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 664 (30/11/2017) - Cost £1

IPCC Refuse to Prosecute Police Officer – As 'It Would Not be in the Public Interest'

Investigation report into the actions of Norfolk police before a fatal car accident in which a 19-year-old Preston Fulcher died. Preston was killed when he crashed his car into a tree during a police pursuit near North Walsham, Norfolk in June 2016. An inquest jury (13th November) returned a narrative verdict. The IPCC investigation was concluded in December 2016 and the report was provided to the force, the Coroner and the Crown Prosecution Service (CPS). In March 2017, the CPS decided there was sufficient evidence to prosecute but it was not in the public interest to do so because of the exemptions for police driving, the nature of the emergency and the level of blame that could be attributed to the officer's actions. Preston's family exercised their victim's right to review but upon review the CPS decided there was insufficient evidence for a prosecution. In the investigator's opinion the driver of the police car, PC Richard Jeffrey, had a case to answer for gross misconduct. However, following further expert opinion and discussions with Norfolk Police, who disagreed with these findings, IPCC Associate Commissioner Tom Milsom agreed with the force that there was insufficient evidence that a reasonable tribunal could find a case to answer against PC Jeffrey.

Coroner Grants Anonymity for Police Officers During the Inquest of Rashan Charles

Officers involved in the death of Rashan Charles have been granted anonymity at the pre-inquest review into the death of the 20 year old father. Rashan died following restraint by Metropolitan Police officers in Hackney, East London in the early hours of Sunday 23 July 2017. The coroner rejected the argument that there was a direct threat to officers lives, but granted anonymity. The officers will therefore give their evidence to the inquest into his death anonymously, meaning their names will not be revealed, and their faces will not be visible to the public gallery. Officers are to be referred to as BX47, the officer who initially restrained Rashan, and BX48. Anonymity was also given to two witnesses. Coroner Mary Hassel rejected that there was a real and immediate risk to life to those granted anonymity and said, "Mr Charles's family must be allowed to participate effectively. What is in a name? A great deal." However the judgement continued: "My starting point is open justice. I regret deeply any departure from that." Concluding, "I am acutely aware that there already exists a lack of confidence by some in certain institutions, for example the police. However, on this occasion, although it is finely balanced, I am of the view that the screening of the two police officers at inquest, and the use of ciphers in place of their names, is necessary in the interests of justice."

Rashan's death, the latest of four deaths of young black men in just over four weeks in summer, sparked widespread concern. The spate of deaths in June and July is part of a long history of a disproportionate number of restraint related deaths of people from black and minority ethnic groups. At the hearing, Jude Bunting, a legal representative for the family, argued that the case is of the utmost public interest noting, "…the Black Lives Matter movement have taken this to heart." The legal representatives of the police however highlighted the murder of Jo Cox MP by a far-right terrorist engaged with Nazism and white supremacy, as an example of the risks posed to officers. The full inquest into Rashan Charles' death is scheduled to open on 4 June 2018. An Independent Police Complaints Commission is investigation is ongoing; they are yet to announce whether recommendations for further criminal action should follow.A spokesperson for the family said: "Although this is disappointing it was not unexpected. Our focus remains on the quality of the IPCC investigation of Rashan's death, and on ensuring that proper consideration is given to criminal charges. These officers will not be able to hide behind anonymity in the criminal courts." Deborah Coles, director of INQUEST said: "This is a case of significant public interest and the process for holding police to account must be an open and transparent one. There is a disturbing trend of anonymity being granted to police officers at inquests and hearings into contentious police related deaths. Open justice is vital to assuage public concern about cover ups and to ensure accountability. This decision will only fuel the anger and suspicion that the police are promoting tactics to deflect responsibility for their actions."

Outside the Rules: How Immigration Detainees in Prison Are Let Down

Duncan Lewis: Unlike those held in Immigration Removal Centres (IRC's), immigration detainees in prison are not permitted a mobile phone or internet access and face significant obstacles accessing lawyers, charities, and Home Office caseworkers. And if that isn't bad enough, immigration detainees in prison are also denied the basic safeguards afforded to those in IRC's. The safeguards, found in the Detention Centre Rules are crucial in preventing vulnerable people from being held in detention. Rule 35 is especially important. Under this rule, doctors are required to assess whether a detainee is particularly vulnerable in detention, and to send a report of the assessment to the Home Office. The doctors look especially at special illnesses and conditions, including mental health issues as well as a history of torture, sexual abuse or trafficking. These reports can either result in the Home Office taking the initiative to release the individual, or can help lawyers obtain both release and compensation on the basis that they were unlawfully detained.

The problem is, Detention Centre Rules are just that, for those in detention centres, and they do not apply to those being held under immigration powers in prison. There, only the Prison Rules apply, even if you are being held under immigration powers. Do the Prisons Rules have any safeguards like Rule 35? The simple answer is no. Prison Rule 21 requires the prison governor to report to the Secretary of State for Justice about any 'prisoner whose health is likely to be injuriously affected by continued imprisonment or any conditions of imprisonment.' But Rule 21 does not explicitly apply to torture victims or those with suicidal intentions, nor is there any obligation on the governor to report to the Home Office. This is obviously unfair and unreasonable. There is no reason to think that detainees vulnerable to suffer harm as a result of detention in an IRC would not suffer the same level of harm in a prison. We at Duncan Lewis Solicitors are not alone in thinking this. In November 2015, Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Prisons (HMIP) recommended that: 'The Prison Rules should be amended to afford immigration detainees the same protections of Rule 35 of the Detention Centre Rules.' This was echoed a few months later in January 2016 by a civil servant, Stephen Shaw, when he was asked by the Home Office to write a report about detention. But the Home Office has ignored these recommendations from senior officials. This different treatment makes no sense and needs to be challenged. Over the last two years there have been at any one time between 450 and 550 people held in prison under immigration powers, that is around 15-20% of the detained population. It is impossible to know how many of these would have been released if they had been held in an IRC, because they are not afforded the same safeguards. We believe that every single woman and man unlawfully detained is an outrage. The Public Law Team at Duncan Lewis Solicitors specialise in fearlessly challenging unlawful detention. If you are being held in a prison under immigration powers, and being detained is affecting your physical or mental health, please get in touch with us and we will do our best to assist you.

Supergrass Evidence Will be Used in Murder Trial

BBC News: Evidence from a so-called supergrass will be used against an alleged Ulster Volunteer Force (UVF) man accused of murdering two men during the Troubles. Catholic workmen Gary Convie and Eamon Fox were shot dead at a building site in Belfast city centre in May 1994. It is understood the man to be charged is James Smyth, from Forthriver Link in Belfast. Former UVF commander Gary Haggarty, who has admitted 202 offences, including five murders, will be the star witness. The police bristle at the very mention of the word supergrass, because of its association with a series of high-profile trials in the 1980s. Hundreds of republicans and loyalists were convicted on the word of informers and suspects who agreed to give evidence in return for reduced sentences, new identities and lives outside Northern Ireland. Those deals were done at a political level, with the details kept secret. Technically, those individuals were assisting offenders but they became known as "touts" and "supergrasses" in communities. The system collapsed in 1985 because of concerns about the credibility of the evidence provided by the supergrasses. Members of the judiciary complained that they were being used as political tools to implement government security policy. A change in law in 2005 implemented safeguards for trials of that kind. Mr Smyth will be prosecuted for the two 1994 murders, one attempted murder, possession of a firearm and ammunition with intent to endanger life, and membership of the UVF. Mr Smyth was previously charged with the murders and when he was brought to court in 2014, he denied all of the offences. The charges were withdrawn two years ago.

Director of Public Prosecutions, Barra McGrory QC, announced on Tuesday the decision to use Haggarty as what is known as an assisting offender. "I am satisfied that there is independent evidence which is capable of supporting his identification of the subject," he said. "This includes both eyewitness and forensic evidence. In these circumstances, I have concluded that there is a reasonable prospect of conviction and that the test for prosecution is met. I can confirm that we intend to use assisting offender Gary Haggarty as a witness in this prosecution." In June, he pleaded guilty to a lengthy list of serious changes, including murders, attempted murders, kidnappings and false imprisonments. He was given five life sentences for the murders, but his agreement to act as an assisting offender will see those terms significantly reduced. All of the killings, and the majority of the other offences, took place while Haggarty was working as a police informer. Haggarty signed an agreement to become an assisting offender under the Serious Organised Crime and Police Act. He was interviewed by detectives more than 1,000 times and the information he gave them ran beyond 12,000 pages.

Grayling's 'Ideological' Defeat Over Prisoners' Legal Aid

Malvika Jagamohan, the Justice Gap: Following a landmark Court of Appeal ruling in April this year that a number of government cuts to legal aid for prisoners were inherently or systemically unfair, the Ministry of Justice last week withdrew an application to appeal the judgment. The decision marks the last in a lengthy list of reforms by former Lord Chancellor, Chris Grayling to be ditched by the government. The Government's surprise decision also marks the culmination of four years of campaigning efforts to reverse unpopular reforms to legal aid for prisoners introduced by the former justice secretary. Deborah Russo, joint managing solicitor of the Prisoners' Advice Service, said: 'After a long wait and years of battling through the courts we at PAS very much welcome the Secretary of State's decision to finally accept the Court of Appeal's ruling of inherent unfairness of the legal aid cuts imposed on prisoners back in December 2013. We believe that urgent action is now required to reinstate legal aid for some of the most vulnerable members of our society.'

Prisoners' legal aid: an ideological battleground: Back in 2013 Chris Grayling, the then Lord Chancellor, described his plans to cut legal aid for prisoners as 'ideological' in a session before the House of Commons' justice committee. 'I do not think prisoners should be able to go to court to debate which prison they sent to,' he told MPs. When pressed by Jeremy Corbyn, now leader of the Labour party, about prisoners claiming ill-treatment or suffering neglect as a result of medical conditions, Grayling replied that they were 'matters for an ombudsman'. The exchange prompted the following observation from the human rights lawyer barrister Baroness Helena Kennedy: 'It is as though it is not enough to go to prison and lose your liberty, and experience the deprivations that we know imprisonment means, so we are looking for other ways to punish.' Lord Pannick QC said that Grayling's cuts threatened to 'reverse 35 years of progress' in the approach adopted by the legal system to the treatment of prisoners which began in 1978 following the Hull prison riots. The MoJ's recent climbdown represents the latest in a long list of reforms made by Grayling only to be ditched by subsequent justice ministers, including his notorious book ban for prisoners, plans for a new secure college for young offenders, court charge on convicted criminals, criminal legal aid reforms as well as a £5.9million contract to supply training programmes for prisons in Saudi Arabia.'

The Howard League and the Prisoners' Advice Service saw calls by prisoners to their advice lines rise by almost 50 per cent since the cuts came into effect in 2013. This came alongside a growing crisis in prisons characterised by an alarming increase in suicides and incidents of self-harm, and escalating violence. Prison reform campaigners hoped that the Prisons and Courts Bill would mark the start of long overdue prison reform, however this was dropped by the government following the announcement of the snap general election on June 8. Between the launch of the legal challenge in 2013 and the case being heard in the Court of Appeal, the Government conceded ground on a number of areas where legal aid had been cut. They accepted that legal aid should be available in the form of exceptional funding for cases involving mother and baby units, resettlement, licence conditions and segregation.

The court, therefore, directed its attention to five areas where legal aid had been removed, finding that there was inherent or systemic unfairness in three of these: pre-tariff reviews by the Parole Board where the Board does not have the power to direct release; categorisation reviews of category A prisoners, and decisions about placement in close supervision centres. The Court drew upon the wider context of crisis in prisons, stating that "at a time when the evidence about prison staffing levels, the current state of prisons, and the workload of the Parole Board suggests that the system is under considerable pressure, the system has at present not got the capacity to sufficiently fill the gap in the run of cases in those three areas."

In arriving at its judgment, the Court gave particular consideration to the consequences for vulnerable prisoners, such as those with learning difficulties and mental health issues. The judgment by the Court of Appeal was not without its critics. Tory MP, Andrew Rosindell, responding to the ruling said: 'There is absolutely no support in the country for this kind of decision,' he said. 'Clearly the Government must take action to appeal to ensure taxpayer's money is not helping the most dangerous people in society. The British people will not be happy that they are funding cases that could see some of the most dangerous people in society back on the streets.' Alongside this most recent victory for legal aid campaigners, the government has finally announced a timetable for the long-awaited review of the Legal Aid, Sentencing and Punishment of Offenders 2012 (LASPO). It aims to publish its findings by summer 2018.

Early Day Motion 509: Human Rights Defender Mr Alwadaei And Situation In Bahrain

That this House is very concerned about the three-year prison sentences handed down recently in Bahrain for alleged terrorism offences committed by three family members of the UK-based Bahraini human rights activist, Sayed Ahmed Alwadaei; notes that the trial has been widely criticised, including by UN experts, and seen as an attempt to punish and silence Mr Alwadaei; is also concerned by the purported defamation in statements made by the Bahraini Embassy in the UK in connection with the case; is alarmed by the continuing deterioration in the human rights situation in Bahrain, marked by the approval of a constitutional amendment allowing civilians to be tried before a military court, the on-going trial of prominent human rights defender Nabeel Rajab and further charges, which appear to be politically motivated, brought against imprisoned opposition leader Sheikh Ali Salman; recalls the UN High Commissioner stating at the Human Rights Council session in September 2017 that the democratic space in the country has essentially been shut down and that no public relations campaign can paper over the violations being inflicted on the people of Bahrain; asks the Government of Bahrain to remove illegal restrictions on the activities of civil society and of peaceful opposition and to end politically motivated prosecutions immediately; and calls on the Government to raise these concerns with the Bahraini Government and to demonstrate the value of its assistance to them.

Early Day Motion 520: Extra-Judicial Killings In The Philippines

That this House notes with alarm the number of extra-judicial killings which have taken place in the Philippines as a result of President Duterte's so-called war on drugs which is estimated by Amnesty International at around 1,000 killings a month and further notes the threat of President Duterte to kill human rights defenders and journalists; notes the Philippines Government's refusal to accept the recommendations of the UN Human Rights Committee Periodic Review for ending the extra-judicial killings, and the EU's current review of its preferential trade deal with the Philippines in the light of the continued killings and human rights violations; notes with concern the visit of the UK International Trade Minister, on 3 and 4 April 2017, in which he met with President Duterte and offered increased trade between the UK and the Philippines; calls on the Government to halt any further UK trade missions to the Philippines until the killings have stopped; and further calls to commit itself to attach at least the same requirements for basic human rights standards, which are contained in the EU's trade agreements to any post Brexit trade agreement which it makes with the Philippines or with any other country.

Learning lessons: Deaths in Approved Premises Involving Substance Misuse

Approved Premise (APs), home to people released from prison or on bail or court orders, need more effective drug testing practices and better staff guidance to identify and address the risks associated with substance misuse, and support individuals. Overdoses of opiate and other drugs, including alcohol, by people released from prison remain a significant risk, the PPO's Learning Lessons bulletin found. Individuals are at a higher risk of overdose if they slip back into drug and alcohol use after periods of abstinence or detoxification. The bulletin, based on findings from deaths in APs investigated by the PPO, also raised significant concerns about New Psychoactive Substances (NPS). These range from stimulants to hallucinogens and are commonly seen in prisons and the community as synthetic cannabinoids, known by names such as Spice and Mamba. PPO investigations identified issues with the effectiveness and implementation of drug testing regimes, as well as deficiencies in information sharing and in welfare checks.

The bulletin made a number of recommendations: Tests should be undertaken for all suspected drugs, but particularly opiates if the resident is a previous user. Substance misuse needs to be managed holistically, and testing practices should reflect the resident's full risk of misusing all types of substances. Tests should be undertaken on induction for residents who are at high risk of substance misuse and whenever substance misuse is suspected. If AP staff suspect someone is under the influence of NPS they should seek medical advice and respond to the symptoms presented. Staff should undertake routine and targeted room searches. Staff should advise residents of the dangers of using NPS. The NPS should review its drug testing policy within APs and should consider introducing testing for NPS. The NPS should revise the AP manual to provide up-to-date guidance on the management of NPS use. Staff who work with an AP resident should ensure risk management information is shared with appropriate agencies. This includes, but is not limited to, the resident's risk to themselves and of substance misuse. The NPS should revise the AP manual to emphasise the importance of information sharing about a resident's substance misuse. Staff undertaking checks of residents should satisfy themselves the resident is safe and well. During a check, staff must have sight of the resident. The NPS should review the guidance on welfare checks to ensure it is clear why the checks are needed and what they should entail, particularly in relation to substance misuse.

Acting Ombudsman Elizabeth Moody said: "We know offenders can be at heightened risk of death following their release into the community. I hope this bulletin will help AP staff apply the learning from our investigations to improve the ways they identify, monitor and address the risk factors associated with substance misuse."

'Speedy Justice' Deterring Magistrates From Releasing Offenders

Law Gazette: Magistrates under pressure to conduct 'speedy justice' are reluctant to release offenders back into the community, a senior representative of the magistracy has revealed. Sheena Jowett, deputy chair of the Magistrates Association, told a Westminster Legal Policy Forum seminar on probation services that offenders' behaviour is often linked to possible mental illness, drug and alcohol abuse, learning difficulties and a possible history of trauma. Jowett said: 'We are being pushed for speedy justice these days. If someone is before us and pleads guilty, we are expected to deal with them on the day. If someone pleads not guilty, we do a pre-trial review, look at what's going on and set a trial date... One hearing for a guilty plea, two hearings for a not guilty plea.

However, speedy justice 'is not so good for us when we sentence sometimes [because of the] lack of information', Jowett warned. The National Probation Service, which supervises high-risk offenders released into the community, has 'little time to investigate the person in front of us'. Probation services were previously delivered by 35 self-governing probation trusts working under the direction of the National Offender Management Service (NOMS). In 2014 probation services were divided into a National Probation Service across seven regions and new community rehabilitation companies (CRCs). In July 2015 some 243,000 offenders were supervised by the NPS and CRCs. The Magistrates Association, which has 15,000 members, believes magistrates should have more information in their sentences. However, magistrates have no contact with community rehabilitation companies. Jowett, who commutes two hours to sit in West Wales, said: 'We do not know, generally speaking, what's available. There has been mapping on a regional basis [of] what's available but that's going to vary widely between urban and rural communities.' Highlighting a lack of information in relation to rehabilitation activity requirements, which can form part of a community order, Jowett warned: 'It's important we do know because if we have not got the confidence in our sentences we're not going to feel...that the community is the right place for offenders in front of us. 'The punishment must fit the crime. But can I also add it must fit the offender that comes to us.'

Only 5% of 'Honour' Crimes Reported to Police are Referred to CPS

Hannah Summers, Guardian: The police are failing the victims of "honour" crimes, with just 5% of reported cases being referred to the Crown Prosecution Service, a leading charity has warned. The number of cases of "honour" based violence, forced marriage and FGM reported to the police has increased by 53% since 2014, figures obtained through the Freedom of Information Act show. However, despite the rise in reporting, the volume of cases referred to the CPS for a charging decision is the lowest it has been for five years. "More victims of 'honour' based violence are coming forward to the police than ever before but worryingly the evidence suggests those seeking justice are being failed by the system," said Diana Nammi, the executive director of the Iranian and Kurdish Women's Rights Organisation. The number of "honour" crimes reported to the police increased from 3,335 in 2014 to 5,595 in 2015 – a rise of 68%, according to data collected by the charity from every police force in the country. The number of reports dropped slightly to 5,105 in 2016.

However, the latest figures published by the CPS show only 256 "honour" crimes were referred to the organisation by police in 2016/17 – just 5% of the cases reported over a similar period. The 256 referrals resulted in 215 prosecutions and a subsequent 122 convictions. Nammi said: "Of the large numbers reporting these crimes, very few cases are referred to the CPS and ultimately we are not seeing enough prosecutions. Our findings show the low prosecution rate cannot be blamed on the incorrect assumption that victims are not coming forward. "Some of these cases can be hard to prosecute but with a record number of victims reporting, it is imperative the justice system is fit to respond and, where necessary, perpetrators are held to account." The increase in reporting follows the criminalisation of forced marriage in June 2014, which has led to an improved awareness of "honour" crimes, but only one prosecution under the legislation. A report on the police response to these crimes, which disproportionately affect women from ethnic minorities, was published in December 2015 by Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabulary. The police watchdog concluded only three of 43 police forces in England and Wales were adequately prepared in all areas to respond to the needs of victims and take a case through to prosecution. The report laid out 14 recommendations to be put in place by the end of 2016, yet some remain outstanding.

The HM inspector of constabulary, Wendy Williams, said: "We made a series of recommendations to the Home Office, the National Police Chiefs Council, chief constables and the College of Policing all of which were aimed at improving practice in relation to these extremely vulnerable victims. We are reviewing the data on recorded crimes and prosecutions and will use this in deciding what follow-up activity we might carry out in 2018/19." She added: "In future we shall be asking forces to submit information to us which provides details of how they are assessing current and future demands for their service in this area." The National Police Chiefs Council lead for "honour" based violence, Commander Ivan Balhatchet, told the Guardian: ""Honour' based abuse is a complex crime which often happens within community or family networks that many victims find it very difficult to speak out against and can face further threats, violence or isolation if they do. In all cases our priority is to safeguard vulnerable victims from this appalling form of abuse so we work to put protection orders in place as soon as possible even where a conviction is not possible." His comments followed the news last week that a man was to be charged for FGM, following an investigation by the Metropolitan police. If the prosecution is successful it would mean the first British conviction for FGM since the practice was outlawed in 1985.

Insp Allen Davis who leads Project Azure, the Met's response to FGM, said: "These are hidden crimes and police data is never going to reflect the true scale of the problem. The data is really useful for shining a light on this complex area but it needs to be taken in context. For example, with FGM, we get a lot of reports where a child may be at risk but it doesn't necessarily mean a crime has occurred. It will be counted as a police report but the response may involve obtaining a protection order." He added: "The police are absolutely taking these crimes seriously and we would like to see more referrals and prosecutions but often there are other safeguarding outcomes that don't involve a conviction."

Women's charities say a victim of "honour" abuse is much more likely to see a case through to prosecution when supported by the third sector. However, cuts to legal aid and support services within BAME communities have left many women without recourse to justice. The National College of Policing said it has published guidance for forces around "honour" crimes and is in ongoing discussions about reviewing risk assessments for forced marriage, FGM and "honour" based violence. Earlier this year the home secretary, Amber Rudd, announced more than 40 projects to share a £17m transformation fund as part of the government's £100m pledge to help tackle violence against women and girls.

Seek Advice Over Forensics 'Data Manipulation' Concerns

Law Gazette: The government has urged people worried that family court cases may have been affected by widely reported alleged forensic data manipulation to seek legal advice. In a written ministerial statement, policing minister Nick Hurd said that contractor Randox Testing Services (RTS) informed Greater Manchester Police in January that test results may have been manipulated at its laboratories. Ongoing police investigations have since uncovered that the same manipulation may have occurred at Trimega Laboratories Ltd, Hurd said. The tests involved detect the presence of drugs and in some cases alcohol in an individual's hair, blood or urine. Hurd said the alleged manipulation raises doubts about the reliability of some test results, which may have been subsequently relied on in criminal, coroners and family court proceedings. However, the Ministry of Justice does not believe that any civil cases are affected. The results may also have been used by local authorities when making child protection decisions outside the court process, or by private employers for drug and alcohol testing.

Hurd confirmed that results from all tests carried out by Trimega between 2010 and 2014 are being treated as potentially unreliable. The number of Trimega's customers affected, such as local authorities, individuals, legal representatives and employers, is unknown. It is unlikely that decisions about children's welfare will have been taken solely on the basis of toxicology test results, Hurd said. However, the government has created form C650, an application notice to vary or discharge a final court order in relation to children. Hurd encouraged individuals to seek legal advice from a solicitor or Citizens Advice before making an application. Private employers who may have commissioned a test are also encouraged to seek advice.

Most drug tests from RTS between 2013 and 2017 are being treated as potentially unreliable, Hurd said. RTS was mainly commissioned by individual police forces when investigating criminal offences. They have also been commissioned to undertake hair-strand tests for drugs and alcohol in the civil and family jurisdictions. In a statement posted on its website, RTS said it has worked alongside the police and appropriate authorities throughout the 10-month investigation. Dr Mark Piper, RTS toxicology manager, said: 'We have acted as whistleblower to ensure the integrity of the criminal justice system. We will continue to work with Greater Manchester Police and the appropriate authorities in the investigation. We will do all we can to ensure this situation is resolved and deeply regret the distress that has been caused. We are now well advanced in developing a foolproof testing system which would enhance the security of our operations in the future, to provide the necessary level of confidence.'

CCRC Statement on the Randox Situation

The CCRC has made sure that it is fully informed of developments in the Randox situation. Since the issues first emerged we have been liaising with both the Crown Prosecution Service and the Forensic Science Regulator. We have remained alive to the fact that there could be a significant number of cases, of varying types, where the reliability of Randox test results could raise questions about the safety of criminal convictions. With that in mind we have asked that the CPS makes clear the role of the CCRC in any correspondence it has with people whose convictions may be affected by these issues. We have also asked for assurance from the CPS that we will be informed about conviction cases causing particular concern and have offered the benefit of our experience and expertise with miscarriages of justice in the process of assessing the potential impact of Randox results on the safety of convictions. Given the situation as set out in the Ministerial Statement and at the joint NPCC and FSR press conference, it is clear that the situation has the potential to generate a considerable number of cases for the CCRC as the independent statutory body responsible for reviewing potential miscarriages of justice. At this stage, there is no way of accurately assessing how many, or what types of cases will come our way, but we are alive to the situation and we continue to liaise with both the Crown Prosecution Service and the Forensic Science Regulator.

I Was a Victim of Undercover Police Abuse. I and Others Fear We Won't Get Justice

Alison Anon: Here in the Royal Courts of Justice we are listening for crumbs of information about the officers who used and abused us. But nothing is revealed. I've been researching undercover policing ever since the boyfriend I knew as Mark Cassidy left me in spring 2000. Like the other female activists bringing cases of undercover police abuse to light, I have become skilled in scouring documents, interrogating and interpreting evidence. We've fought a legal case against the Metropolitan police to expose its institutional sexist practices, and waited for five years for an apology that should have been given much earlier. Now I'm one of the 180 "non-state core participants" (NSCPs) in the public inquiry into undercover policing. Established in March 2015, the inquiry was due to report in July 2018, but it's looking unlikely any evidence will be heard until 2019, and the end date is no longer even in sight. Sir John Mitting, the inquiry chair, is sitting for three days this week in the Royal Courts of Justice in London, listening to legal arguments and counter-arguments about police anonymity. He obliquely responded to a letter from October signed by 115 NSCPs expressing our concern about the inquiry's lack of openness and transparency, stating that his priority was to "discover the truth".

For many of the ordinary people attending as core participants, the Royal Courts building – with its endless gothic corridors – is intimidating and alien. Sitting in the public gallery of court 76 is a collection of journalists, core participants, and our friends and family. We are listening to the lawyers discuss principles established in case law that very few of us sitting at the back will understand. We usually sit politely and wait in good faith, as we've been doing now for two years, for crumbs of information about the police officers who collectively used and abused us. But yesterday morning was different. Vocal interventions from core participants expressed our frustration at a process which, despite the judge's reassurance, is looking more likely to obfuscate than reveal the truth. Because nothing is being revealed. Not even the full list of the groups spied on. Despite the Metropolitan police apology issued to me and the other women, Mark Jenner (who I knew as Mark Cassidy) is the only officer cited in our case whose identity has still not been officially confirmed by either the Met or the inquiry. No reason has been

given. The latest tranche of documents promised that some names would be revealed: a few cover names (including HN81, who infiltrated the Stephen Lawrence family campaign) and some real names. Each officer is coded by an HN number, and the list is dizzying.

But many officers we will learn nothing about. The judge has already made some orders for some evidence to be heard in secret, and it will no doubt be so heavily redacted before it reaches the public as to be meaningless. In these cases, he will rely on information collected by the police about their own officers. How can this be fair? How can a judge determine the impact of secret deployments if those who were targeted are not told who spied on them? Without transparency, how do we know if these nameless HN numbers infiltrated other family justice campaigns? How do we know if they had abusive, intimate relationships with those they spied on? How do we know if they passed on information to private corporations resulting in trade unionists being blacklisted from work? And how do we know if they acted within the law? Trying to access and make sense of their redacted evidence buried deep within the inquiry's website is hugely challenging. Like the corridors of the building, the complexity of the website renders many of us bewildered and disengaged from a process in which our participation feels anything but "core".

Despite institutional racism being central to the setting up of the inquiry, when it was revealed that the Lawrence family was spied upon, the inquiry team is all white. It is predominantly male and is now being chaired by a judge who is a member of the men-only Garrick Club. A letter sent to the home secretary in September, requesting a meeting to discuss the inappropriateness of the new judge, has been ignored. Instead of recognising the damage done to those of us who tracked down our ex-partners, various witnesses are characterising our searches as malicious. And the emphasis the police are placing on the right of the abusers to protect their families contrasts sickeningly with their total lack of regard for the families they intruded upon. Mitting must appreciate the context in which his inquiry is now taking place. Since the recent revelations about abuse of women by men in the film industry, parliament and elsewhere, the misogyny of our society has become unignorable. What happened to us was sustained abuse.

The men who have been exposed in other spheres have been named and shamed. Harvey Weinstein, Max Stafford-Clark and Kevin Spacey cannot hide who they were when they were abusing their positions of power. Sexual abusers should not be able to rely on a court anonymity order. Undercover police officers, by contrast, were given state-sponsored identities. From what we know thus far, it's likely that many committed long-term and far-reaching human rights abuses, for which they may never be held publicly responsible if their real names are concealed. If they didn't commit these wrongdoings, what are they afraid of? If their targets were legitimate, why do they need to hide behind fake names? Sexual abusers should not be able to rely on a court anonymity order. No one else alleged to have committed such abuse is offered this privilege. We know that three officers who had intimate, sexual relationships with activists (John Dines, Bob Lambert and Andy Coles) all went on to reinvent themselves, taking on public roles as advisers and consultants to international police departments and university criminology courses, or holding public office as a deputy police and crime commissioner. Without knowing the real names of the officers involved in our lives and the lives of others, how do we hold to account those who have since created illustrious careers advising policymakers on police matters? Many of us feel this inquiry is turning into another attempt at an establishment cover-up. Our patience is running out.

Alison is one of eight women who successfully took legal action against the Metropolitan police over the conduct of undercover officers. Most of the women have chosen to remain anonymous

Mother 'Heartbroken' as Misconduct Cases Against Officers Dropped

Jon Sharman, Independent: A mother has spoken of the "heartbreaking" failure of her eight-year search for the truth about her son's death in a police chase after misconduct cases against two officers involved in the resulting crash and its aftermath were dismissed. Liam Albert, 17, died a week after crashing a stolen Mazda in Surrey in 2009 following a high-speed pursuit that began in south-west London. PC John Wills, the passenger in the pursuing Metropolitan Police car, and Inspector Mandy Chamberlain, who arrived at the crash site later, faced gross misconduct proceedings over claims they removed an exhibit from the scene and ordered the deletion of photographic evidence, respectively. PC Wills was also said to have failed to install his car's video recording system.

The driver of the police car, PC Paul Rogers, retired last year after the Crown Prosecution Service (CPS) said there was not enough evidence to bring criminal charges over the crash, so did not face a misconduct hearing. It was claimed Insp Chamberlain had ordered him to delete phone photos of the crash. On Thursday 02/11/2017, PC Wills' and Insp Chamberlain's request to throw out the cases was granted after senior officers ruled so much time had elapsed that a fair hearing was "not possible".

Speaking exclusively to The Independent, Liam's mother Sharla John said she felt her concerns about the crash evidence had been "shoved under the carpet like it means nothing". She and Liam's father, Delroy Albert, first filed a complaint to the Met in 2010. Ms John said: "What we were looking for were answers to how he died, how did the collision happen, what were the events leading up to [it]. Which will not bring my son back but at least gives us some idea. There's so many questions that haven't been answered, that, deliberately, to us it looks like, they have skimmed past. They've just humoured us from the beginning, I believe. We look to the police for guidance, for help, for confidence, for protection. That's just knocked me for six. Emotionally it's not going to leave us, we're not going to get a closure."

Surrey Police first investigated the crash, finding no case to answer against any officer. A year after Liam's death his parents filed a complaint with the Met after learning of the phone pictures. Documents seen by The Independent show how it was repeatedly put off until the Independent Police Complaints Commission (IPCC) launched its own probe in 2013. The Met first said it would postpone its investigation to allow Liam's inquest to take place, a process which did not conclude until December 2011. After the teen's parents filed a renewed request based on information that came to light at Woking Coroner's Court, the force twice asked the IPCC for permission to end its investigation, in March and May 2012, on grounds it was "repetitious". The second request was granted but overturned by judicial review in 2013. The IPCC began its investigation in May that year — now nearly four years after the crash. However, it did not interview PC Wills or Insp Chamberlain until the autumn of 2014, Thursday's hearing was told, and only finished its investigation in June 2015 when it handed its findings to the CPS. Met commander Ivan Balhatchet, leading the misconduct panel, said the delay was "entirely unsatisfactory and completely unacceptable". On Thursday the commission apologised to Liam's parents and the officers, saying it had "undergone a substantial change programme and has made significant improvements in the way we work".

The CPS' decision not to prosecute came in March last year. In April, the IPCC told the Met to begin the misconduct process — some 18 months before the hearings eventually took place. Cmdr Balhatchet said: "Significant periods of time passed because of disagreement between the Met and the IPCC as to whether the latter had provided proper disclosure of

investigation material." On 8 July 2009, PCs Rogers and Wills chased Liam from Merton over the county border into Surrey. The teen crashed into another car near a roundabout in Lammas Lane, Esher, at about 4.50am. He was taken to Kingston Hospital but died of his injuries on 15 July. PC Wills was later accused of failing to install an in-car ProVida video system before the chase, failing to provide an appropriate commentary during it and removing an item from the crash scene without permission. Insp Chamberlain withheld evidence from Surrey Police and ordered the deletion of photographs, it was alleged.

But Cmdr Balhatchet ruled the eight-year time gap between the crash and the hearing had resulted in prejudice against both officers. Also on the panel were assessors Superintendent Tony Josephs, of the Met, and Yvonne Taylor, from the Mayor's Office for Policing and Crime. The legal advisor was Jonathan Swift QC. Insp Chamberlain was only notified her conduct was under scrutiny in January 2014, denying her the chance to reflect on potentially material matters and so causing prejudice, the hearing was told. And the passage of time had put PC Wills at a disadvantage due to possible problems in speaking to his statements and actions of eight years ago, it heard. At an earlier hearing PC Wills' lawyer, Kevin Baumber, said that while Liam's death was "tragic" PC Wills faced no allegations blaming him for it and there were no circumstances which justified the delay in misconduct allegations being brought forward. Hugh Davies, counsel for Insp Chamberlain, added that all evidence against her was available by mid-December of 2009. In the intervening time, Insp Chamberlain believed she was only a witness and may have disposed of evidence that could help her case now, while her memory of her two hours at the scene of the crash would have been "compromised" by the passage of time, Mr Davies told the earlier hearing.

Andre Clovis, representing Ms John and Mr Albert, told The Independent: "Despite knowing of the disturbing conduct issues in this case from very early on, the MPS delayed and then actively opposed this investigation commencing, such that no steps were taken by them between 2009 and 2013. "The IPCC's inability to make coherent submissions to the misconduct panel for the unexplained delays since 2013, and their open concessions of fault, is considered by Liam's parents to be nothing short of an embarrassment and a disgraceful waste of public funds. This outcome was foreseeable and confirms all that is wrong with the complaints system. Lessons seem not to be learnt and so it is almost impossible to hold police officers to account for alleged misconduct." Ms John, 48, a facilities manager, added: "Another family is going to sit here and have this interview next year, next month. Nothing has changed. I don't think it's fair that the ex-police investigate the police in any case. It's establishment against establishment. It's not going to give any other family the incentive to take the IPCC on. I would probably be put off. But you've got to try. We had to try. It's been a slog, it's been a long eight years. It's not for nothing but they make it feel like we have done it for nothing because they haven't put any effort in. It's heartbreaking to listen to."

The panel concluded on Thursday that "the disciplinary charges should be dismissed on the basis that it is not possible for there to be a fair hearing of them". Cmdr Balhatchet added: "The conduct of the investigation into the complaint made by Liam Albert's parents was entirely unsatisfactory and completely unacceptable. It must not be allowed to happen again. Situations such as this do nothing but harm public confidence. The delay that has occurred has betrayed the trust of Liam Albert's parents. The complaint that they made should have been investigated promptly. I have not seen a case that comes close to this case in terms of the length of time to investigate. "We cannot see that there was any sense of urgency."

Richard Martin, the Met's deputy assistant commissioner for professionalism said: "It is crucially important for public confidence that police officers are held to account and the sad death of Liam has been investigated twice, through a managed and then independent IPCC inquiry, and fully scruti-

nised during an inquest. However, it is also very important that officers are treated fairly and in the exceptional circumstances of this case the panel determined that could not happen. While there are often some unavoidable delays in arranging misconduct hearings, we will review what happened in this case and I would like to express our regret to Liam's family if there are things we could have done better." IPCC commissioner Cindy Butts apologised to Liam's parents and PC Wills and Insp Chamberlain. She said: "While our investigation was completed within two years, we recognise that, at eight years, this process has taken far too long. Since this investigation concluded, the IPCC has undergone a substantial change programme and has made significant improvements in the way we work to prevent similar delays occurring. This includes the introduction of a quality assurance process to highlight issues before unnecessary delays can set in and a more streamlined investigation process."

Name, Number and Nationality

Greg Foxsmith, 'The Justice Gap': A new requirement is in force with effect from the start of the week that requires every defendant appearing before a criminal court to confirm their nationality, or risk a prosecution and imprisonment. n practice, 'the Court'. is likely to be the Magistrates Court, at the first appearance in a case. The provision is offensive and objectionable, and straight out of the UKIP dream statute book. Why stop there? Why not require confirmation of religion? Perhaps instead of requiring a question and answer routine, the Court could just write down the defendant's skin colour. It is presumed the legislation is to assist with the speedy deportation of 'foreign' criminals. But how to monitor them once identified? Well lock them up obviously – something that is nine times more likely to happen if the foreign national is non-white, as evidenced in the Lammy report. But after that? It is a only a short step from obtaining verification of nationality to requiring the foreign defendant to be tagged, a digital equivalent of being forced to display a star or triangle. The legislation ironically became effective the day after Remembrance Sunday.

Enforcement: How are the provisions to be policed? If a defendant fails to answer, it presumably falls on the prosecutor to lay a charge. My contacts in the CPS tell me in they have had no training or guidance in respect of this legislation. How will the charge be proved? The prosecutor cannot be a witness in their own case. Will the judge be required to give evidence, or treat it as they would a contempt? Is the defence advocate professionally embarrassed in the substantive proceedings as well as the nationality offence? There may well be a temptation for a foreign national appearing in court to keep their head down and answer 'British'. But perversely, as a British born citizen ashamed of this legislation and outraged at it's purpose, the temptation for me were I appearing as a defendant would be to refuse to answer out of sheer bloody-mindedness ('don't tell em Pike!') or to say something flippant (European? Independent republic of Islington?). Answering questions in these circumstances (rather than sticking up two fingers) is I'm afraid alien to me. In fact it's as foreign as compulsory ID cards.

Absurdities: Is it permissible to answer 'none' if the defendant is stateless, the refugee without a nation home? What of the defendant who answers one nationality, but is believed to be of another (the first limb of the s3 offence?) How is the 'true' nationality to be proven? Is there a defence if the defendant genuinely believes they have acquired British nationality, answers accordingly, but finds out status still undetermined, or is it a strict liability offence? What is the penalty for the prankster who answers 'Vulcan' or 'Jedi'? Do they get a second chance?

Which nationalities are recognised? The 193 currently recognised by the UN, or a broader definition? There are said to be 270 nationalities (and 300 different languages) in London alone. What of dependent territories, or those are on the verge of becoming sovereign nations?

What of autonomous regions of different nations? Can a resident from Barcelona answer 'Catalan'? Are fat-cat tax avoiders to say 'British', or name their off-shore domiciled nationality? What of those with joint or dual nationality, do they get to choose? At this post-Brexit time of national discourse leading to discontent, with the issues of prejudice and discrimination in the criminal justice system to the fore after publication of David Lammy's report, the timing of this rushed and ill-judged legislation is unfortunate. Nigel Farage may be cheering, I am not.

HMP North Sea Camp – Some Concerns

HMP North Sea Camp, a category D resettlement prison near Boston in Lincolnshire, mixed sex offenders with other prisoners but achieved an atmosphere of peaceful co-existence, according to a report by Inspectors found negligible levels of violence and use of force by staff, earning the prison – home to just over 400 men, most serving long sentence and 60% of them sex offenders - the highest rating of 'good' for safety. Peter Clarke, HMCI, said: "There was no segregation unit, and no need for one. The fact that the population was fully integrated yet there was little if any hostility towards sex offenders was a tribute to the ethos of the prison and the care that was taken to generate an atmosphere of peaceful co-existence and tolerance." The report noted: "A 'don't ask, don't tell' policy was used well to address the fears of men who were vulnerable because of their offence about living in a mixed population." HMP North Sea Camp was also rated as good for resettlement work – its core function as an open prison. Mr Clarke said the prison had "moved on dramatically" since the last inspection, in 2014. At that time there was still concern about a serious incident that took place during a release on temporary licence (ROTL), exposing weaknesses in the resettlement process. Mr Clarke added: "Relationships between staff and prisoners were respectful, which was a major strength of the prison and the basis on which much of the progress of the past few years was clearly built. The senior leadership, and indeed all staff, were committed to producing a safe and decent environment in which the men could make progress towards eventual release and successful resettlement."

Inspectors, however, raised some concerns: • Prisoner accommodation was in a poor state. The residential units were old, far too many of the rooms were too small to be used for double occupancy and the showers and toilets urgently needed refurbishment. However, it was clear that a comparatively modest investment could deliver significant improvements. • The prison had several houses outside the gate known as the Jubilee units, which offered men coming towards the end of their sentences excellent opportunities to gain resettlement experience. However, several of these houses were unused, virtually derelict and needed refurbishment. The inspection also found a tension between performance measures used by HM Prison and Probation Service (HMPPS), which judged performance based on the numbers of prisoners placed in work within the prison, and what should have been the objective of the prison, which was to maximise the use of ROTL. The report noted: "The prison was not credited for those prisoners employed under ROTL outside the confines of the prison. The governor was, appropriately, concerned to get as many men working under ROTL as possible but the performance targets were causing some concern. It seems, Mr Clarke said, that the HMPPS performance measure had been designed for the closed prison estate, and it should be revisited to make it appropriate for open prisons. "As it stood, there was an incentive not to achieve in full the core purpose of the prison." 19 recommendations from the last inspection had not been achieved. Inspectors made 49 recommendations,

Mr Clarke said: "Overall, HMP North Sea Camp had made very real progress since the last inspection. It was a safe and decent prison with some bold policies relating to the management of its complex population, and it was now a successful establishment."

HMP Erlestoke –Significant Spice Drug Problems

HMP Erlestoke in Wiltshire had failed to tackle a significant drugs problem - particularly with the synthetic cannabis, Spice - which generated violence and bullying and 'a sense of hopelessness' among prisoners, according to a report by HM Inspectorate of Prisons (HMIP). Peter Clarke, HM Chief Inspector of Prisons, said Erlestoke – a category C training jail with around 500 prisoners, mostly serving life or very long sentences – had clearly deteriorated since it was last inspected four years ago, and outcomes were now judged to be insufficiently good in three of our four tests of a healthy prison. Safety in the prison was not good enough, Mr Clarke said. 'Much of the violence and bullying… was, in our view, linked to a significant drug problem, and yet the prison lacked an effective drug strategy. Work to confront and reduce violence was weak and uncoordinated, and staff confidence and competence in ensuring reasonable challenge and supervision needed improvement.' Inspectors found that inexperienced staff often worked on 'challenging' wings without support from experienced colleagues. Incidents of prisoners self-harming had doubled since we last inspected.

Many prisoners trying to tackle drug addiction told inspectors 'that the availability of drugs, coupled with the recent smoking ban, had contributed to a widespread sense of hopelessness, and that it was difficult to maintain recovery in an atmosphere where so many other prisoners were regularly under the influence of Spice. 'Prisoners also told us that the price of Spice was around half of that for illicit tobacco, which encouraged more Spice use than we have seen in similar prisons recently. There were frequent medical emergencies, some very serious, resulting from Spice use, partly due to prisoners smoking Spice without diluting it with tobacco, as is common practice elsewhere.' Other priorities to be tackled, inspectors said, were: 'Chaotic' arrangements for receiving new prisoners into the jail. New arrivals were often left without basic items, such as a kettle or pillow. Prisoners had to request to be taken to a separate clothing store for basic items like socks, only to find there were none available. Better promotion of equality – inspectors found Erlestoke had 'a poor understanding of the needs and perceptions of prisoners from minority groups.' Ensuring prisoners attended activities. Inspectors found 23% of prisoners locked in cell during the working day, with significant numbers of others not doing anything purposeful. There was also 'unacceptably poor punctuality or non-attendance of those meant to be at work or training.' 34 recommendations from the last inspection had not been achieved, Inspectors made 71 recommendations.

HMP Northumberland - Prison's Plans No Effect on High Violence, Lack of Safety and Drugs

HMP Northumberland, a large training prison, had high levels of violence, with more than a quarter of prisoners feeling unsafe, and severe drugs problems, according to an HM Inspectorate of Prisons report. The prison had suffered six self-inflicted deaths in the last three years but few of the shortcomings identified by investigations into those deaths had been addressed. And there was a "clearly unacceptable" failure to assess the risk posed to the public by many released prisoners. Peter Clarke, HM Chief Inspector of Prisons, said the leadership team had a wide range of plans and strategies in place to tackle these and other problems "but many of them had yet to achieve their desired effect." HMP Northumberland, a category C jail formed in 2011, was inspected in July and August. Inspectors were concerned to find that:

• 35 recommendations from the last inspection had not been achieved and 13 only partly achieved. • Violence had more than doubled since the previous inspection in 2014; 58% had felt unsafe at some time, a significantly higher figure than at similar prisons and much higher than at the last inspection." Mr Clarke said: "It was also troubling that 28% of prisoners felt unsafe at the time of this inspection, a very high figure by any standards. In the face of this grim picture, one would have expected there to be detailed analysis of the violence, leading to a comprehensive violence reduction plan. This was not what we found. There were plans for the future, but these had not yet come to fruition." • Few of the shortcomings identified by Prisons and Probation Ombudsman (PPO) investigations into the six self-inflicted deaths since 2014 had been addressed. "This was difficult to comprehend and demanded the personal attention of senior management." • A total of 61% of men said that it was easy or very easy to obtain illicit drugs in the jail, and 21% said they had acquired a drug habit since entering the prison. The drug supply reduction strategy was clearly not working. • Inspectors were particularly concerned that 59% of prisoners covered by MAPPA (multi-agency public protection arrangements to assess risk and protect the public) were being released without confirmation of their MAPPA level. "This was clearly unacceptable in terms of the risk this could potentially pose to the public." • There were also serious concerns about some aspects of medicines management. • Inspectors made 71 recommendations.

On a more positive note, inspectors found some excellent work in a residential unit dedicated to older prisoners, and it was obvious that the men valued the opportunity to be there among their peers, away from what they described as "the noise, violence and drugs." Activities for over 50s in a weekly club run by Age UK included carpet bowls, speakers, quizzes and table games. Overall, Mr Clarke said: "There was a very clear determination on the part of the director and leadership of the prison to make improvements, and a palpable energy and enthusiasm about their wish to do so. It is to their credit that there were a wide range of plans and strategies in place, but many of them had yet to achieve their desired effect. HM Inspectorate of Prisons is often encouraged to believe that if we had inspected an establishment a few months later than we actually did, we would have seen significant improvements. This report conveys our actual findings at the time of the inspection. It may well be that the plans we were told about will, in due course, lead to improvement, and this may happen at HMP Northumberland. It is to be hoped that this will be the case."

Justice Has Been Served.' Wrongly Convicted Man Gets $15 Million

A federal jury has awarded $15 million to a wrongfully convicted man in his lawsuit against the Baltimore Police Department and two detectives. The Baltimore Sun reports that Sabein Burgess said "justice has been served" after the verdict Tuesday 22/11/2017.The 47-year-old Burgess spent nearly two decades in prison after being convicted in 1995 of killing his girlfriend. He was sentenced to life plus 20 years in prison. Burgess was released in 2015 after being exonerated. In the civil trial, Burgess accused now-retired homicide detectives Gerald Goldstein and Steven Lehman of pinning the crime on him without pursuing other credible leads.

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.