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 596 (18/08/2016) - Cost £1

The Breaking Down of the EU Convention On Human Rights, and the UK's Responsibility

UK Human Rights Blog, George Stafford: Numerous members of the new Government have stated that they want a greater role in the world for a post-Brexit UK, rather than a diminished one. If the Government is to be diplomatically resurgent, what sort of challenges might it wish to confront? It could do far worse than face up to the creeping, unspoken, but calamitous refusal of governments all across Europe to implement judgments of the European Court of Human Rights (ECtHR). This problem is not only hugely important, but is also notable because the UK should take a large amount of responsibility for it happening in the first place. The problem started around the turn of the century. Previously, between the Court's creation in the 1950s and the mid-1990s, judgments were implemented by governments quickly and consistently. However, in the late 1990s, this began to change. By 1996, there were over 700 outstanding judgments against governments. By the end of the millennium, there were over 2,200, and by 2004, there were almost 4,000. Today, the total number is well over 10,000 outstanding judgments of the ECtHR, which national governments are simply ignoring (see here, page 56). That is a colossal figure, and amounts to nothing less than the breaking down of the rule of law.

It is not simply 10,000 cases of individual injustice. Those cases are crucial for identifying widespread problems in countries where the basic human rights of citizens are being violated time and time again. For example, this year I attended an International Day Against Homophobia (IDAHO) protest in Tbilisi, Georgia. Across the globe, individual IDAHO protests attract tens of thousands of activists in a single city, and are crucial for promoting LGBTI rights. In Georgia, there were only 8 brave activists in attendance. They were furtive and alone, because LGBTI activists in Georgia have feared for their physical safety ever since the IDAHO annual march was first attacked by hundreds of homophobes in 2012. The activists won an ECtHR case that highlighted the lack of state protection for their march, and the total absence of punishment for their vicious attackers. But by the time of this year's protest, that judgment had still not been implemented. This meant that whilst 40,000 homophobic demonstrators assembled in the centre of the city, the unprotected LGBTI activists stayed at home, or met in tiny, unnoticed, ad-hoc groups in the suburbs. They were left fearful for their lives, and unable work to bring the change in society that they deserve. A vast number of ECtHR judgments like this – the ones that are difficult, the ones that really matter – are being ignored in countries all across Europe. The machine for spreading human rights across Europe is breaking.

What is the cause of this? Observers point to a number of things: an increase in procedural rights violations being complained of; an increase in positive obligations established by the case law of the Court; and the admittance of numerous Eastern European states to the Court's jurisdiction, with significant human rights challenges (e.g. see this report, pages 37-38). Yet there is another important cause of this non-implementation. A number of established democracies have slowed down implementation of judgments, or refused to implement certain cases altogether. Among these bad apples, the UK has the most noticeably rotten core. In particular, the refusal to implement the Hirst judgment on prisoner voting has had a significant effect on the actions of other countries in the Court's jurisdiction. The UK's global reputation for human rights makes its refusal to implement ECtHR judgments the best excuse imaginable for other countries to do the same.

Time and time again, it has been observed that the UK's attitude towards the ECtHR is undermining the implementation system, and/or the UK's ability to improve human rights around the world. Among those who have stated that this is the case, are the Secretary General of the body that oversees the ECtHR (see the fourth paragraph of this speech by Thorbjørn Jagland); parliamentary members of the international body that helps oversee the implementation of ECtHR judgments (e.g. see speeches by Mr Biedron and Lord Anderson); the Council of Europe's Commissioner for Human Rights; a UK cross-party Parliamentary committee assembled to address prisoner voting (see paras 4 to 6 of this report); another UK select committee, the Joint Committee on Human Rights (see para 3.23 of this report); an international think tank dedicated to spreading human rights (see para 1.1 of this); a UK NGO that works to spread human rights in Eastern Europe; leading practicing lawyers; leading legal academics; and experts from Chatham House.

Another useful way to look at the impact of the UK's policy, is through statistics: 'Leading' judgments of the ECtHR are those which identify a structural problem – a general issue in a country's human rights protections, which leads to repeated violations. In order to be implemented, leading judgments require government action beyond the individual case. The graph shows that the number of leading judgments that went unimplemented was rising before Hirst. But it skyrocketed after the UK refused to implement that judgment within a reasonable time (which may be regarded as 2 years, looking at reports by the Council of Europe – e.g. as indicated on pages 74 and 75 of the most recent implementation report).The numbers show correlation, without necessarily proving causation. It would probably be misleading to claim that the UK's non-implementation of Hirst was the sole cause of the spike in the graph. Nevertheless, combined with the large amount of expert evidence that the UK's position is causing huge damage, the graph is very worrying. It is very hard to deny the link between the UK's non-implementation of Hirst, and a growing refusal by governments across the continent to address hundreds of crucial, systematic human rights abuses. It is certainly not the only cause of these refusals. But it is nevertheless a very real one – and a very powerful one. This is something that has received almost no comment in the UK press, but about which we should be profoundly ashamed. The sad thing is, it need not have been this way. Prior to Hirst, the UK's record on human rights and implementation of ECtHR judgments was almost unparalleled in other large European democracies. Researchers have also suggested that other countries should be copying the structure of the UK's implementation system (see pages 221 and 222 of this study). This is because the mechanisms in place for overseeing the implementation of judgments, by specialist Parliamentary committee, give the UK an exemplary record on speedy, effective implementation (with the notable exceptions of Hirst and some others).

In summary: there is a huge problem with the otherwise admirable convention system; the UK has done a great deal to exacerbate that problem; and the UK is in an excellent position to take a lead on addressing it. Implementing Hirst would of course be an ideal first step. However, given that the new Prime Minister declared a few months ago that she would like to leave the ECtHR's jurisdiction, it does not seem likely that she is in the mood to implement its most unpopular judgment. Nevertheless, the UK could and should make every effort possible to improve the implementation system, even if it does not implement Hirst. It could do this through diplomatic efforts, but also through additional funding for the institutions and NGOs that are crucial for Europe-wide implementation. Boris Johnson has declared himself to be a great supporter of the Convention system. As the UK's new Foreign Secretary, he could do a great deal to make that vocal support a pragmatic reality. There has been a lot of talk recently about certain individuals starting a Brexit fire, and then deciding not to be involved in putting it out. Whether or not Brexit is a Johnson-caused fire, we can be confident that the non-implementation of ECtHR judgments is a raging inferno – and that the UK has been stoking that fire for many, many years. Rather than looking the other way, we should be the first to try to douse the flames.

Statement from Republican Prisoners Roe 4 HMP Maghaberry 11/08/16

Republican Prisoners wish to make it clear that what occurred on the Republican Wing on the 10th August, was no less than a co-ordinated physical attack. Two separate incidents in which two governors were physically involved resulted in two prisoners being struck and manhandled whilst three others were brutally assaulted. This was the combination of months of harassment and intimidation against Republican Prisoners. This was not an insignificant or spontaneous incident. This was a co-ordinated attack carried out by former H-Block screws and Crumlin Road screws, former UDR men and others who have regularly abused and intimidated Republican Prisoners on the landings. Seven Governors were present on the wing while Republican Prisoners were locked down for five hours with no access to health care, solicitors, toilets or food before being escorted to cells by dozens of screws clad in riot gear. PSNI members also arrived on the landing whilst medics whispered and collaborated with the security governor. Clearly the "supposedly impartial" PSNI is keen to act in unison with the jail administration to oppress Republican Prisoners. It is obvious that the Six County Prison Service is determined to break the spirit and resolve of Republican Prisoners and they will happily resort to the old tactic of physical violence but we remain today unbowed and unbroken Republican Political Prisoners.

Belfast firm KRW Law, which is instructed by a number of a number of sentenced and remand prisoners detained in the Roe House segregated wing, issued a statement following reports that the wing was put into lockdown on Wednesday 10th August,. Roe House houses republican prisoners and tensions between the prisoners, the Prison Service and the Prison Officers Association have been a feature of the separated regime for a number of years. In a statement, KRW Law said violent tensions had "erupted again between staff and prisoners with allegations of verbal abuse against prisoners and the use of restraint, lock down and segregation". A control squad of prison officers allegedly "danced all over" one prisoner while others came to his assistance and were placed in segregated accommodation. The statement added: "Lawyers from KRW LAW LLP will be accessing their clients as soon as possible to take instruction on the current position in Roe House. "We will be requesting an independent investigation and recommending complaints to the Prisoner Ombudsman and the IMB. We will be alerting both Amnesty International and the International Committee of the Red Cross who are monitoring conditions at Roe House. We will be seeking meetings with the Northern Ireland Prison Service and, if necessary, the Minister for Justice."

Brendan McConville & John Paul Wootton the Persecution Never Stops

The Northern Ireland Prison Service has been challenged over its decision to refuse to let a man convicted of the murder of PSNI officer Stephen Carroll receive a booklet from the campaign to free him. Belfast solicitor Darragh Mackin of KRW Law wrote to prison authorities after they prevented Brendan McConville receiving a copy of a booklet by the Justice for the Craigavon Two campaign. The campaign group has called for the release of Mr McConville and John Paul Wootton, who were both convicted of the 2009 murder. Mr Mackin told The Irish News: "It appears this booklet has been refused solely on the basis that it relates to an ongoing public campaign entitled 'Justice for the Craigavon Two'. "It may be that the prison does not agree with the basis behind the campaign to which the materials relate, nevertheless, the prison has no lawful basis in which to continue to confiscate and remove our client's property." In his letter, Mr Mackin referred to prison authorities previously refusing to allow photographs relating to the campaign into the jail. He wrote: "This was met with pre-action correspondence, which ultimately resulted in the return of the property. "That in itself is indicative that the basis to which you propose to remove this property is entirely without foundation."

Suspects Tried to Pawn Items Back to Owner Source: The Leaf-Chronicle

Two people were arrested Tuesday 9th August, after they tried to pawn items at a Riverside Drive pawn shop that belonged to the pawn shop owner. Jeremy Allen Watts, 30, and Jessica Faye Heady, 24, visited the Cash America Pawn shop on Riverside Drive with several items to pawn. The pawn shop owner and victim, Edward Dial, recognized the items and went home. There, he noticed that someone had broken into his residence and taken several items, the report said. The property was valued at more than $1,000. Watts, of Nunnelly, Tennessee, and Heady, of Bellevue, were charged with aggravated burglary. Both were held on $50,000 bond.

Court of Appeal Orders Release Of Court Judgment On Ellie Butler's Death

David Hart QC, Human Rights Blog: This is the most recent in the long series of legal steps touching on the violent career of Ben Butler, recently convicted of the murder of his daughter, Ellie. Butler was convicted for Grievous Bodily Harm, and then cleared on appeal. Care proceedings were commenced at the end of which Ellie was ordered to be returned to her parents by Hogg J in October 2012. A year later, on 28 October 2013, Ellie was found dead. C, the subject of this appeal, is Ellie's younger sister. In June 2014, Eleanor King J, in the family courts, found that Butler had caused Ellie's death, Ellie's mother (Jennie Gray) had failed to protect her from Butler, and C had been the victim of physical and emotional abuse. This judgment had been the subject of reporting restrictions. Immediately after Butler's conviction in June 2016, media organisations applied for the release of Eleanor King J's judgment to Pauffley J in the family court. Pauffley J dismissed this application. Her decision was roundly reversed in this decision of the Court of Appeal. The human rights clash is the familiar one of freedom of expression under Article 10 versus the right to a fair trial under Article 6 ECHR.

Pauffley J dismissed the application because of the possibility that the release of the judgment might prejudice Butler's right to a fair (re-)trial. She was ruling the day after his murder conviction, and it was being said that he would be seeking permission to appeal to the Court of Appeal Criminal Division (CACD). The CA decided that the court had the power under its inherent jurisdiction to order the continued retention of the judgment, despite the fact that there were no active criminal proceedings within the meaning of the Contempt of Court Act 1981 because they been terminated. It also held that Article 6 was potentially in play even though there were no current proceedings. But those rulings did not prescribe how the power to retain or release the judgment should be exercised. Its conclusion (contrary to the views of Pauffley J) was that little weight should be given to Butler's Article 6 rights in those circumstances. Butler would only be standing trial again if the CACD set aside his conviction and ordered a re-trial. There was no analysis of the likelihood of this outcome – unsurprising because Butler had done no more than say that he wanted to appeal. So the Court held that at best there was a speculative possibility of this.

But the CA's central conclusion was that the chance of prejudice of such a trial was so negligible that it should have been given little or no weight in the balancing exercise. On prejudice, it held that: The judge failed to take into account (i) the fact that the jury would be directed to ignore anything they read or heard outside the trial and that it should and would be trusted to follow the directions given by the trial judge; (ii) the fact that broadcasting and newspaper editors should be trusted to behave responsibly; and (iii) the fade factor (it would be many months and possibly more than a year before a retrial would take place). Hence, it ruled that if the judge had properly taken these factors into account, she would have been bound to conclude that the judgment should be put into the public domain. In doing so, it founded on Strasbourg cases (such as Beggs v. UK) where virulent

press campaigns had been held not to prejudice fair trials: Hence, and subject to specific redactions necessary to protect the interests of C, the judgment should be released.

Conclusion: I cannot help thinking that the CA showed a touching faith in (i) the efficacy of a direction that a jury should ignore the press/internet when trying a case and (ii) the responsibility of the press when handling such an explosively newsworthy story, were Butler to be tried again. Nor is the internet subject to the fade factor applicable to print journalists – after a few Googling seconds I could find as much press coverage as I wanted on Butler and Gray over the last few years, and much of it strongly prejudicial. I quite understand the strong policy reasons for not allowing criminal appeals on the grounds that the right to a fair trial had been impaired by grossly prejudicial press coverage. But I am not sure this can be read directly over to the current situation, where any problem could be avoided altogether by not releasing the judgment until Butler's potential appeal had been determined. That is not to say that I disagree with the outcome – a convicted defendant cannot simply hold up press disclosures by saying that he wants to appeal.

Medway Child Jail Inspectors Find Further Serious Failings *Alan Travis, Guardian*

Access to pornography and "very high and growing" levels of violence are among the latest "serious and widespread failings" uncovered by official inspectors at the scandal-hit Medway child jail, which had been run by G4S. An inspection report into Medway secure training centre, published on Monday, reveals that behaviour management has deteriorated significantly in the seven months since undercover filming by BBC Panorama exposed staff assaulting children and revealed that staff had deliberately falsified records. The inspectors from Ofsted, HM Inspectorate of Prisons and the Care Quality Commission went to Medway in June shortly before the Ministry of Justice's national offender management service took over the running of the jail from G4S, the private security multinational. Kent police have arrested 11 people from Medway in connection with allegations including use of unnecessary force. Five staff members have been sacked, three suspended and the centre's director stepped down following the allegations. The official inspectors say that the enforced removal of some staff, together with the fact that 67% of staff have left over the past 12 months, means that most current staff are very inexperienced. The inspectors say that G4S did not ensure they had sufficient support and supervision.

"Levels of violence in the centre are very high and growing. This includes violence between young people and violence towards staff, despite a small and stable population of young people. The centre's senior managers are not aware of the increasing trends in many areas of the centre's functioning, and this is a stark example of their lack of oversight and governance," say the inspectors, concluding that Medway's stability has been "sorely undermined". They say that recommendations by the Medway improvement board and G4S's own improvement plan have not been implemented properly and even simple maintenance tasks, such as making sure the door locks work smoothly, that could have helped stabilise the centre, have not happened.

Among the examples revealed by the inspectors' report are: Two USB sticks containing "highly inappropriate" material have been found, making clear that young people held at the centre have been able to access pornography. One young person was able to get hold of a broken pool cue and attempted to assault another child with it because it was insecurely stored and inadequate searching had taken place. A games console was brought into the jail by a staff member for a child who breached procedures leading to serious misuse. The inspectors found that rewards and sanctions were implemented inconsistently, levels of violence were high, particularly against staff, and oversight of the use of force and restraint was poor.

They also found evidence that violence against children and staff was under-reported and staff were unable to provide the inspectors with accurate records of the number of children requiring medical treatment as a result of assaults or fights. Use of force and restraint were increasing and the number of such incidents in May, the month before the inspection, was higher than at any point in the previous 12 months. At the time of the inspection in June there were 29 young people aged 12-18 being held at Medway, which can hold up to 76 children sentenced or remanded in custody. Lord McNally, the chairman of the Youth Justice Board, which is responsible for Medway, said the inspection findings were completely unacceptable. "Work was advanced at the time of the inspection to transfer the running of the Centre to the National Offender Management Service (Noms). This has now taken place, with the appointment of a new centre manager and senior management team. "I am determined that Medway STC should have the strong leadership, management and monitoring needed to deliver the quality and standards of care we all expect and which are essential for the safety and wellbeing of the children who are placed there," he said.

But Andrew Neilson, the director of campaigns at the Howard League for Penal Reform, said the damning report underscored why G4S was no longer running Medway. He said: "Children in Medway are not safe and, given the allegations that were made in the Panorama documentary in January, it is shocking to see that violence is under-reported and medical treatment is being inadequately recorded. This cannot go on. "It is not simply the secure training centres which have proved failed models of child custody. In both young offender institutions and secure training centres we see problems of violence and cultures far removed from the caring environments children need. Radical action is required."

Children's rights campaigner Carolyne Willow, the director of Article 39, added: "If policy makers had given priority to children's rights, there is no question that Medway secure training centre would have been long closed by now. "Just because the children there are prisoners is no excuse for propping up an abusive institution. We cannot continue with this two-tier child protection system: every child, no matter where they are from or what they have done, is entitled to feel safe and to know that the authorities will do right by them when abuse happens," she said. Jerry Petherick, the managing director of G4S custodial and detention services, said the report was "deeply disappointing, coming as it does after a number of years in which Ofsted rated Medway as good or outstanding". He added: "This was clearly a period of intense disruption which created uncertainty and instability for the young people and staff at the centre and it proved extremely challenging to maintain appropriate staffing levels and standards. "The management of Medway STC has now been transferred to Noms, and the lessons learned at Medway will be applied through a far-reaching review of our standards, skills and processes at Oakhill, our remaining STC near Milton Keynes. I fully expect this to translate into substantial changes to the way in which the centre is run."

MET to Change Policy Following IPCC Investigation Into Ashraf Amrani

The Metropolitan Police (MPS) is to amend its policy to ensure that Jigsaw units, who deal with rape and serious sexual assaults, are notified as soon as possible if a person they are monitoring is arrested, bailed or charged. The change follows an IPCC investigation into police contact with Ashraf Amrani prior to his death. A jury at a HM Coroner inquest today found that Mr Amrani had taken his own life and that both his parents were unlawfully killed the previous day. Mr Amrani was subject to a prison licence for a sexual offence committed in 2009 and was arrested by the MPS on 10 February 2015 on suspicion of affray. After becoming unwell

and being transferred to a hospital he was then street bailed, meaning he did not attend a police station, on 11 February. Mr Amrani was found dead near his home address on the 13 February and his parents' bodies found at their home address on the same day.

The IPCC investigation found that a police sergeant had a case to answer for misconduct in failing to carry out an adequate risk assessment when street bailing Mr Amrani. At a misconduct meeting, conducted by the MPS, the case to answer was proven and the sergeant received a written warning for his conduct. The MPS bail policy will be also be changed to require street bail decisions to be discussed with a supervisor at the time or as soon as practicable afterwards. IPCC Associate Commissioner Tom Milsom said: "This was a tragic case and my thoughts are with the extended Amrani family today. Following a recommendation from the IPCC the MPS has agreed to alter its policies to ensure that the specialist units who monitor those on license for prior sexual offences are notified as soon as possible when those people are arrested or bailed so more informed decisions can be made." The decision to bail Mr Amrani and not pursue an investigation while he remained in custody failed to protect the safety of the public."

Two Humberside Police Officers Dismissed For 'Gross Misconduct' *BBC News*

Two police officers, including one who punched a detained man, have been dismissed for gross misconduct after a hearing by an independent panel. The pair have not been named as their hearing was conducted in private, said Humberside Police. One officer was said to have punched the man during a scuffle as officers tried to search him. The panel ruled the punch was not necessary to gain control of the man and was gross misconduct. On a separate occasion the same officer claimed to have arrested a man outside an address when it had in fact been made inside. Another time the officer also left work without permission. Both these were deemed to be misconduct and all three counts were found proven. The second dismissed officer was present when a colleague punched a man being detained but did not challenge or report the excessive force. On a separate occasion the officer twice fell asleep during a cell watch on a vulnerable person in custody. The panel found two counts of gross misconduct. Both officers were dismissed without notice. Ch Supt Judi Heaton said: "The behaviour of both officers fell below the expected standard" but the majority of the force was "hard-working, dedicated and committed".

1.3bn Troubled Families Scheme Has Had 'No Discernible Impact'

Lisa O'Carroll, Guardian: Senior civil servant describes unpublished Whitehall report into efforts to tackle entrenched social problems as damning.The £1.3bn government "troubled families" scheme to tackle entrenched social problems following the riots in 2011 has had no discernible impact on unemployment, truancy or criminality, an unpublished Whitehall report has found. The official evaluation of the programme launched by David Cameron has not been published because it would be embarrassing to ministers, it has been claimed. A senior civil servant, interviewed for an investigation by BBC's Newsnight, described the report by independent consultancy Ecorys as damning.

The initial troubled families scheme, launched by Cameron in 2012, sought to "turn around the lives of the 120,000 most troubled households in the country" at a cost of about £400m. A second wave of the scheme has since been launched to cover another 400,000 families at a further cost of £900m. Cameron said he wanted to put "rocket boosters" into the system to underline the importance of strong parenting in preventing the kind of social problems that led to the riots in London and elsewhere. It aimed to break the cycle of problems such as poor parenting, domestic abuse and other issues including institutional care identified by Dame

Louise Casey as contributing to the transmission of problems through generations.

But a separate government-commissioned audit of the effectiveness of the programme has concluded differently. According to Newsnight, the Ecorys report examined data from 56 local authorities and concluded there was "no discernible impact on the percentage of adults claiming out-of-work benefits either 12 or 18 months after starting on the programme" and "no obvious impact on the likelihood that adults were employed 12 or 18 months after starting on the programme. Participation did not have any discernible impact on adult offending" seven to 18 months after the family was booked into the programme, it said. Ecorys added: "Whilst it was more difficult to match the treatment and comparison groups when looking at child outcomes, the findings suggested that the programme also had no detectable impact on child offending." They also identified problems with the data quality and representativeness. "The sample sizes that the national administrative data provided meant that it was feasible to detect impacts which were relatively small in magnitude." It said the success criteria were also vague – families could be deemed "turned around" even while the children were still persistently truant or committing crime, just so long as they did so less frequently than they had done before. Councils were paid £3,200 for each family they signed up to the programme with a further payment of £800 when the family met certain criteria. Nationally, 98.9% of the 118,000 families in the scheme were deemed "turned around" by the government. A Department for Communities and Local Government spokesman said: "It is wrong to say that any report on Troubled Families has been suppressed. There were several strands to the evaluation work commissioned by the last government and there is not yet a final report."

CPS Upholds Decision Not to Charge Over MI6 Role In Libyans' Rendition

Rob Evans, Guardian: Families' lawyers claim 'stitch-up' after failure to overturn decision not to bring charges over abduction of dissidents: Prosecutors have rejected an attempt to overturn their decision not to charge anyone over the involvement of the British intelligence agency MI6 in the kidnapping of two Libyan dissidents in a joint operation with the CIA. Lawyers for the two families accused prosecutors of a "complete stitch-up" after failing to quash the decision not to bring any charges over the abduction of the dissidents and their families, including a pregnant woman and children.

The Crown Prosecution Service announced in June that, after a Scotland Yard investigation lasting four years, it did not have enough evidence bring criminal charges. Detectives had compiled a 28,000-page file on how the CIA and MI6 had collaborated to abduct the families of the two prominent dissidents, Abdel Hakim Belhaj and Sami al-Saadi, and fly them to the late Libyan dictator Muammar Gaddafi's prisons in 2004. Documents that came to light in 2011 after the toppling of Gaddafi revealed the UK's participation in the abduction of Belhaj and his pregnant wife, and al-Saadi and his wife and four young children, from south-east Asia.

Detectives questioned Sir Mark Allen, the former head of counter-terrorism at MI6, about faxes from London to Tripoli, signed "Mark", that acknowledged his role in the abduction of Belhaj. They also uncovered evidence that MI6 had sought political authority from ministers for some of their actions. The two families demanded a review of the CPS decision not to charge, as they were entitled to do so as victims under an official scheme. On Friday, Greg McGill, the CPS's director of legal services, said: "As the result of a request under the victims' right to review scheme, the decision to take no further action in this case was looked at again. After careful consideration of all the evidence I have decided to uphold the original decision in this case."

Cori Crider, a lawyer with the human rights group Reprieve, representing the two families, said: "This was exactly what we feared would happen when the CPS froze the victims out of the so-

called 'victims' review'." She said the review was "not a run-of-the-mill exercise" as the police investigation had examined the conduct of ministers and senior intelligence officers. "It was vital that the review command public confidence. Instead the CPS flogged it through in seven weeks, without making even the feeblest attempt to engage the victims about their concerns," she said. She added that Alison Saunders, the director of public prosecutions, "came into post saying that women and child victims got a raw deal out of the justice system – and she promised to make it better. The Belhaj and al-Saadi families have seen no sign that those words meant anything."

In June, Belhaj and his wife, Fatima Boudchar, spoke of their distress at the decision not to charge anyone. Boudchar said she could not believe it. "I was heavily pregnant when Britain helped kidnap and deliver me to Gaddafi. My baby weighed four pounds when he was born," she said. "I wonder how a British mother would have felt in my situation, if, while she was still carrying her baby, a gang of kidnappers seized her, took her to a secret cell, tortured her, taped her to a stretcher, and delivered her and her baby to a horrendous dictator." The two families, who were living in exile when they were abducted, have described how they were tortured for years after they were sent back to Libya.

Women Are Dying in Jails They Should Not Have Been Sent To

Eric Allison, Guardian: Last month, the Ministry of Justice published the Safety in Custody statistical bulletin on deaths, self-harm and assaults in prisons. It made grim reading. Deaths in custody were up 30% from 2015's figures – self-inflicted by 28%. Self-harm incidents were up 27% and assaults 31%. But one section hurtled out of the briefing. In the year to March 2016, 11 female prisoners had apparently killed themselves, the biggest such toll in 12 years. This figure accounts for more than 10% of all self-inflicted deaths in prisons, even though women make up less than 5% of the prison population. The week the report came out, another two female prisoners seemingly took their own lives. It took me back to 2003; then, 14 women ended their own lives in a 12 month period, six in one jail, Styal, in Cheshire. The following year, 13 female prisoners killed themselves in England.

It was hoped that those deaths marked a tragic turning point and they did, to a degree. In 2005, First Night centres opened in women's prisons, the first, poignantly in Styal. The centres operate mental health assessment programmes and detoxification units, aimed at better identifying women at risk when they arrive. Then, as now, the particular problems facing women in prison were well known. Many female prisoners have been sexually or physically abused as children, and experienced domestic violence as adults. Around a third were in care as children. Many female prisoners are mothers and primary carers. Every year, around 18,000 children are affected by their mother being sent to jail. As women are usually the main caregiver, many end up in care. We can only guess how much that adds to the anguish of mothers behind bars. When the First Night centre at Styal opened soon after Mothers' Day the then governor told me that 41 women had tried to kill themselves in his jail on that day.

In 2006, the government commissioned Baroness Jean Corston to carry out a review of vulnerable women in the Criminal Justice system. Her report made 43 recommendations and all bar two were accepted by the then labour government. Prison sentences should be reserved only for "serious or violent female offenders" she argued and women's jails should be replaced, over time, by "geographically dispersed small multi-functional custodial units" which would help with mental health problems, addictions, housing and employment. This would help keep families together. Although the government rejected her advice to scrap large women's jails, for a time, it appeared as though things were improving. The death toll dropped, with the next decade

averaging three self-inflicted deaths a year. But these latest figures show the system lurching back towards the death tolls we hoped Corston's legacy had left behind for good.

Why the upsurge? We know the prison service is in crisis, staff cuts and overcrowding are a toxic mix, but with female prisoners particularly, we have to look at one glaring fault – one warning that was ignored. Despite all the evidence that smaller jails are better at reducing reoffending among female prisoners, of the 10 closed women's jails in England, only one holds less than 300 women (282), the rest house 300 plus, with the largest holding 527. In May, Michael Gove told the Radio Times that the Archers storyline, of a woman locked up for stabbing her abusive husband, "reinforced the case for reform of women's prisons". And that "too many women are in jail". But his planned prison reforms barely touch on the plight of women prisoners. All of the six new reform prisons are male institutions and, apart from the closure of Holloway, women inmates barely rate a mention in the proposed changes.

Another country, close to home, has shown us the way. Last year, I reported that Scotland's justice minister, Michael Matheson, scrapped plans to build a new large women's prison and replaced it with a smaller one, holding just 80 inmates. Other female offenders are being placed in five small regional units offering help with drugs, alcohol, domestic abuse and mental health problems. And this in a country that has seen just one recorded suicide of a female prisoner in 10 years. It is widely accepted that female prisoners are disproportionately likely to die in jail, but successive governments have ignored all the warning signs. We now have a female prime minister and justice secretary. Will they work together to stem the tide of deaths of female prisoners that should shame us all?

Officer Involved in Restraint of Colin Holt, Leading To His Death, Guilty Of Gross Misconduct

PC Reeves was today 10/08/2016, found guilty of gross misconduct regarding the restraint of Colin Holt and the unlawful entry into Colin's property. He was also found guilty of being in breach of the professional standards of honesty and integrity regarding false statements he gave about his conduct during the restraint of Colin. The disciplinary hearing also found that he breached his duty of care to Colin. Colin Holt died on 30 August 2010. He suffered from mental health problems and had absconded from the hospital where he had been sectioned. Police were subsequently called and attended his property where they entered and restrained him.

On 18 February 2015, a jury returned critical findings in the inquest into the death of Colin. They concluded that 3 police officers failed to comply with their duty of care for Colin after he had been restrained in the prone position with his hands cuffed behind his back. The jury found that this position was maintained throughout the restraint of Colin which resulted in the compromise of his breathing and subsequently caused his death by positional asphyxia. The medical experts who gave evidence agreed that, on the balance of probabilities, had Colin be repositioned earlier after he was initially restrained he would not have died. After an IPCC investigation following Colin's death, two officers were charged with misconduct in public office. They were acquitted at Maidstone Crown Court in May 2013. In April 2015 PC Bowdery, one of the officers involved in the restraint of Colin, was dismissed from Kent Police following a police disciplinary hearing finding of gross misconduct. A third officer involved, PC Leigh, retired from the force prior to the misconduct process.

Quote from Sharon Holt, Colin Holt's sister: "Six years on from Colin's death, we still have many unanswered questions. We raised concerns about Colin's mental health almost four weeks before he was finally sectioned. Colin received no support during this time. In the days before Colin died I wasn't concerned about his mental health at that time and so cannot understand why the

decision to section him was taken the next day. It is still very upsetting that we were not informed when Colin was sectioned or told where he was. We are pleased with the decision of the IPCC to recommend a disciplinary hearings for this officer. We are also thankful for the support of Mark Scott, our solicitor and Shona Crallan, our caseworker at INQUEST."

Quote from Shona Crallan at INQUEST: "It is unacceptable that this family should have to wait 6 years for a police officer, involved in Colin's death, to be held accountable. We welcome the decision today, while conscious of the many questions still unanswered for Colin's family." INQUEST has been working with the family of Colin Holt since 2010. The family was represented by INQUEST Lawyers Group member Mark Scott from Bhatt Murphy solicitors.

Crackdown Launched as Phone Seizures in Prisons Rise in England and Wales

BBC New: The number of mobile phones being seized in English and Welsh jails has risen markedly, figures indicate. Almost 15,000 handsets and SIM cards were taken from jails in 2015 - a sharp rise on 2014 and 2013 when 9,745 and 7,400 were seized respectively. The government is launching a new crackdown to target inmates using mobiles to run criminal operations. Prison authorities will use legal powers to curb mobile use which have come into force.

Under the measures, introduced in the Serious Crime Act 2015, prison governors will no longer have to physically find phones or deploy blocking technology to stop them being used. Instead prison staff or police will be able to get the phones cut off remotely by producing evidence that a given number is being used illicitly. "We are determined to do all we can to prevent prisoners having access to mobile phones," Justice Secretary Liz Truss said. "We are stepping up measures to find and block them and empowering prison officers to take action."

The new powers - which took effect last week- will be overseen by the Investigatory Powers Commissioner. Once a mobile number is identified, the prison can apply to the courts for a Telecommunications Restriction Order (TRO) through which mobile networks can be instructed to blacklist the phone remotely - making it unusable. The use of phones in prison has been linked to cases involving drug dealing and smuggling guns into the UK.

In January last year Alexander Mullings, 23 was found guilty of masterminding a plot to import sub-machine guns into the country from his cell in Wandsworth Prison. In July 2015 Christopher Welsh, then 37, was given 12 further years in prison after he was found guilty of dealing in drugs from his cell. Security minister Ben Wallace said: "Criminals are locked up to protect communities from their actions - so it is totally unacceptable for them to continue their life of crime behind bars. "Telecommunications Restriction Orders will give us the power to disconnect the phones prisoners use to continue orchestrating serious crimes while in jail."

50% of Immigrants Held in US 'Priority' Program Have No Criminal Conviction

Renée Feltz, Guardian: A program intended to prioritize the deportation of immigrants who officials call "the worst of the worst" is missing its target, according to a new report. An analysis of requests by federal officials for local jails to keep immigrants suspected of violating US immigration law in custody found half of the so-called "holds" were placed on people who had been arrested but actually had no criminal conviction. Some had been picked up during traffic violations, or had their charges dropped. But their arrest triggered a process that ended with their federal immigration detention, and in many cases led to deportation proceedings. Just one quarter had committed the most serious types of offenses, such as murder or sexual assault, according to the Transactional Records Access Clearinghouse, which is based at Syracuse University

and obtained the records through an open records request. The most common conviction was for drunk driving, followed by miscellaneous assaults and simple traffic offenses.

This comes as Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) claims it has narrowed the criteria it used under a started in 2008 called Secure Communities that contributed to a record number of deportations under Barack Obama. Under the program, federal officials ask local jails to hold undocumented immigrants they arrest in custody so that they can be transferred to federal immigration detention centers. In November 2014, Homeland Security director Jeh Johnson said a new program called the Priority Enforcement Program (PEP) would focus on "criminal aliens" convicted of felonies or several misdemeanor offenses. In fact, the most recent data shows ICE now targets people with no criminal record at a slightly higher rate than before. ICE said it could not comment on an analysis performed by an external organization. But spokeswoman Sarah Rodriquez said the agency "continues to make significant strides … through PEP to ensure a common-sense approach that focuses enforcement resources on convicted criminals and individuals who threaten public safety and national security".

The agency says it also tries to consider "important community policing needs". But here too, it may be be falling short. "The policies they are implementing are not keeping anyone secure," said Maria Sotomayor, an undocumented immigrant who lives in Philadelphia, and who met with Johnson in May when he tried unsuccessfully to convince the city to implement the PEP program, which would have ended its "sanctuary city" policy that keeps ICE and police separate. "I told him that because of these detainers, an immigrant who is a victim of a crime will think many times before calling the police to make a report because we could get picked up too," recalled Sotomayor.

Before PEP was officially implemented last year, at least 377 local law enforcement agencies were refusing to honor some or all requests to hold immigrants in detention from ICE. The agency says 17 of the 25 jurisdictions with the highest number of declined detainers are now participating in the program. Meanwhile, immigration advocates have sued to obtain more details how the PEP program actually differs from its predecessor. "We suspect this PEP program was just a name change," said Jessica Bansel, legal director of the National Day Laborers Organizing Network. For example, while ICE can now ask local jails to simply inform them when an immigrant is in custody, not to detain them, Bansel noted the agency also has two new detainer forms that are specifically designed to request custody of a person who recently entered the country illegally, but has not been convicted of a crime and is not a security risk. "This sort of makes the whole thing a joke," said Bansel.

Raza, R (On the Application Of v SSHB [2016] EWCA Civ 807 (29 July 2016)

The judgment in this case considered the question of "If bail is granted by the First-Tier Tribunal on conditions, how long do these conditions last and does the Secretary of State or her immigration officers have authority to vary or relax those conditions?" These were the central issues on appeal from the UT (Immigration and Asylum Chamber) judgment given by McCloskey P and UTJ Storey on 24 February 2016.

The Appellant in this case was released on bail by the FTT, on 9 October 2014, subject to primary and secondary conditions including tagging and curfew conditions. The secondary conditions included a requirement for the Appellant to report to the UKBA on a specific date. The Appellant reported as required and the SSHD notified him of his curfew conditions. The Appellant later made numerous requests to the SSHD to vary the curfew order and/or remove the requirement to wear the electronic tag with which had been fitted. He also made a bail variation

application to the FTT which was refused on 16 February 2015 and on a further application on 14 July 2015 the FTT declined to consider the request on the grounds that it lacked jurisdiction and that the appropriate body was the CIO. On 7 August 2015 the Appellant filed a Judicial Review application at the UT seeking to challenge the legality of his tagging and curfew.

The SSHD conceded and removed the Appellant's tag on 9 October 2015.The UT decided to determine the issues owing to their "unusual and important nature". The UT decided that the SSHD did not have the power to remove or relax bail conditions imposed by the FTT and had acted ultra-vires and that the FTT had a continuing role for so long as the bail order existed.

The Appellant filed an appeal to the Court of Appeal challenging this decision as the judgment would have meant that the Appellant would need to be re-tagged and the SSHD supported this application. The submissions were that on the true construction of paragraph 22 (1A) of Schedule 2 Immigration Act 1971, the FTT had the power to grant bail in order to secure the Appellant's surrender to an Immigration officer and once that had been done any conditions of bail imposed by the FTT lapsed and continuance of bail was then at the discretion of the SSHD and her officials. The Appellant submitted that the SSHD would be guided by any conditions the FTT proposed and could be judicially reviewed if they unreasonably imposed more draconian conditions. "It is fair to say that there are no express words in paragraph 22 saying that bail conditions are to cease on surrender but in my view Mr Clement's guidance correctly states the position as a matter of necessary inference from the terms of paragraph 22 and particularly 22(1A). It follows that there is no sub-scenario of FTT bail of non-finite duration in a case where there is no pending appeal to the FTT". (Paragraph 27)

The Court of Appeal decided that it was clear that the curfew conditions were imposed by the SSHD and that it was right that any application to discharge it was therefore to be made to her and not the FTT. "To that extent, the Upper Tribunal seems to have made its decision under a misapprehension of the position (no doubt because they did not have the documents produced recently to this court) and should have decided that, if the decision to impose a curfew was properly authorised, the Secretary of State had power to vary or discharge it. If it was not a properly authorised decision it could, no doubt, be quashed by judicial review but either way the Secretary of State was the correct respondent".(Paragraph 20) Further, the Court of Appeal agreed that the correct legal position is that conditions of bail imposed by the FTT expire on surrender to an immigration officer who then imposed his or her own conditions as is reflected clearly in paragraphs 33 and 35 of the Presidential Guidance Note. This decision greatly assists in clarifying the grey area as to when FTT bail comes to an end and when it becomes the responsibility of the SSHD to impose and vary bail conditions and what powers the SSHD has in this respect. Practitioners should now have a clearer picture of when to apply for variation of bail to the FTT and when to approach the SSHD directly.

Counsel - Chris Buttler of Matrix Chambers. Solicitor – Shalini Patel

Prison Officer Could Be Jailed Over Lesbian Fling With Dangerous Inmate

Lucy Thornton, Kevin Donald, Daily Mirror :A prison officer faces jail for a sexual fling behind bars with a dangerous inmate, a court has been told. Melissa Priestley's sex sessions with convicted thug Leonie Kinnish, 27, were uncovered after raunchy letters were found in the prisoner's cell. Kinnish was serving an extended sentence after she robbed a vulnerable couple in their home and she was branded a danger to the public. Her previous offences include an unprovoked street attack with a hammer, which landed her a four-year jail term, and

a conviction for fraud. Durham crown court heard that 33-year-old Priestley had given almost a decade of service at HMP Low Newton – home to notorious prisoner Rose West - when the allegations arose. A search of Kinnish's cell led to the discovery of letters suggesting an inappropriate relationship had taken place with a staff member. During the subsequent police investigation, messages found on Priestley's phone appeared to confirm the fling.

Priestley was charged with misconduct in a public office, between October 1 and December 2 last year, with the charge saying that as a prison officer she "wilfully misconducted herself by engaging in a sexual relationship with Leonie Kinnish.". She admitted the charge during a short plea hearing on Thursday. Ros Scott Bell, for Priestley, requested preparation of a background report on her client, prior to next month's sentencing hearing. She told the court: "This is a lady of hitherto good character who had been working at Low Newton since April 2006." Judge Christopher Prince agreed and told Priestley that all sentencing options, including custody, remain open to the court. He bailed the defendant, of Newton Aycliffe, County Durham, to return for the sentencing hearing on Thursday, September 22.

Following the hearing, John Dilworth, Deputy Chief Crown Prosecutor for the North-East, said: "For people to have confidence in the criminal justice system, they need to know that the law applies equally to all of those involved in the delivery of justice. The relationship between Melissa Priestly and the prisoner, over whom she had a professional duty of care, was wholly inappropriate. I would like to praise the swift actions of the prison authorities and police, once the initial reports of this relationship were received. Through their diligence vital evidence was preserved, assisting greatly in the Crown's preparation of a robust case against Melissa Priestley."

Kinnish and her brother Adrian were jailed at Preston crown court in January last year. Judge Pamela Badley said Leonie Kinnish posed such a danger to the public that she must be given an extended sentence of four years to protect the public from harm. The court heard Leonie knew that her victims, who were both in their 50s, had mobility problems but raided their flat on December 28t, 2013, and forced them to hand over cash. She was convicted of robbery and her brother of assault causing actual bodily harm. Kinnie had previously served a four-year sentence for an unprovoked street assault with a hammer. After she was handed her sentence, she begged Judge Badley to spare Adrian jail, saying: "Please don't send him down. It's my fault." Leonie Kinnish, of Greenset Close, Lancaster, was handed a five-year custodial term with four-year extended licence and Adrian Kinnish, of no fixed address, was given nine months.

Dalian Atkinson Death: Black People 'More Likely' to be Tasered By Police

Campaigners have reacted to the death of ex-footballer Dalian Atkinson by claiming you are "off the scale more likely" to be Tasered if you are black. The death of the 48-year-old black ex-Aston Villa striker, outside his parent's house in Telford, Shropshire, in the early hours of Monday morning, has added to tensions that were already running high in the wake of this summer's 'Black Lives Matter' protests. The incident has prompted calls for Prime Minister Theresa May to lead an "urgent and fundamental" review of how police use a weapon that can deliver a 50,000-volt shock and was fired 1,921 times in England and Wales last year.

A leading campaigner against excessive police deployment of Tasers has now told The Independent that the way the weapons are being used generally is "a reflection of institutional racism within the police". Matilda MacAttram, the director of the human rights campaign group Black Mental Health UK, said: "If you are black and living in England, the likelihood of you being Tasered is off the scale compared to the rest of the population." There is no indication that

the officers who attended the incident involving Mr Atkinson discriminated on racial grounds or acted inappropriately in any way. But Ms MacAttram said that when it came to the use of Tasers generally, an October 2013 report for the London Assembly found that black people represented half of those subjected to Taser deployment, despite making up only 10 per cent of the capital's population. In October 2015, Home Office statistics supplied as a result of a BBC Freedom of Information request showed that between 2010 and 2014 about 12 per cent of incidents in England and Wales where Tasers were drawn, aimed or fired involved black people – three times higher than their four per cent representation within the general population. Ms MacAttram said: "If we are living in a civilised 21st Century society, one would hope this wouldn't happen."

The precise details of Mr Atkinson's death are now the subject of an Independent Police Complaints Commission (IPCC) investigation, but his father Ernest, 85, said that his son had been "in a real state" shortly before the police arrived, telling reporters: "I don't know if he was drunk or on drugs but he was very agitated and his mind was upset." Ms MacAttram, who is calling for a ban on the routine use of Tasers against those detained in mental health institutions, criticised a general culture "where violence is being used against the most vulnerable in our society when they are in need of help". "The use of a Taser is never acceptable when dealing with somebody who is known to have or suspected to have a mental health condition. There has been a 10-year routine human rights abuse where the default is Tasers against the vulnerable on the streets or in hospitals. "When somebody is vulnerable, the response will not be – as it was 15 years ago – to try to engage with the person." She was backed by the Liberal Democrat MP Norman Lamb, who is supporting her efforts to ensure that the Policing and Crime Bill, currently passing through Parliament, includes a ban on routine Taser use against those detained in mental health institutions.

The former health minister said: "This [Mr Atkinson's death] was a tragic event. But it is not the only one. There needs to be an urgent and fundamental review of the use of Tasers. "Theresa May [when Home Secretary] had previously raised concerns about it and so I would like to see her take a lead on this. "Tasers are sometimes regarded as a safe option compared to the use of physical restraint, but there is accumulating evidence that that is not the case. There are very serious risks." Since 2004, when Tasers were authorised for use by authorised police firearms officers, before being given to other specially trained units in 2007, there have been at least 10 deaths in England and Wales linked to the so-called 'stun guns'. After it emerged that Mr Atkinson suffered a cardiac arrest as he was being taken to hospital in an ambulance, his nephew Fabian Atkinson said the ex-Aston Villa player had been having dialysis treatment for kidney problems. "And obviously that's inevitably why his heart was weaker. How do they know, unnaturally putting volts through a body, how do they know they're going to survive that?" he said. Mr Atkinson's death also comes two months after ex-soldier Spencer Beynon died in June as a result of being Tasered by police in Llanelli, South Wales, after stabbing a dog and then himself.

A Home Office spokesman said: "We are committed to giving the police the necessary tools to do their job — and a Taser provides officers with an important tactical option when facing potentially physically violent situations. But just as with sensitive powers like stop and search and mental health detention, the police use of force warrants proper accountability and transparency." The National Police Chiefs' Council (NPCC) refused to comment on Mr Atkinson's death until the IPCC had completed its investigation, but at the time of the BBC Freedom of Information request a spokesman said specialist Taser officers acted fairly regardless of race. The spokesman said: "Every use of Taser is reported and scrutinised by a supervisor and officers are personally accountable to the law each time their Taser is drawn. "Officers receive specialist training that helps them to determine the best course of action in resolving a violent or potentially violent situation. Taser is one of many tactical options a police officer can use. "In 80 per cent of Taser uses in the UK, the mere presence of the device is enough to resolve the violent or potentially violent situation without any force being used."

Another Death In Police Custody - Two Hours After Being Arrested

An investigation has been launched after a man died in police custody. Northumbria Police has said that a 45-year-old was arrested by officers in the Whitley Bay area at around 8pm, on Saturday. He was taken to the Middle Engine Lane police station, where he became unwell. During his time in custody, he received immediate medical attention within the cell and an ambulance was called to the station. Following further treatment by paramedics, the man was pronounced dead at just after 10pm. The death has been referred to the Independent Police Complaints Commission (IPCC) as matter of course. Supt Nicola Musgrove, of Northumbria Police, said: "This death within our custody is a tragic incident. "We immediately referred the death to the IPCC, as we would with any death in police custody, and we are assisting them fully. "Northumbria Police takes its commitment to the welfare of prisoners extremely seriously. "We will give the IPCC our full cooperation while they investigate all factors." The IPCC has confirmed it has started an independent investigation into the incident. Chronicle Live

Judge Dismisses Convictions of 3 Men Imprisoned for 20 Years

A judge on Monday 15/08/2016, tossed out murder convictions for three men who spent 20 years in prison in a case that started unraveling when attorneys learned a top county prosecutor deliberately hid witness statements casting doubt on their guilt. The men, Laurese Glover, Derrick Wheatt and Eugene Johnson, were convicted as teenagers in January 1996 for the fatal shooting of 19-year-old Clifton Hudson in East Cleveland but denied killing him. Johnson and Wheatt received sentences of 18 year to life, and Glover was sentenced to 15 years to life. Cuyahoga County Common Pleas Judge Nancy Margaret Russo released the men from prison in March 2015 and, for a second time, ordered a new trial after attorneys for the Ohio Innocence Project found a letter written by first assistant county prosecutor Carmen Marino in 1998 telling East Cleveland police to withhold the investigative file from attorneys filing an appeal of the convictions. Marino's letter instead directed police to send the file to him. The judge, during the March 2015 hearing, called Marino's letter a "deliberate, willful and malicious suppression" of evidence. The file contained reports with witness statements that identified someone other than Johnson as Hudson's killer in February 1995. Glover and Wheatt were charged with murder because they were seen in a vehicle along with Johnson near where Hudson was fatally shot.

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.