap: With a complete set of new Justice Ministers now in place, a question mark hangs over the future of the Government's prison reform agenda. Criminal justice organisations wasted no time in urging new Secretary of State Liz Truss to build on the momentum for change created by her predecessor and to take forward an approach which "will deliver local accountability, build job prospects, cut prisoner numbers, lift the aspirations of prison officers and put education and rehabilitation at the heart of our justice system".

Will she do so? Using her first full day in office to visit two London prisons was a promising signal of continuity but how might the change of personnel and post Brexit politics affect the development of penal policy? As things stand, this spring's Queen's speech will continue to define the government's programme, with a promise to legislate to reform prisons and courts "to give individuals a second chance". The Prison and Courts Reform Bill will be designed to give prison governors "unprecedented freedom and they will be able to ensure prisoners receive better education. Old and inefficient prisons will be closed and new institutions built where prisoners can be put more effectively to work". The day before his departure, Michael Gove told the Justice Select Committee to expect a White paper in the autumn and the bill, (possibly in draft form) in the New Year.

There no reason that Ms Truss and her team shouldn't deliver on that timetable but they will want to make their mark on the proposals. Back in 2011, in a book she co-authored with four other

new MP's, Ms Truss wrote that "we are not ashamed to say that prisons should be tough, unpleasant and uncomfortable places. That's the point of them". To be fair, After the Coalition: a Conservative Agenda for Britain also argued for constructive prison regimes that promote work, training and alcohol and drug rehabilitation, but made clear these should be strict "to promote some measure of discipline". Expect therefore a harder edge to the reforms with access to rehabilitation contingent on good behaviour or a wider range of punishments for those who don't comply.

There is still a lack of clarity about what level of autonomy the Governors of so called Reform Prisons will actually be able to enjoy. Gove promised to send the Justice Committee a list of the Prison service Instructions and Orders which these six Governors are permitted to ignore. New ministers may feel the need to take a close look at it in case they are allowing "prisoners to be treated in a way that reflect the normal life of freedom that all citizens generally enjoy"- an approach which despite being part of international norms and standards, appeared to disturb Ms Truss and her co-authors in 2011.

Expect too a close look at Mr Gove's plans however tentative to reduce the prison population. After the Coalition argued that public confidence needed to be restored to the justice system "by seeking longer, tougher prison sentences" and by changing early release requirements which see offenders "frequently let out far too early". Unless she has changed her views, Ms Truss's appointment may spell bad news for IPP prisoners and those who might have benefitted from greater opportunities for release on temporary licence. When he last answered Justice Questions, Gove agreed with Bob Neill MP that his reforms were part of a broader change to the criminal justice system, "and part of that is diverting people from custody when appropriate". The new Secretary of State may not agree.

In their book, Ms Truss and colleagues wanted longer sentences not only to protect the public but to provide greater opportunities for rehabilitation. They argued that these could be made affordable by freeing up prison space through deporting foreign criminals and making the NHS take responsibility for the significant proportion of prisoners who are seriously mentally ill. The first of these proposals could well be made more difficult by Brexit and while some of the millions a week for health promised by Leave campaigners could conceivably be used to fund the second, it seems a long shot.

Indeed, the likely squeeze on public spending and fall in property prices could well force the Treasury to revisit the £1.3 billion prison modernisation programme. Only Holloway and Kennett have been confirmed for closure with decisions on new sites yet to be finalised. Expect a significantly diluted plan to emerge later in the year. The new secure schools being proposed by Charlie Taylor's youth justice review will most likely go the way of the Secure College abandoned by Gove a year ago. In his last appearance at the Justice Committee, Gove was asked if things go wrong in the reform prisons, where accountability lies. With me, he replied. Now Gove has gone, his successor must decide whether to reply in the same way, not only in respect of the prisons but the broader policy context in which they sit.

Activists Win Damages Against City Police For False Imprisonment

Diane Taylor, Guardian: Eleven activists who took part in G20 protests seven years ago have received more than £60,000 in damages from the City of London police for false imprisonment, assault and breaches of the Human Rights Act. The case has raised serious questions about who owns personal data collected by police. The protesters, known as the Space Hijackers, took part in the April 2009 protests. The group, which disbanded in 2014, described itself as "anarchitects" who organised various protests highlighting public space issues. Its

actions included a party on the Circle line of the underground with a mobile bar and sound system and restoring public benches to spaces they had been removed from. The 11 activists were charged with impersonating police officers and wearing police uniform with intent to deceive, although the fake police uniforms and fake lorry they used bore very little resemblance to those of real officers. They were bailed to appear at City of London magistrates court in September 2009. All 11 pleaded not guilty and a trial was scheduled for February 2010. However, two weeks before the trial, all charges were dropped against them because "there was not enough evidence to provide a realistic prospect of conviction". Each protester has received between £4,650 and £7,050 and an agreement from the police that their names and biometric data would be removed from police records.

Their solicitor, Susie Labinjoh from the law firm Hodge Jones & Allen, said: "There has been an ongoing wrangle between the arresting forces, Metropolitan police and City of London police as to who was responsible for owning the DNA, fingerprints and photos, ensuring that local records were destroyed and that the police national computer records were deleted. "In the end we had to obtain consent to the destruction from both forces as neither could decide who owned the data. It took over 18 months before the records were finally removed." Labinjoh said the arrest of the Space Hijackers was "utterly ridiculous" given that they looked nothing like real police officers. "These arrests were a complete waste of public money and police resources," she added. A statement from the Space Hijackers said: "We always refuted these ridiculous claims on the part of the police and the Crown Prosecution Service and invited people to look over the past 10 years of our work, which the police were well aware of, to see that we have a long history of parody, dressing up and winding up the powers that be."

The commissioner of the City of London police, Ian Dyson, wrote to the 11 activists saying: "I accept the Crown Prosecution Service finding in discontinuing the criminal prosecution against you that there was no longer sufficient evidence for a realistic prospect of conviction. I regret that the standard of the treatment you received from the force [on 1 April 2009] did not meet with your expectations and I am committed to continuously improving the service we provide, to ensure public trust and confidence are maintained." Leah Borromeo, a journalist, film-maker and artist who worked with the Space Hijackers and received one of the payouts from the City of London force, said: "The settlement was token and their apology a non-apology. If they were truly apologetic, then they would not have resisted compensation claims and not dragged out the process over years and they would have actively taken a lead in working out ways to restructure police culture that stamp out the impunity and entitlement with which they act."

What Does Theresa May's Record as Home Secretary Tell Us? *Alan Travis, Guardian*

Much has been made in recent days of Theresa May's reforming zeal, as one of Britain's longest serving home secretaries, in taking on the police, scaling back the racially divisive use of stop and search and facing down the US government over the deportation of computer hacker Gary McKinnon. But these undoubted liberal moments and the promise of future achievements as a "One Nation" reformer on the steps of Downing Street have obscured a much stronger underlying record as a tough Tory traditionalist home secretary. She was simply more Michael Howard than Roy Jenkins, albeit in a modern setting.

Her six years at the Home Office were marked by an instinctive secrecy, a talent for "going missing" or delegating when things went wrong, and a too careless approach to civil liberties.Her capacity to make herself scarce at key moments of political danger peaked during the referendum

campaign. Her minimal public contribution not only failed to defend her record on immigration but instead focused on her personal pledge to withdraw from the European convention on human rights to demonstrate that she was a wafer-thin remainer. So what in May's record as home secretary justifies this somewhat darker reading that she is not quite as nice as she looks, and do any of her previously frustrated plans hint at what she might do now she is prime minister?

Extremism and Free Speech: Just before the last general election, May set out her own personal "wish-list" to reform counter-extremism strategy. It was met by objections from no fewer than six other Tory cabinet ministers and agreement has yet to be reached on a long-delayed but promised counter-extremism bill. ay's plan included "extremism disruption orders" designed to be used against non-violent "individual extremists who incite hatred". The conditions promise to include banning such individuals from broadcasting and her speech promised to give Ofcom more powers to take action against extremist broadcasts. Leaked cabinet correspondence showed that what she really wanted to do was have Ofcom vet British television programmes before they were broadcast. Her then culture secretary, Sajid Javid, told her it would amount to state censorship and an attack on freedom of expression. The most recent extremism strategy paper suggested that she had backed down on this and Ofcom rules will only required broadcasters to ensure extremists are challenged on air. However, May is committed to conducting a new "counter-ideology campaign at pace and scale" to combat Islamist extremism and the issue could be reopened again.

Surveillance: In May's first 100 days as home secretary in 2010, she introduced legislation to scrap Labour's £4.5bn national identity card scheme, saying it would be the "first step of many that this government is taking to reduce the control of the state over decent, law-abiding people". A Protection of Freedoms Act also followed, but Charles Farr – whose influence was rapidly growing – and his office for security and counter-terrorism were soon pushing for the introduction of what became the first version of the snooper's charter – the draft communications bill. May embraced it fully but it was torpedoed by Nick Clegg. When whistleblower Edward Snowden disclosed in the Guardian the scale of GCHQ bulk harvesting programmes of everyone's confidential digital data, she responded by accusing him of damaging national security. Her legislative response, the investigatory powers bill, now going through parliament, does provide a new legal and oversight framework for those mass state surveillance programmes but it also extends them to track and store for 12 months, everyone's web browsing histories.

Immigration and Refugees: Her most recent Immigration Act was designed in her words "to create a hostile environment" for illegal migrants by a package of measures including requiring landlords to check on the immigration status of all prospective tenants. This culminated in the infamous Operation Vaken "Go Home" vans touring immigrant communities and as a result of which only 11 people actually left the country. When the net migration figures came out – as they do every three months – May always sent out her immigration minister, James Brokenshire, to explain why they had failed yet again to deliver the promised deep cuts in net migration. In cabinet, she blamed the rest of the government for giving up on tackling rising immigration and turned down their pleas to remove overseas students from the target. But she pressed ahead with immigration policies that including splitting up an estimated 33,000 families in Britain because they don't earn enough and refused to put any time limit on the detention of immigration detainees.

As far as refugees are concerned, Britain has already left the European Union. May refused to take part in any of the EU relocation or resettlement scheme and was a key player in last year's decision to withdraw British support for proactive naval search and rescue missions

in the Mediterranean on the grounds it would encourage other to make the dangerous journey. Instead she has focused on providing aid to refugees in countries neighbouring Syria. She hinted at an even tougher approach to asylum at the last Conservative party conference, saying she wanted to allow those recognised as refugees only a temporary stay in Britain.

Policing and Crime: She dispelled any notion of a liberal approach to policing and crime when she "joked" about Ken Clarke's approach as justice secretary: "I lock them up. He lets them out," she said. The political impact of a 20% cut in Whitehall funding for police budgets has been blunted by the continuing fall in the overall crime rate in England and Wales. Figures published for the first time this Thursday about the scale of online crime may tarnish that achievement. She pushed through important reforms in policing, especially on child abuse, rape and violence against women and girls and initiating inquiries into historical injustices including Hillsborough. But her flagship reform of elected police and crime commissioners has not captured the public imagination and even she has acknowledged that their impact has been mixed. Her last act as home secretary was to kick into the long grass a possible inquiry into the 1984 "battle of Orgreave".

Human Rights: May has made denouncing the Human Rights Act and demanding Britain's withdrawal from the European convention on human rights a major theme of her Tory party conference speeches while she was home secretary. During her only press questioning after her only leadership campaign speech she appeared to drop this hardline stance but was in fact careful only to say that "no parliamentary majority exists for it". That means she is likely to go into the next election pledged to Britain's withdrawal from the European convention on human rights – which would leave Britain as the only European country in the same position as the pariah state of Belarus.

Eddie Gilfoyle to Keep on Fighting After Watchdog Rejects Case

Jon Robins, Justice Gap: The family of Eddie Gilfoye has promised to fight on after the miscarriage of justice watchdog rejected the latest attempt to overturn his conviction. It has been more than five years since the Criminal Cases Review Commission was presented with new evidence raising serious questions about the safety of the 54 year old's conviction for murdering his wife in 1992. A statement from his lawyers Birnberg Peirce & Partners, said that this latest development was 'far from the end of Eddie Gilfoyle's fight to clear his name'. 'Eddie will want to to make an informed decision and is faced with the potential of taking on the CCRC in addition to every organ of the legal system to get justice. It's regrettable but maybe in the wider interests of others for him to do so.'

The case is one of the highest profile alleged miscarriage of justices in recent years. Paula Gilfoyle was discovered hanging from a beam in the garage of their home in Upton, on the Wirral. She was eight and a half months pregnant and seemingly happy. The jury in the trial was told that pregnant women don't kill themselves and, instead, accepted that Gilfoyle tricked his wife into writing a suicide note, persuaded her to climb a step ladder up and put her head in the noose. The CCRC's decision to reject the application, apparently consisting of more than 2,000 pages a fresh argument, comes as a shock in a case which attracted unease about safety of the initial conviction from the start and which appeared to have almost completely unraveled over the last couple of years leaving a police cover-up exposed.

It has been almost six years since dramatic evidence emerged undermining Paula as the happy-go-lucky young woman presented to the jury. In August 2010 Gilfoyle's solicitor Matt Foot came across a padlocked metal box containing her diaries whilst going through unused exhibits at a local police station. The diaries were withheld from the original defence and revealed a complicated

past including a previous suicide attempt, plus the suicide threat of her first boyfriend Mark Roberts who was convicted of rape and murder. In 2012 it emerged that that the initial botched investigation had not come about by accident but was the result of a deliberate policy. The coroner's officer was first on the scene effectively, taking control and, in doing so, losing vital evidence – he had told more senior detectives 'there's nothing for you' – as a result of a highly unusual local policy whereby the police control room called out the coroner's officer in all cases of the suspicious death.

Last month there were yet more revelations this time eroding the integrity of the original police investigation. The Times, which has championed the case since Gilfoyle's release in December 2010, reported a 'police cover-up exposed 23 years after husband's murder trial'. 'Has a more tangled web ever been weaved by British police than that around the case of Eddie Gilfoyle?' asked investigations editor Dominic Kennedy. There was an appeal in 1995 followed by a second appeal on the referral of the CCRC in 2000. The Commission has long been under fire for its inaction on the Gilfoyle case. The House of Commons' justice committee in last year's report into the CCRC quoted Paul May, who chaired the Birmingham Six campaign and has run many miscarriage campaigns, calling the delay a 'disgrace'.

The recent rejection of the case has stunned those watching the Gilfoyle case which appeared to be gathering unstoppable momentum. In the last few weeks high profile long term supporters of Gilfoyle have spoken out about the case. Alison Halford, the assistant chief constable of Merseyside Police at the time of Mrs Gilfoyle's death, last month described the new revelations as 'sickening'. 'Eddie Gilfoyle's life has been ruined,' she told the Liverpool Echo. 'Merseyside Police have lied, and lied, and withheld evidence. Someone has to be held accountable. It makes me feel sick.' Lord Hunt, Gilfoyle's former MP, this month wrote to the then Home Secretary, now prime minister Theresa May to intervene. 'This is becoming a long-running saga of cover-up after cover-up,' said Hunt, who has been convinced of Gilfoyle's innocence for years. 'The home secretary should lift the lid on what has been a catalogue of errors resulting in the most unjust conviction of anybody in my 40 years in Parliament.'

'This is far from the end of Eddie Gilfoyle's fight to clear his name. There will never be an end to when someone like Eddie is wrongly convicted. Eddie has had to fight systems failure within the legal system, his case has now become a sad example of systems failure of the CCRC. Eddie will want to to make an informed decision and is faced with the potential of taking on the CCRC in addition to every organ of the legal system to get justice. It's regrettable but maybe in the wider interests of others for him to do so.' Statement released through Birnberg Peirce & Partners

Call for Prison Brain Screening

The National Prisoner Healthcare Network has called for a pilot study to be set up to examine the practicality and validity of introducing screening for head injury in prison to identify prisoners who may have committed crimes because of historic injuries. Research has shown that the risk of violent crime is more than three times higher among those with a history of brain injury than the general population - and that it can also reduce tolerance to alcohol. It is also known that prevalence of a history of admission to hospital with a head injury is significantly higher in prisoners than in the general population. While currently prisoners do receive a medical assessment on arrival at jail, the signs of brain injury may not be apparent even to doctors during the routine assessment. The Network also called for NHS services in prisons and local brain injury services to work together more closely, and for setting up a secure brain injury rehabilitation unit in Scotland for prisoners to be considered. The Scottish Prison Service said new work was being taken forward to train staff to spot prisoners whose behaviour may be affected by a past brain injury.

"There is a simple and unpalatable truth about far too many of our prisons. They have become unacceptably violent and dangerous places" *Peter Clarke HMCIP*

HM Chief Inspector of Prisons for England and Wales Annual Report 2015/16

This is my first annual report since being appointed HM Chief Inspector of Prisons. I am privileged to lead a skilled and dedicated team in HM Inspectorate of Prisons who take great pride in their work, their independence, their values and their focus on the personal experiences of those held in detention. Our many and varied stakeholders hold the Inspectorate in very high regard. My predecessor, Nick Hardwick, can take pride in his achievements at the Inspectorate, and I wish him well in his future endeavours.

I took up post on 1 February 2016, and as a consequence of the inevitable delay between an inspection taking place and the publication of the report, all of the inspection activity referred to in this annual report took place under my predecessor. The reports of those inspections have all now been published and are available on our website.

In my first few months as Chief Inspector I have tried to visit and inspect as many prisons, secure training centres, young offender institutions and immigration removal centres as possible. I have found that the grim situation referred to by Nick Hardwick in his report last year has not improved, and in some key areas it has, if anything, become even worse. This is despite a slight upturn in our assessments of adult prisons and young offender institutions.

Any improvement is welcome, but it is far too soon to say whether these improvements will be maintained. They are, in any event, still at historically low levels, and in all bar one area far below where they were five years ago. Year on year comparisons are also notoriously tricky as we do not inspect the same institutions each year, and we deliberately skew our inspection programme towards those places where we assess the risk to be greatest. These are usually announced rather than unannounced inspections, designed to help the establishment make improvements within a short timeframe. There is thus a risk in placing reliance in year on year comparisons.

What I have seen is that despite the sterling efforts of many who work in the Prison Service at all levels, there is a simple and unpalatable truth about far too many of our prisons. They have become unacceptably violent and dangerous places. During 2015 there were over 20,000 assaults in our prisons, an increase of some 27% over the previous year. As if that were not bad enough, within that huge increase, serious assaults have risen by even more, by 31%, up to nearly 3,000. It is hardly surprising that in the face of this surge in violence, the number of apparent homicides between April 2015 and March 2016 rose from four to six. In the face of this upsurge in violence, we should not forget the dangers faced by staff who work in our prisons and other places of detention. The tragic death of court escort officer Lorraine Barwell, killed by a prisoner at Blackfriars Crown Court in June 2015, serves as a stark reminder of this.

The picture in respect of self-harm and suicide is equally shocking. Over 32,000 incidents of self-harm in 2015 is an increase of 25% on the previous calendar year, and the tragic total of 100 selfinflicted deaths between April 2015 and March 2016 marks a 27% increase.

It is clear that a large part of this violence is linked to the harm caused by new psychoactive substances (NPS) which are having a dramatic and destabilising effect in many of our prisons. In December 2015 we published our thematic report Changing patterns of substance misuse in adult prisons and service responses. The report pointed out that these synthetic substances, often known as 'Spice' or 'Mamba,' were becoming ever more prevalent in prisons and exacerbating problems of debt, bullying, self-harm and violence. The effects of these drugs can be unpredictable and extreme. Their use can be linked to attacks on other prisoners and staff,

self-inflicted deaths, serious illness and life-changing self-harm. The Prisons and Probation Ombudsman has recently identified 39 deaths in prisons between June 2013 and June 2015 that can be linked to the use of NPS. The situation has shown no signs of improvement since June 2015; in fact quite the reverse, and tragically the death toll will inevitably rise.

During my visits to prisons I have met prisoners who have 'self-segregated' in order to escape the violence caused by these substances, and I have talked with members of staff who have described the terrifying effects they can have on those who take them. Some prisons are making every effort to mitigate the impact of these drugs by trying to disrupt the supply routes and lessen demand for them through education and targeted interventions. However, in other places the response has been more patchy, with no clear strategy in place.

On a national level, while various aspects of the problem are being addressed, through, for example, criminalising possession of the products and the better use of testing and detection technologies, the simple fact remains that there is, as yet, no overall national strategy for dealing with the problem. I have been told by a member of staff in a local prison that too many prison leaders regard the problem as just another iteration of the long-standing problem of drugs in prisons. He told me in no uncertain terms that this was wrong. In many years of working in prisons he had seen nothing like it before. We have seen how NPS-fuelled instability has restricted the ability of staff to get prisoners safely to and from education, training and other activities. The implications of this for a reform programme based on enhancing the role of education in rehabilitation and resettlement should be obvious.

In my first few months I have also been struck by the sheer number of people in various forms of detention who are clearly contending with mental health issues. There can be no substitute for professional assessment, diagnosis and treatment, but if as a layman I may make an observation it is this: I have seen for myself that sometimes those with the most severe issues find themselves being subjected to the most severe treatment. All too often those who cannot be accommodated on a wing, either for their own safety or that of their fellow prisoners, find themselves housed in the segregation unit. There, the conditions are often such that by internationally recognised standards they would be classified as solitary confinement. At one prison where this was happening, I was told that it was because there were no secure beds available elsewhere. No one could sensibly argue that a segregation unit is a therapeutic environment or a suitable place to hold such people.

These three issues of violence, drugs and mental health will, on many occasions, find themselves intertwined. They are, in turn, compounded by the perennial problems of overcrowding, poor physical environments in ageing prisons, and inadequate staffing. The fact that I shall not explore these issues in depth in this introduction does not mean that I do not attach great importance to them. They are inextricably linked to, and indeed to some extent underpin what I might describe as the strategic threats posed by NPS, violence and the prevalence of mental illness in our prisons.

In contrast with much of the men's prison estate it is reassuring to be able to report that outcomes for prisoners in the two women's prisons inspected during the year were impressive. Three of the four areas of our healthy prison tests covered in those inspections were judged to be good or reasonably good in both prisons, although Holloway continued to struggle in delivering meaningful purposeful activity. Holloway has, of course, now closed, and it is to be hoped that the standards that are now widespread across the women's estate will be replicated or indeed improved on in the facilities to which the women move.

Perhaps some of the most troubling findings and incidents in the past year have been

in relation to those places where children are detained. We inspected five young offender institutions and two secure training centres, with an additional unscheduled visit to a secure training centre. Section 5 should be required reading for anyone who is in any doubt as to whether the current arrangements for the detention of children are satisfactory. Four out of the five young offender institutions that we inspected were found to be not sufficiently good in the area of safety. This had a knock on effect on purposeful activity, as a result of which education and training opportunities suffered. Children are being kept locked in their cells for far too much of the day. They are frequently getting insufficient fresh air and exercise. As with my layman's view of mental health issues in adult prisons, my first impression from an inspection of a young offender institution (not included in this report) was that many of the boys were not thriving physically. To my eyes, many of them looked unhealthy.

Early in 2016 allegations emerged in a BBC Panorama programme of mistreatment and abuse of children at Medway secure training centre. A team from HM Inspectorate of Prisons and Ofsted immediately deployed to Medway and took steps to ensure that the children in detention there were being properly safeguarded. An Improvement Board was installed by the Secretary of State and as a result of its later, highly critical report, the centre is no longer run by G4S, but has reverted to direct management by the National Offender Management Service (NOMS). At the time of writing we are awaiting a review of the youth justice system being carried out by Charlie Taylor. Clearly there is a need for fundamental change in order to create safe and purposeful detention for children. Meanwhile, HM Inspectorate of Prisons will maintain the momentum of its inspection programme of children's detention in 2016–17, with no easing back in the face of budgetary pressures, as had at one stage been envisaged.

During our inspections of immigration detention, perhaps the most shocking discovery was in Dover. While inspecting the immigration detention facilities there during summer 2015, inspectors found that another detention facility was being used for short-term detention of migrants who had sought to evade border controls. This was in a facility known as the Longport Freight Shed. We had not previously been notified of this facility, and the conditions that inspectors found when they insisted on visiting were totally unacceptable, even for fairly short periods of detention. Even after several months of use, conditions had not improved. The fact that the freight shed had been used at all to house detainees and that little, if anything, was done to improve matters over the course of the summer, betrays a shocking lack of contingency planning and agile response to a developing, although entirely predictable, situation. The facility has since been closed, and I have been assured that if such a situation arises again, we will be notified so that proper independent scrutiny can take place. A further inspection in the immigration detention estate that gave cause for great concern was at Yarl's Wood immigration removal centre. The issues at this establishment were serious, and we have therefore included a specific case study in Section 6 of this report.

We have been encouraged by Parliamentary committees and others to improve the impact of the Inspectorate, and this is an ambition to which I am fully committed. Following an inspection, an establishment is expected to complete an action plan in response to our recommendations. 'Action plan' is, in too many cases, a misnomer. I have seen poorly performing prisons where their implementation of previous inspection recommendations has been woeful. It is therefore hardly surprising that they have either failed to improve or actually deteriorated. As part of the prison reform programme, individual establishments and government departments alike should be placed under an obligation either to accept recommendations, or to

set out very clearly why a recommendation will not or cannot be implemented. These explanations should then be open to public and Parliamentary scrutiny.

HM Inspectorate of Prisons repeatedly asserts its independence from government and others, and it is right that it should do so. But true independence is about more than simply making an assertion. We must be able to report exactly what we find. My distinguished predecessor Lord Ramsbotham has written that 'My orders were to report what I saw.' In essence that is still the case. HM Inspectorate of Prisons neither validates nor criticises government policy, except insofar as it affects the conditions and treatment of prisoners.

Uniquely we focus on the prisoner experience. We make our judgements based on international human rights standards, in support of the UK's treaty obligations. The Inspectorate is not a regulator in the sense of having powers to enforce standards. Our power comes from the ability to publish our reports, persuade the unwilling, encourage the good and expose that which is unacceptable. We will continue to report what we see. *Peter Clarke HMCIP*

Prison Reform Trust Summer 2016 Report

The Prison Reform Trust an independent UK charity working to create a just, humane and effective penal system. They monitor prison conditions, whilst working to reduce unnecessary imprisonment, improve treatments for prisoners and their families and promote equality and human rights in the justice system. They have recently released their Summer 2016 Briefing, highlighting the state of the penal system. Amongst the eye-catching statistics are: • On 17 June 2016, the prison population in England and Wales was 84,405 – a rise of 92% since 1993 • England and Wales have the highest imprisonment rate in Western Europe, locking up 147 people per 100,000 of the population • Over two-thirds (68%) of under 18 year olds are reconvicted within a year of release • People were held for 44 months beyond tariff on average • One in ten people (10,897) remanded in custody were subsequently acquitted • "This report shows the justice secretary where she must begin on prison reform. Making prisons safe for everyone who lives and works in them is the absolute priority and the necessary bedrock for longer term change. She must urgently solve the mismatch between the demand on the prison service and the resources available to meet it. Realistically, that means reducing the number of prisoners so that prisons can return to being places where staff and prisoners can rebuild the relationships on which security, safety and rehabilitation all depend."

How Will Human Rights Fare Under New PM Theresa May?

Theresa May has been sworn in as Prime Minister of the United Kingdom, prompting speculation about the impact her leadership will have on human rights. The former Home Secretary has been a vocal and long-standing critic of the Human Rights Act. In a 2011 speech she insisted that the legislation "needs to go", making controversial reference to what legal commentators argued was a "mythical example" of an immigrant who could not be deported because "he had a pet cat". Her appointment of Liz Truss as Justice Secretary, who has previously spoken out against the HRA, suggests that the Government will continue with plans to replace the Act with a British Bill of Rights.

Nonetheless, it appears that the UK will remain a signatory to the European Convention on Human Rights, at least in the near future. During her campaign to be Prime Minister, Theresa May stated that she would not pursue pulling out of the ECHR, describing the issue as divisive and lacking majority support in Parliament. Amnesty International have said that they "warmly welcome" this commitment, and have called on the Prime Minister to "turn the corner on human rights" in the UK. In an examination of "Theresa May's Eight Human Rights

Highs and Lows", RightsInfo has noted that in 2012 May "came out strongly in support of the proposal to change the law so people of the same sex could marry". Pink News charts her evolution on LGBT rights to become the "unsung hero" of equal marriage, while pointing out criticisms that conditions for LGBT asylum-seekers have worsened under her tenure as Home Secretary. On the issue of freedom of religion, commentators have similarly looked to Teresa May's actions as Home Secretary for an indication of her position.

Brain Dead

A man has been accused of using a stolen human brain to get high. Joshua Long, 26, was charged with abuse of a corpse after a relative discovered a human brain stuffed into a WalMart bag. Mr Long, who is already in jail awaiting trial for a string of burglary offences, allegedly admitted to his aunt that he and a friend used the embalming fluids from the brain, which they nicknamed "Freddy", to enhance their marijuana smoking experience. He and another man, who lived in the trailer where the brain was found, used the formaldehyde in the brain to create "wet" marijuana. Mr Long's friend is currently wanted for his role in the burglaries. According to the US Drug Enforcement Agency, soaking marijuana in embalming fluids is an "emerging drug trend" among teenagers and adolescents. The use of the extremely carcinogenic fluids has a hallucinogenic effect and can even function as an aphrodisiac for women. But the DEA says most offenders source their fluid from morgues, funeral homes, or from companies over the Internet. Mr Long's use of a human brain is a bizarre and unique deviation from the norm. Ironically, the drug is reputed to cause permanent brain damage.

Met 'May be Overly Targeting BAME Youths as Gang Members'

Vikram Dodd, Guardian: The Metropolitan police may be overly targeting black and ethnic minority youths as gang members, resulting in them being treated more harshly by the courts, prisons and justice system, a review has found. The concerns centre on figures showing nearly 90% of youths classed as gang members by Britain's largest force are black or from other ethnic minority backgrounds (BAME) – which is considerably in excess of their proportion in the population. The review is being led by the Labour MP David Lammy and was ordered by David Cameron when he was prime minister. The work continues despite the change in Downing Street. Concerns centre around the Met's database of gang suspects, called the gangs matrix. Figures for 2016 show that of the 3,626 people listed on that database, 78% were black and a further 9% were from other ethnic minority backgrounds. Ethnic minorities make up 40% of London's population.

The figures cover people known to be in a gang, suspected of involvement, or at risk of joining a gang. Lammy said the effects are that someone can get a longer sentence and be treated more harshly throughout the criminal justice system. In a speech, he said some cases may be mistaken, with youths wrongly labelled as gang members not knowing how to be cleared of the stigma. Speaking in London last Friday 15/06/2016, Lammy gave the first clues as to the direction in which his review is heading. He said: "We have, therefore, a journey through the system in which suspected gang membership can affect decisions at each turn, from charging, to conviction, to sentencing, to treatment in prison and rehabilitation in the community. "And we have the gang matrix as the source of much of the information used by other actors in the justice system. Prisoners I have spoken to in both adult prisons and youth offending institutions have often been frank about their involvement in criminality. But the same people have often also been insistent that they were mislabelled as gang members by the police and then subsequently by the rest of the justice system."

For the Met's figures to be correct, there would have to be 360 white gang members across all of London's 32 boroughs. The issue was referenced by Theresa May when she took office last Wednesday. In her speech outside 10 Downing Street she highlighted racial discrimination in the justice system and said: "If you're black, you're treated more harshly by the criminal justice system than if you're white." Lammy gave the example of a parent who adopted one black and one white child. Both got into trouble and enmeshed into the criminal justice system. "But it was the black child who had wrongly been tagged with the label of 'gang member' and the label had stuck," the MP said. "The parent and his adopted son had no idea how to remove the label – and his name from the gangs matrix." Lammy added: "One member of a youth offending team told me that her team would routinely make decisions based on the information they were given about gang membership. "Decisions, she said, were being made without challenging where the information came from, or whether it was reliable and up to date." The full report is expected to be given to May early next year. Lammy's inquiry is being staffed and supported by civil servants in a sign of how seriously the government is taking it. Lammy said gang members carry out half of all shootings in the capital and he said many victims came from ethnic minority backgrounds. But the MP added: "But the concern I have heard – repeatedly I must say – is that young people from ethnic minority backgrounds are also being tagged with the 'gang' label in ways they do not feel is justified; and that this tag can have real consequences for the way the criminal justice system deals with those individuals." Lammy is the MP for Tottenham and Wood Green – the seat of riots in 2011 that spread to become the worst in modern English history. Cameron's claims that gangs were behind the disturbances was overplayed, with strained relations with police and other social factors playing a part. Lammy said: "When four in five people on the gangs matrix are black – and that database currently informs decisions throughout the criminal justice system – it is something that someone in my position has a duty to scrutinise closely."

Inspection of HMYOI Wetherby & Keppel unit – Is it Fit for Purpose?

HMYOI Wetherby held 272 boys at the time of this inspection, and with a certified normal accommodation of 336 was therefore not overcrowded. The inspection also included the Keppel unit, located within the overall perimeter of the YOI, but physically separated from it. The Keppel unit, opened in 2008, is intended to provide an appropriately safe and supportive environment for some of the most challenging and vulnerable young people in the country. It is a national facility, and is the only unit of its kind in the secure estate. Previous inspections have reported very positively on the Keppel unit, and indeed the last inspection noted that it 'now provided a model of how a specialist unit should be run'. There is much that is positive about both Wetherby and Keppel, but there are also some serious concerns about the deterioration in outcomes for the boys in some key areas. I would encourage readers to look at the detail of this report, as not to do so would run the risk of failing to appreciate the many examples of very good and positive things that some extremely committed staff are delivering for the benefit of those in their care. However, there is no escaping the fact that outcomes for the boys have declined dramatically in the area of 'purposeful activity', and the lack of proper recording practices makes it impossible for us to be assured that there are not serious failing in other areas.

For instance, when looking at the subject of 'safety', inspectors found that although the available information showed that force had been used on 437 occasions during the six months prior to the inspection, slightly less than at comparable establishments, records were far from complete. Nearly 300 documents were missing at the time of the report, making it impossible to determine with accuracy the level and extent of the use of force. This becomes even more con-

cerning when one considers that planned interventions were rarely filmed, body-worn cameras underused and the review processes after the use of force were patchy. We were also concerned to find that pain inducing techniques and strip search while under restraint had been used. Perhaps it is no coincidence that at the previous inspection in January 2015 we made 21 recommendations in the area of 'safety', but found that only one had been fully achieved.

If poor operational practice, as seen during this inspection is to be put into a meaningful context and not simply ascribed to day to day failings, it is important to understand how and why it has been allowed to take root. At Wetherby there have clearly been difficulties in the relationship between the establishment and the Youth Justice Board. This was played out in disagreements as to how the new core day could or should be implemented. The new standardised core day was designed by NOMS, based on a number of building blocks proposed by the YJB, and signed off by the YOI Reform Project. Despite this there were clearly serious issues between the YJB and management at Wetherby about whether it was fit for purpose, and the governor had implemented an alternative core day that did not meet the needs of the young people. The result has been that the regime had been applied inconsistently and unpredictably, leading to many boys having insufficient time out of their cells, not being able to attend education or other activities, not always being able to have 30 minutes exercise each day, and having to eat their breakfasts locked in their cells.

The impact this was having on the boys' ability to access the undoubtedly good education on offer at Wetherby and in the Keppel unit, was all too easy to see, and sits behind the declines in our assessment of purposeful activity in this report. For instance, in the Keppel unit we found that 31% of boys were locked in their cells during key work periods, when at the last inspection it had been 0%. Getting the boys to education was not sufficiently prioritised, and exercise was limited to 30 minutes each day, weather permitting. The simple fact has to be faced, that despite the best efforts of dedicated teachers, with the quality of teaching, training, learning and assessment judged by Ofsted inspectors to be 'goodoverall effectiveness of learning and skills and work was graded by those same inspectors as 'inadequate', because the overall provision was poorly managed. With overall attendance at classes sitting at around 66%, this outcome was sadly inevitable.

I have to return to the subject of the relationship between Wetherby management and the Youth Justice Board. There were clearly serious issues between them about whether the new core day was fit for purpose at Wetherby. At the time of the inspection the relationship was clearly fractured, although I was told that efforts were being made to move things forward so that a core day more specifically tailored to Wetherby's need could be agreed. In meetings with both the governor and her team, I was left in no doubt as to the sense of frustration they felt at the situation. I make no comment on whether one party or the other is to blame for what has happened. However, there is clearly a shared responsibility to improve the relationship and ensure that the children in custody at Wetherby and in the Keppel unit are not the ones left to suffer as a result of disagreements over policy and operational practice. As it stood at the time of our inspection, there was a clear linkage between the failure to deliver the new core day, the lack of priority afforded to education and training, and the consequent declines in outcomes for the young people. In particular, it is sad to see that the Keppel unit, once famed for its groundbreaking approach to supporting the most challenging boys held in the custodial estate, was at the time of the inspection failing to deliver the educational outcomes that had previously been its hallmark. 39 recommendations from the last report were not achieved and 10 only partly achieved. Inspectors made 80 recommendations at this inspection. Inspection took place 22 February – 4 March 2016, Peter Clarke HMCIP May 2016

Sex With Benefits

A US benefits claimant trying to check his benefit balance was shocked to be put through to a premium sex line when he rang the number on the back of his electronic benefit card. In an unfortunate misprint on some cards the number provided put callers through to a live chat line. The Maine Department of Health and Human Services said it was aware the number was wrong by one digit. When LJ Langelier, 25, called the number before taking his son shopping, a recorded voice gave him an unexpected invitation: "Welcome to America's hottest talk line. Ladies, to talk with interesting and exciting guys free, press one now. It played over my car speaker, I was like, 'Wow, I must have messed that number up somehow really bad'," he told the Bangor Daily News. "I look at the card, I dial it the exact same way again, and it keeps happening. I thought it was just hilarious." When he checked with friends, they turned out to have the same misprint. In its defence, the human services department says the company that operates the sex line searches for phone numbers that are very similar to widely published government phone numbers and buys them to take advantage of consumers misdialling. It said the number was being corrected on all new cards.

Teenager Sues After Repeatedly Being Held Overnight in Police Cell

Owen Bowcott, Guardian: A 14-year-old boy who was repeatedly held overnight in police cells is suing the Metropolitan police and his local council over their failure to provide safer alternative accommodation. The judicial review challenge has been brought by Just For Kids Law, which is determined to prevent more than 20,000 children a year – some as young as eight – being detained by officers in what are alleged to be unsuitable and illegal locations for those under 18. The London council involved, Islington, is said at one stage to have proposed removing the teenager to secure accommodation in Northumberland or Southampton because it had nothing available locally. Keeping children overnight in police cells can contravene provisions in section 38 of the Police and Criminal Evidence Act (PACE) and section 21 of the Children Act 1989.

It is also in defiance of a letter circulated to local authority children's departments by Theresa May, then home secretary, and the former education secretary Nicky Morgan earlier this year. The letter pointed out: "Evidence suggests that the legal requirements are not being followed. The law is clear that there are very limited circumstances to justify the detention of children at police stations." It added: "Police custody can be a distressing experience and this is particularly so for children and young people in trouble." The only exemptions, according to the circular, are when it is impracticable to transfer them or where no secure local authority accommodation is available.

The Islington test case is being brought on behalf of the 14-year-old, who has not been identified. He was held three times in March and on other occasions when he spent two nights in a row in a cell; he has since been charged. The teenager has a criminal record, but none of his offences involve violence so he is said to pose no risk of serious harm to the public. Islington council declined to comment on the case. A report by the Howard League for Penal Reform found there were 86,034 overnight detentions of children under 18 between 2010 and 2011 – equivalent to more than 800 a week. Of these, 387 were primary school children.

More recent figures obtained through freedom of information (FOI) requests show that in the financial year 2014-15, more than 22,000 children – including an eight-year-old – were held in police cells overnight. A further FOI request by Just for Kids Law in May this year revealed that children were kept overnight in police custody in Islington after having been charged on 94 occasions in the past year. The No Child in Cells campaign is aimed at the broader issue of preventing children being held in police cells at any time. A 17-year-old boy told the campaign: "I felt as if I had been thrown in

a cell and left to die. I had no idea how long I would be in there. No one brought me any food or water. No blanket, thin fireproof mattress. There was a camera in the cell. "They could see you going to the toilet that was in the cell. When I was taken between cells, I could hear people yelling and banging and there were guys in full riot gear. I felt like I was in the shark pit."

Just For Kids Law argues that all children aged under 18 are vulnerable by reason of their age and require additional protection. Three years ago, the charity won a key test case when the high court found that police had acted unlawfully by failing to amend codes of practice issued under PACE ensuring that 17-year-olds in custody are treated as children, provided with appropriate adult support and that their parents are notified. Last year, the all-party parliamentary group for children published a report on custody that noted: "There continues to be no requirement for all forces to provide the Home Office with data on the number of children held in custody overnight and the number transferred to local authority accommodation, making it difficult to monitor accurately – locally or nationally – the degree to which legal obligations are being met." Shauneen Lambe, the executive director of Just for Kids Law, said: "We have been forced to issue legal proceedings against Islington council, which is one of the worst boroughs in London for detaining children overnight in police cells. Everyone agrees – including the current prime minister and the police – that cells are not fit places for children to spend the night. "We are acting in this case for a vulnerable 14-year-old boy who was kept in a cell overnight on multiple occasions in March this year because no alternative accommodation was found for him. We know this is a nationwide problem and will be taking similar action against other local authorities until this practice is stopped." Children should be held in cells only as a last resort, she believes. Lambe added: "Councils should comply with the law, and take seriously their responsibilities towards protecting children who have been arrested."

The Met said: "[The service] takes its duty of care towards children and vulnerable adults seriously. While we recognise police custody can be a daunting and intimidating experience for children, custody suites are designed to provide a safe and secure environment for detainees and our suites are regularly inspected by Her Majesty's inspectorates of constabularies and prisons. "Additional safeguards for children in custody include notifying their parent/guardian, providing appropriate adults to give extra support and more frequent welfare checks. Custody staff have received training in identifying and acting on vulnerabilities. "It is not unlawful to detain a child overnight. It may be necessary to detain a child if there is an ongoing investigation that necessitates their detention, for example to take forensic samples, or to prevent evidence being lost or destroyed. "We recognise children do get detained overnight after being charged with an offence when they should be transferred to local authority accommodation. This transfer may not happen for one of a number of reasons, which includes no available accommodation. We are working with others to reduce the number of children detained in police custody overnight."

Patel (Respondent) v Mirza (Appellant) – UKSC 2014/0218

On appeal from the Court of Appeal (Civil Division) (England and Wales)

Mr Patel (the respondent) transferred £620,000 to Mr Mirza (the appellant) so that Mr Mirza could use it to bet on share price movements based on inside information. Insider dealing is illegal under Part V of the Criminal Justice Act 1993. The inside information was not forthcoming and the agreement was not carried out. Mr Patel has not received the money back from Mr Mirza. In his pleadings at first instance (basing his claim on unjust enrichment and/or a Quistclose trust), Mr Patel set out the facts of the illegal agreement. This appeal considers whether the respondent is entitled to recover money transferred to the appellant in furtherance of a contract entered into for an illegal purpose from which the respondent only withdrew

once it could no longer be performed. The Supreme Court unanimously dismisses Mr Mirza's appeal. Mr Patel is entitled to restitution of the £620,000 which he paid to Mr Mirza.

Reasons For The Judgment: Lord Mansfield said in Holman v Johnson (1775) 1 Cowp 341, 343 that "no court will lend its aid to a man who founds his cause of action upon an immoral or an illegal act" [1]. Behind this maxim, there are two broad policy reasons for the common law doctrine of illegality as a defence to a civil claim. First, a person should not be allowed to profit from his own wrongdoing. Second, the law should be coherent and not self-defeating, condoning illegality by giving with the left hand what it takes with the right hand [99]. The reliance test expressed in Tinsley v Milligan [1994] 1 AC 340 bars the claimant if he/she relies on the illegality in order to bring the claim. This test has been criticised and Tinsley should no longer be followed [110]. The essential rationale of the illegality doctrine, as explained by the Supreme Court of Canada in Hall v Hebert [1993] 3 RCS 159, is that it would be contrary to the public interest to enforce a claim if to do so would be harmful to the integrity of the legal system. In assessing whether the public interest would be harmed in that way, it is necessary to consider a) the underlying purpose of the prohibition which has been transgressed and whether that purpose will be enhanced by denial of the claim, b) any other relevant public policy on which the denial of the claim may have an impact and c) whether denial of the claim would be a proportionate response to the illegality. Various factors may be relevant, but the court is not free to decide a case in an undisciplined way. The public interest is best served by a principled and transparent assessment of the considerations identified, rather by than the application of a formal approach capable of producing results which may appear arbitrary, unjust or disproportionate [120]. In considering whether it would be disproportionate to refuse relief to which the claimant would otherwise be entitled, as a matter of public policy, various factors may be relevant. Potentially relevant factors include the seriousness of the conduct, its centrality to the contract, whether it was intentional and whether there was marked disparity in the parties' respective culpability [107].

A claimant, such as Mr Patel, who satisfies the ordinary requirements of a claim for unjust enrichment, should not be debarred from enforcing his claim by reason only of the fact that the money which he seeks to recover was paid for an unlawful purpose. There may be rare cases where for some particular reason the enforcement of such a claim might be regarded as undermining the integrity of the justice system, but there are no such circumstances in this case [121]. Lord Kerr writes a concurring judgment elaborating on aspects of Lord Toulson's judgment. Lord Kerr identifies that there is a choice of approaches between a rule-based approach on the one hand and on the other a more flexible approach, taking into account the policy considerations that are said to favour recognising the defence of illegality [133]. A rule-based approach to the question has failed to lead to the predictability it sought. Further, it is questionable whether particular weight should be given to predictability where a claimant and defendant have been parties to an illegal agreement [137]. Lord Neuberger [143, 163], Lord Mance [197-199], Lord Clarke [210] and Lord Sumption [250, 253] all conclude there is no inconsistency in the law in permitting a party to an illegal arrangement to recover any sum paid under it, so long as restitution is possible. An order for restitution simply returns the parties to the positon in which they would and should have been, had no such illegal arrangement been made. Lord Neuberger goes on however to express the further view that, in relation to other issues involving illegal arrangements, the approach suggested by Lord Toulson provides as reliable and helpful guidance as it is possible to give [174, 186]. Lord Mance, Clarke and Sumption, in separate judgments expressing general agreement with each other, consider that, with the above clarification of the operation of restitution, there is no basis for substituting for the clear-cut principle identified in Holman v Johnson and Hall v Hebert, founded on the need to maintain the integrity of the law, a mix of factors as advocated by Lord Toulson, which would not offer the same coherence or certainty.

Early Day Motion 361: Death Squads in the Philippines and President Duterte

That this House condemns in the strongest terms the extra-judicial killings of drug users in the Philippines; expresses the deepest concern that the killings come as a result of newly inaugurated President, Rodrigo Duterte, telling citizens to form death squads and in his words to go ahead and kill drug addicts; considers that those with addictions deserve support to beat their addictions rather than punishment, and certainly not murder; and calls on the Government to make strong representations to President Duterte and express the alarm at which this development was met by hon. Members.

Bulk Data Collection Only Lawful In Serious Crime Cases *Owen Bowcott, Guardian*

Retaining data from telephone calls and emails is legal only if law enforcement agencies use it to tackle serious crime, the EU's highest court has ruled. The preliminary finding by the influential European court of justice (ECJ) in Luxembourg came in response to a legal challenge that was brought initially by David Davis, when he was a backbench Conservative, and Tom Watson, Labour's deputy leader, over the legality of GCHQ's bulk interception of call records and online messages. Davis, one of the most vociferous critics of the state's powers to collect data on its citizens, quietly withdrew from the case after his appointment to the cabinet. Many had commented on his involvement in the case at the EU's highest court, after he was appointed secretary of state for leaving the European Union. In an opinion likely to be followed by the full court, the advocate general, Henrik Saugmandsgaard Øe, clarified EU law after the two MPs successfully argued in British courts that the Data Retention and Investigatory Powers Act (Dripa) 2014 was illegal.

The ECJ's advocate general said: "Solely the fight against serious crime is an objective in the general interest that is capable of justifying a general obligation to retain data, whereas combating ordinary offences … are not." Only the data associated with calls and emails is retained not the content of messages. The preliminary ruling appears to bring European data retention practices closer into line with the debate over the passage of the UK's investigatory powers bill over what safeguards should be imposed for bulk interception and retention of data.

The court's final decision will be delivered in the coming months. The vast majority of judgments follow the line set out by the advocate general. Davis and Watson, who were supported by the Law Society, had already won a high court victory on the issue but the government appealed and the case was referred to the ECJ. At issue was whether there are EU standards on data retention that need to be respected by member states in their domestic legislation. The result, though significant in the short term, may eventually prove academic once the UK has withdrawn from the EU and the ECJ no longer has judicial authority over the UK. Before he became a minister under Theresa May, Davis travelled to Luxembourg this spring to hear the case being argued at the ECJ. He has argued that the British government is "treating the entire nation as suspects" by ignoring safeguards on retaining and accessing personal communications data.

The outcome of the Dripa case, is likely to have a significant impact on the ultimate shape of the controversial investigatory powers bill – it has been nicknamed the snooper's charter – now before parliament. The case has been heard amid successive jihadi atrocities in Paris, Brussels and Nice that have reinforced political demands for the expansion of powers to intercept emails and phone calls to help catch Islamic State militants operating on the continent. During the Luxembourg hearing, lawyers for the UK government maintained that intercepted communications had been at the heart of every terrorist case investigated by police and the security services in recent years.

Families of British Troops Killed In Iraq - Crowdfunding Legal Case Against Tony Blair

Families of British troops who died in Iraq raised over £50,000 which enough for lawyers to begin a legal action against Tony Blair and others. 'There is no option for legal aid,' explains Reg Keys, whose son Tom was killed in Iraq on June 24th 2003. 'The government won't fund us, and the police and CPS won't look at our case.' Almost seven years after Sir John Chilcot began his inquiry, his report was published earlier this month. For all its massive size – 2.6 million words and 12 volumes – its author did not express a view as to whether the military action was legal or not. 'That could, of course, only be resolved by a properly constituted and internationally recognised court,' Sir John said. The families are determined to hold those they blame to account in a proper court. Reg Keys famously stood against Tony Blair in the 2005 election in his Sedgefield constituency. The then prime minister refused to meet the families, as apparently he does to this day, and was forced to listen to a grieving father. His story was told in the Jimmy McGovern drama Reg broadcast on BBC 1 last month and starring Tim Roth.

Lance Corporal Tom Keys, just four days before his 21st birthday, was one of six Royal Military Policemen – or 'Red Caps' – killed by a group of some 400 Iraqi insurgents who had besieged a police station in the town of Majar Kabir, 100 miles north of Basra. It was the largest single loss of life in a British unit from enemy fire since the Falklands. In an interview with the Justice Gap, his father says: 'Sir John has done awful lot of groundwork for us and for our lawyers. Tony Blair has the cabinet indemnity afforded to state officials. Any court costs for Mr Blair and co will be met by the taxpayer. Here's not called "Teflon Tony" from nothing.' Just before the publication of the Chilcot report, Reg Keys wrote in the Daily Mail about the similarities between Hillsborough, the new inquest into the 1974 Birmingham pub bombings and the fate that befell the Red Caps which were all (in his words) 'avoidable disasters followed by cover-ups by the authorities and then a long battle for the truth'. 'As Hillsborough has shown, and hopefully Birmingham will show, it can take decades, but the truth bubbles to the surface,' Keys wrote.

In the Hillsborough inquests in Warrington the families were given properly funded legal representation (unlike most inquests), whereas Keys and the other families are forced to rely upon the generosity of the British public to secure access to justice. What does he think of that? 'It's nauseating that the families of the bereaved are out there trying to fundraise to bring a man to court who is a multimillionaire. But that is what happens when you take on the establishment,' he replies. Reg Keys, an ambulance paramedic in Solihull for 19 years before retiring to North Wales, is the first to admit he makes an unlikely figurehead for the anti-war movement. 'Back in 2003 when Thomas went to war, I would never have said that I was antiestablishment,' he continues. 'But having dealt with the Ministry of Defence and the government who all cover-up for each other, then you realise that there is an elite. A media blitz will not bring their fortress down. It has to be done with gritty determination.'

Hostages: Naweed Ali, Khobaib Hussain, Mohibur Rahman, Tahir Aziz, Roger Khan, Wang Yam, Andrew Malkinson, Michael Ross, Mark Alexander, Anis Sardar, Jamie Green, Dan Payne, Zoran Dresic, Scott Birtwistle, Jon Beere, Chedwyn Evans, Darren Waterhouse, David Norris, Brendan McConville, John Paul Wooton, John Keelan, Mohammed Niaz Khan, Abid Ashiq Hussain, Sharaz Yaqub, David Ferguson, Anthony Parsons, James Cullinene, Stephen Marsh, Graham Coutts, Royston Moore, Duane King, Leon Chapman, Tony Marshall, Anthony Jackson, David Kent, Norman Grant, Ricardo Morrison, Alex Silva,Terry Smith, Hyrone Hart, Glen Cameron,Warren Slaney, Melvyn 'Adie' McLellan, Lyndon Coles, Robert Bradley, John Twomey, Thomas G. Bourke, David E. Ferguson, Lee Mockble, George Coleman, Neil Hurley, Jaslyn Ricardo Smith, James Dowsett, Kevan & Miran Thakrar, Jordan Towers, Patrick Docherty, Brendan Dixon, Paul Bush, Alex Black, Nicholas Rose, Kevin Nunn, Peter Carine, Paul Higginson, Thomas Petch, Vincent and Sean Bradish, John Allen, Jeremy Bamber, Kevin Lane, Michael Brown, Robert Knapp, William Kenealy, Glyn Razzell, Willie Gage, Kate Keaveney, Michael Stone, Michael Attwooll, John Roden, Nick Tucker, Karl Watson, Terry Allen, Richard Southern, Jamil Chowdhary, Jake Mawhinney, Peter Hannigan.