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 666 (14/12/2017) - Cost £1

Court Acquits Dee Fennell of Encouraging Terrorism

His Honour Judge Geoffrey Miller QC, sitting without a jury in Belfast Crown Court 04/11/2017, acquitted Dee Fennell of encouraging terrorism and inviting support for a proscribed organisation in his speech at an Easter commemoration in April 2015. Damien "Dee" Fennell ("the defendant") was charged with three counts: encouragement of terrorism contrary to s.1(2) of the Terrorism Act 2006; inviting support for a proscribed organisation, contrary to s.12(1) of the Terrorism Act 2000; and addressing a meeting for the purpose of encouraging support for a proscribed organisation, contrary to s.12(3) of the Terrorism Act 2000.

The charges relate to a speech he gave at an Easter Commemoration on 5 April 2015 organised by the Irish Republican Prisoner Welfare Association ("IRPWA") at St Coleman's Cemetery, Lurgan. The event, which was recorded on video, was attended by approximately 70 people. Video footage was posted on YouTube and the IRPWA Facebook page. Police obtained copies of the footage on 13 April 2015 and the postings were removed from both sites shortly after this. The footage shows the defendant speaking for just over 8 minutes reading his speech from paper which he holds in his hands. A search was conducted of the defendant's house on 20 April 2015 and the police recovered one handwritten page of the speech from behind the microwave in the kitchen. Other items were seized including some invitations to the Easter Commemoration.

The defendant replied "no comment" to each question during his police interview and his solicitor read the following statement on his behalf: "On Sunday 5th April 2015 I gave a speech in Lurgan to commemorate the 1916 Easter Rising and the fallen volunteers of subsequent generations while giving a detailed analysis of the existing political context in Ireland and drawing upon history I gave a personal opinion as to why both armed struggle and the IRA exist. At no stage did I encourage anyone to join any organisation; at no stage did I encourage anyone to engage in violence against anyone. While rightly publicly rebuking Sinn Féin for welcoming a commander in chief of the British Armed Forces to Ireland, I did not encourage violence in stating my legitimate anti-monarchist views in the course of my speech. I legitimately encouraged those gathered to become actively involved in republicanism as opposed to simply being supporters of republicanism. I used a historical quote in an analogist way to do so; I did not encourage anyone to join any armed organisation. In the course of republican/loyalist and state commemorations and re-enactments quotations are used legitimately. I believe my arrest is politically motivated and is a prime example of the PSNI being driven by the agenda put forward by unionist elected members representatives and loyalist paramilitaries." - The defendant did not give evidence at the trial.

Judge Miller referred to the right to freedom of expression which is enshrined in Article 10 of the ECHR which the parties agreed is engaged in this case and said it was clear that any limitation placed by statute on these rights must be both proportionate and necessary: "Any analysis of the defendant's words must therefore be made within the context of the surrounding circumstances, the provisions of the terrorism legislation and his Convention rights as enshrined in Article 10".

Count 1: Encouraging Terrorism contrary to s.1 of the Terrorism Act 2006 ("the 2000 Act")

This legislation was passed in the aftermath of the London bombings of 7 July 2005 and the judge said some aspects of the statute were left somewhat opaque and lacking in clarity. The three elements which must be established by the prosecution in order to prove this offence are: • The statement must be published; • It must be likely to be understood by some or all of the members of the public to whom it is published as a direct or indirect encouragement to them to commit, prepare or instigate acts of terrorism or a Convention offence; and • When publishing the statement, or causing it to be published, the defendant must have the necessary state of mind.

Judge Miller said there could be no doubt that the statement was published when it was posted on social media but noted that the prosecution rejected any assertion that the defendant was responsible for the postings. The prosecution instead argued that the oral delivery of the speech amounted to "publication" within the context of the legislation. The prosecution also argued that this was a case of direct encouragement – an assertion that violence against the State is legitimate and an enjoinder to join the IRA. Section 1 of the 2000 Act is worded in a way that the offence can be committed either intentionally or recklessly. The prosecution acknowledged that it would need to show that the defendant was aware of the risk that an effect of the statement would be to encourage terrorism and in the circumstances known to him it was unreasonable for him to take that risk.

Section 20(4) of the 2000 Act sets out what is meant by publication including a person "publishing [a statement] in any manner to the public". The Act, however, does not define whether publication includes giving a speech. Judge Miller said he had "great difficulty" in reconciling the oral delivery of a speech with the statutory requirement that it be "published" and agreed with the reasoning set out by the defence that to do so would result in a breach of the defendant's Article 10 rights to free speech. His conclusion meant that the defendant was entitled to be acquitted on Count 1.

Counts 2 and 3: Inviting support for a proscribed organisation and addressing a meeting for the purpose of encouraging support for a proscribed organisation (s. 12(1) and 12(3) of the Terrorism Act 2000 ("the 2000 Act") - Both the prosecution and defence accepted that these offences involve an interference with the Article 10 right to free speech and the issue was whether in the circumstances the defendant's words fulfilled the requirements of section 12 and whether the interference with his right to freedom of speech was necessary and proportionate. He referred to the leading case on the offences which states that the prosecution must make the jury sure that the organisation was a proscribed organisation, that the defendant used words which invited support for that organisation and that the defendant knew at the time he did so that he was inviting support for that organisation. The case law also stated that there must be proof of an invitation of support for the proscribed organisation and this has to be distinguished from the mere expression of personal beliefs, or an invitation to someone else to share an opinion or belief.

Judge Miller said that in considering the speech he must read it as a piece rather than focus on isolated passages but that this should not preclude him from drawing common sense inferences as to what the defendant meant and what he intended his audience to take from the words he used. He said the speech was full of "hyperbole and rhetoric", the content was "unashamedly partisan with florid and somewhat archaic references such as to "our martyred dead"". The judge said that many would see much of what the defendant said as "deeply objectionable" and "grossly offensive", particularly the oblique reference to the murder of Lord Mountbatten and members of his family. He noted, however, that s.12(1) and (3) of the 2000 Act does not criminalise "expressions of views or opinions, no matter how offensive" but only criminalises "the knowing invitation of support from others for the proscribed organisation".

The prosecution placed emphasis on the parts of the speech where it claimed the defen-

dant "invites his audience to support the IRA". The first section was about the use of the "armed struggle" and the second spoke of supporting republicanism and becoming a "more active republican … to assist in building a movement that will bring us freedom". The defence countered by drawing attention to the context within which the passages appear, namely a call to action in support of the republican cause rather than a call to arms.

Judge Miller stated that he could see no ground for not drawing inferences from the defendant's refusal to give evidence, however, any inferences that could be drawn on the facts of this case would not add to the strength of the Crown case. He concluded: "However offensive the words used by the defendant might be in the ears of many right thinking members of society they were expressions of personal opinion, which did not invite or encourage support for the IRA. In these circumstances he is entitled to be acquitted on Count 2 and 3."

Freshwater Five: CCRC Deny Access to Court of Appeal - Despite Bombshell Fresh Evidence

Five men protesting their innocence of an alleged drugs smuggling plot have been denied the help of the public miscarriage of justice watchdog CCRC, in getting their case in front of the Court of Appeal – despite powerful new scientific evidence showing the prosecution's version of events was impossible. Jamie Green, Jon Beere, Daniel Payne, Scott Birtwistle and Zoran Dresic are serving a total of 104 years in prison between them after being convicted in 2011 of a conspiracy to smuggle £53m of cocaine off the coast of the Isle of Wight. The men have always insisted they are innocent and are represented by legal charity the Centre for Criminal Appeals. Through steadfast campaigning by their families, they have become known as the 'Freshwater Five'.

On the prosecution's case, four of the men sailed out in a fishing boat in May 2010 to collect bags of cocaine thrown off the back of a container ship in the English Channel. Since no evidence of the presence of drugs was found on either vessel, the jury was presented with navigational evidence to support this claim. They were told that the men's fishing boat had crossed behind the container ship, potentially giving them the opportunity to fish out drugs. However, a leading marine GPS expert has since analysed detailed navigational data that was not available at trial and concluded that information presented to the jury was wrong. He found that, in fact, the closest the fishing boat ever got to the track of the container ship was 174m away, making the prosecution's account impossible. Despite this development, the public body responsible for reviewing potential miscarriages of justice – the Criminal Cases Review Commission (CCRC) – has declined to provide the prisoners with evidence from the police files in their case, or add its backing to the clamour of calls that the case needs to be heard again in the Court of Appeal.

The CCRC's refusal to refer the Freshwater Five's case for a fresh hearing comes amidst increasing concerns that the body is failing victims of miscarriages of justice. Set up with high hopes in the wake of the Birmingham Six and Guilford Four cases, the CCRC is now referring just 0.77% of potential miscarriage of justice cases to the Court of Appeal, down significantly from its historical average of 3.3% - a drop of 76% percent. This steep drop has spurred the creation of a new cross-party group of MPs and Lords dedicated to improving systems for preventing and overturning wrongful convictions, which met for the first time in Parliament last Wednesday. Declining resources mean that the CCRC spends just £4 on reviewing cases for every £10 it spent a decade ago. Concerns have also been raised about the CCRC's independence, with some arguing it too often takes the truth of claims by police officers and prosecutors for granted. The CCRC's current Chair, Richard Foster, formerly worked as Chief Executive of the Crown Prosecution Service.

In the Freshwater Five case, the CCRC refused to investigate suggestions of misconduct by the officers involved, despite a retired senior Serious Organised Crime Agency (SOCA) detective finding "inexplicable gaps" in surveillance records. Instead of examining the police file in its entirety, CCRC simply held meetings with officers involved with the case. Despite repeated requests, the CCRC have refused to reveal what was discussed at the meetings.

Emily Bolton, the Freshwater Five's lawyer, said of the CCRC's decision: "The CCRC's decision to not use its powers to refer this case to the Court of Appeal for hearing is baffling and perverse. It seems like the CCRC no longer has either the resources or the independence to effectively investigate miscarriages of justice. In the same week that the CCRC was finalising its decision on the Freshwater Five, the innocence project where I worked in New Orleans walked Wilbert Jones out of prison after he had served 45 years for a crime he did not commit. The evidence that he was innocent was in the police files. Had his lawyers relied on the assertions of the police about the existence of exculpatory evidence, he would still be rotting in prison. Our charity is going to make sure that does not happen to the Freshwater Five."

Suzanne Gower, the Centre for Criminal Appeals's director, who previously worked on the Hillsborough Inquests, commented: "To get to the bottom of a miscarriage of justice, you have to be able to look at all the police documentation around the event in question, not just bits and pieces. The quality of a miscarriage of justice enquiry correlates directly with how much time is spent on it, how much documentation and evidence is examined and how much boots on the ground investigation takes place. Hillsborough has shown the way – but the CCRC has apparently learned nothing from that enquiry."

Abject Refusal Notice From CCRC

The Criminal Cases Review Commission (CCRC) has concluded it cannot refer for appeal the drug smuggling convictions of Jonathan Beere, Scott Birtwistle, Jamie Green, Daniel Payne and Zoran Dresic. The men were tried together at Kingston-upon-Thames Crown Court on charges of conspiring to import 255 kilogrammes of cocaine. On 2 June 2011, all five were convicted of the conspiracy by a majority verdict of 11 to one. Jonathan Beere, Jamie Green and Zoran Dresic were sentenced to 24 years' imprisonment. Daniel Payne was sentenced to 18 years' imprisonment and Scott Birtwistle to 14 years' detention in a Young Offender Institution.

Mr Green and tried to appeal against sentence and conviction but were unsuccessful. Mr Dresic tried to appeal but his grounds were ineffective. Mr Birtwistle tried to appeal against his conviction but was unsuccessful. Mr Beere and Mr Payne tried unsuccessfully to appeal against their sentences. This means that, notwithstanding the Commission's decision in this case, Mr Beere, Mr Dresic and Mr Payne can still approach the Court of Appeal to seek leave to appeal against their convictions and Mr Birtwistle can still seek leave to appeal against his sentence. All five men applied to the CCRC at various points during 2014 and 2015. All were represented by the Centre for Criminal Appeals. After the initial applications, their representatives made additional submissions to the Commission on 26 separate occasions during the review (not including submissions made following the provisional decision not to refer the case which was made in February 2017).

Following a lengthy and detailed investigation into the cases which considered all of the submissions received and a number of other issues, the CCRC has not identified any new evidence or legal argument that it considers capable of raising a real possibility that the Court of Appeal would quash the convictions. For that reason, the convictions cannot be referred for appeal. The decision not to refer the case was taken by a single Commissioner.

The Commission's analysis of the case and its reasons for the decision are set out in detail in a 78-page document called a Statement of Reasons. That document was sent to the Centre for Criminal Appeals on 22 November 2017. Statutory restrictions on disclosure mean that the Commission cannot make its Statement of Reasons public. There are no such restrictions on the men or their representatives.

Indeed, the CCRC invites them to consider publishing the document (on the Centre for Criminal Appeals website), or making it available on request, in order that anyone following the case can understand the CCRC's review and the reasons for the decision not to refer these convictions for appeal. A number of issues relating to the case and the CCRC's review have already been discussed in public and in the media. A summary of the principal reasons why the CCRC is unable to refer the case appears at points (i) to (viii) of paragraph 192 of the Statement of Reasons. The Commission's role in relation to alleged miscarriages of justice involves applying the "real possibility test" that set out in Section 13 of the Criminal Appeal Act 1995. It says the Commission can only refer a case to relevant appeal court if: the Commission consider that there is a real possibility that the conviction, verdict or sentence would not be upheld were the reference to be made."

Three Inmates Cleared of Fatal Stabbing in HMP Pentonville

Three inmates have been cleared of stabbing a new father to death in a war over phones and drugs smuggled into the crisis-hit Pentonville prison. Jamal Mahmoud, 21, was killed in October last year as the 175-year-old jail struggled with overcrowding, staffing, and violent factions fighting to control the lucrative trade in contraband. During an Old Bailey trial, jurors were told CCTV which might have captured the killing on the upper floor of G Wing had been deactivated years ago. On a tour of the heavily-criticised north London jail, the jury saw a gaping hole in netting above the building designed to stem the flow of contraband by drone. The jury deliberated for more than one-and-a-half weeks to find Basana Kimbembi, 35, Robert Butler, 31, and Joshua Ratner, 27, not guilty of murder. However, the 11 men and women convicted Kimbembi of wounding Mahmoud's friend Mohammed Ali with intent to cause grievous bodily harm.

News From SAFARI

Samantha Murray-Evans (44) has been jailed for 27 months for falsely accusing a police officer of rape when he rejected her after their one-night stand. PC Paul Morgan (52) may well have been convicted were it not for the discovery of flirtatious WhatsApp messages sent by Ms Murray-Evans after their one-night¬stand three years ago. The texts including one from Ms Murray-Evans saying 'the sex was great'. She had turned up at his home the day after but sent him aggressive messages after he asked her to leave. Prosecutor Catherine Richards said: "The messages led police to believe this was a false allegation and the matter against him was dropped." Ms Murray-Evans eventually admitted carrying out acts intending to pervert the course of justice. Judge Paul Thomas QC said her 'planned, persistent and callous' lies had ruined Mr Morgan's career and left him depressed and suicidal.

Judge Lady Scott Has Slated Police officer (known only as DC Anderson (Tayside Division, Dundee) who interviewed defendant Jake Hawkins. Lady Scott said: "I found him [DC Anderson] evasive, and in particular I found his denial that he sought to undermine the legal advice given not credible." The advice given to Mr Hawkins by his solicitor was consistently undermined by interviewing officers to the extent that he felt he could no longer trust him. Judge Lady Scott said that statements given by suspects must be "spontaneous and voluntary" and that the Crown

"had not established this interview was fair and the statements made can properly be said to be voluntary". She added that police had effectively "cross-examined" Jake during the interview, an illegal tactic, and described the interview as "wholly improper". During the interrogation, detectives had told Jake Hawkins that they were impartial - but then told him they believed he was guilty. They also deliberately lied to him during the interview, telling him that his solicitor didn't know what evidence they had against him. They repeatedly suggested to him that he should ignore his solicitor's advice, and admitted that these tactics had been used with the intent of coercing him to change his position. Judge Lady Scott stated: "It should be obvious to the police that to seek to undermine a solicitor's advice to a suspect is wholly improper." The interview evidence was ruled inadmissible in Court, and Jake was acquitted. It seems to SAFARI that this is a refreshing change from what frequently happens - when police officers use underhand or unlawful interrogation techniques to coerce suspects into making confessions - and nothing is done about it. The subject of false confessions has been researched extensively by Gisli Guojonsson, CBE (Professor of Forensic Psychology at the Institute of Psychiatry of King's College London), and it is quite clear that these can arise even as a result of mild pressure, let alone persistent, repeated and intense pressure from interviewers. Our feeling is that tactics which have been ruled to be illegal - such as cross¬examining suspects during interview - should be dealt with appropriately by our legal system, and officers who indulge in such tactics should not merely be reprimanded by a judge, but the full weight of the law should be brought down upon them. Only then will it become not worth their while to indulge in such tactics. If any SAFARI reader has had a DC Anderson of Tayside Police involved in their investigation and interviews, and if he used similar techniques to elicit a false confession, it may be worth their while informing their solicitor of this case and the Judge's findings.

From A Regular Reader: "My recent experience as a prisoner maintaining innocence: I was wrongly convicted of rape and am serving a ten-year sentence. My initial security category was B, due to sentence length. My OASys (Offender Assessment System) risk scores are low-to-medium and have not changed since my conviction. On the rare occasions when I have had contact with my Offender Supervisor (Prison Officer) or Offender Manager (Probation Officer) I have said I am happy to do any offending behaviour course they like, so long as it's clear that I'm maintaining my innocence. I've had courses put onto my sentence plan, then taken off again when I was found to be ineligible either because I maintain innocence or because my risk scores were too low. At the first opportunity, I asked to move to Category C, pointing out that the rules (PS40/2011) say that all prisoners should be in the lowest category commensurate with their risk. My risk scores were commensurate with C-cat or D-cat. The rules also say that, where a prisoner is ineligible for courses due to maintaining innocence, the prison must consider other ways in which he or she can demonstrate a reduction in risk. My behaviour and work records were excellent, and I was a volunteer literacy mentor. At my first annual re-cat, in 2015, the prison said that I would stay Cat-B because I had not demonstrated any reduction in risk. I appealed internally, and then to the Prisons and Probation Ombudsman, all to no avail. In 2016 I was again turned down, but this time I won my internal appeal. I was told by the Re-Cat Officer: "I have been asked to review the documentation, having been advised that being in denial should not stop progression. [He] could be managed in C-cat conditions." This was the same officer who had rejected me the previous year for being "in denial". Perhaps the rules (in force since 2011) are finally becoming understood! I endorse SAFARI's advice to prisoners: engage in sentence plan targets while always telling the truth about your innocence; and, if at first you don't succeed, complain, complain, complain! I'd also urge the Prison Service to make its rules clear to its staff. At present, a prisoner

who completes a course and thus achieves a small reduction to a still-quite-high risk score can qualify for aD-cat (open) prison ahead of a prisoner whose risk score has been consistently much lower but cannot be reduced further. This contradicts the section of the rules that says all prisoners should be in the lowest security category commensurate with their risk."

Ex-Lib Dem Jason Zadrozny's life is in tatters after three years of what amounts to persecution by police and the CPS. Despite knowing that his accuser was being treated with drugs which can produce delusions; despite knowing early on that Jason had no connection whatsoever to a house in which the accuser said Jason had abused him; despite having been told on the day Jason was first arrested that Jason didn't own a car in which his accuser had said he had been abused until years after the alleged event; and despite knowing that another witness who claimed to have seen Jason kissing his accuser, and also claimed to have been in the car with Jason and the accuser, had previously been convicted of perverting the course of justice, they continued to hound him. Police conduct during interviews was also improper, with Jason being subjected to homophobic attitudes. He says: "I was repeatedly asked the most explicit and intimate questions. I felt one of the officers was simply disgusted that I am gay. After listening to their questions, I felt dirty." The story of his arrest was leaked to the BBC by an unidentified Labour source (which begs the question: how did they know about it?), and to radio Mansfield 103.2 by a senior officer before any official comment was released by Police. Tony Delahunty, managing director and news editor of Mansfield 103.2, says: "This was before any official statement, and it was coming direct from Notts police. It looks now like an attempt to manipulate the media." This was just 56 days before the General Election, in which Jason would have stood as Ashfield's Lib Dem candidate, ensuring that the accusations and arrest would get maximum publicity. Added to this, Police raided the Lib Dem offices, seizing computers and mobile phones that Jason had never used, and despite there having been no suggestion that they were involved. Jason's campaign manager, Dave Hennigan, said: "Our HQ was rendered useless. They disabled our campaign." As a result of the false accusations, the leaking of the story to the media, and the seizure of the Lib Dem offices' equipment, both Jason's reputation and the Lib Dem campaign were destroyed. Jason says: "I believe the intention was to cause me maximum damage, not only politically but emotionally, to break me. Everyone assumed the worst must be true, and in our society allegations of this kind are the worst you can throw at anyone." He also says:

"All along I've wondered how I could have been charged, let alone found guilty. I'm loath to believe the police can really be so incompetent, and that it took nearly three years. The agenda seems to have been to prolong the pain as long as possible." Without any chance to clear his name Jason was forced out of the Lib Dems. He says: "I'm broke. Clearing my name has taken almost every penny I had. And I lost my chance to represent the area where I grew up in Parliament [...] Now I'm left trying to pick up the threads of my life, but it's sinking in, what I've lost. In every way, I feel bereaved." It was only when the trial was actually due to begin that the CPS announced it was dropping all charges because, they said, there was "no realistic prospect of conviction." Why not be honest and drop the charges as soon as it became clear the allegations had been fabricated in the first place?

Serious questions have now been asked about the Police and CPS's handling of Jason's case. Not only did the prosecution and police know early on of all the weakness in their case, but they also chose not to disclose it to Jason's team until almost two years after his initial arrest, and even then it took another ten months before they backed down. SAFARI feels that Jason should be heavily compensated, not only for the financial costs involved (which

would have been significantly less if the undermining evidence had been disclosed earlier, or the police had investigated about the car in a timely manner) but also for the severe emotional damage that has been caused to him which will, no doubt, haunt him for the rest of his life. We also feel that the entire background and timing of this incident should be subjected to the most extensive scrutiny. If the accuser and the other witness are prosecuted - as we feel they should be - for perverting the course of justice, more light might be shed on this.

Police Officer Who Blackmailed Member of the Public Has Sentence Increased

A police officer who blackmailed a man after photographing him visiting a sex worker has had his prison sentence increased after it was referred to the Court of Appeal as unduly lenient. Gareth Suffling was a Detective Constable at Bedfordshire police when he parked close to the place of work of a sex worker in Luton and took photos of a man arriving and leaving. Suffling, 36, put the victim's car registration plate through the police computer to track down where he lived and blackmailed him, leaving a note and a copy of the photographs. The note told him he must pay £1,000 or the pictures would be sent to family members and neighbours. The victim reported the blackmail to the police where Suffling was part of the investigating team. Officers noticed he was acting strangely and a search of the police computer found he had already searched for the victim's details under the pretence of dangerous driving. The blackmail letter was also found on Suffling's computer after he failed to fully delete it. He was originally sentenced to 18 months in prison for blackmail and misconduct in public office at St Albans Crown Court in September. He will now serve 3 years in prison. The Solicitor General Robert Buckland QC MP referred the original sentence to the Court of Appeal under the Unduly Lenient Sentence scheme. Speaking after the hearing the Solicitor General said: Suffling was in a position of trust when he carried out these offences and his letter of blackmail was nothing short of menacing. This increased prison sentence shows that anyone caught using their position in public office to commit a crime will be punished.

Families at Inquests Should Get Funding if Police do, Says Chief Coroner

Owen Bowcott, Guardian: Bereaved relatives should be granted legal aid at inquests in which the government pays for lawyers to represent police officers or other state employees, the chief coroner has urged. Judge Mark Lucraft QC's recommendation in his first annual report will add to the growing pressure on the government to grant special funding to families seeking justice in controversial cases such as deaths in police custody, in prison or while waiting for an ambulance. Among his proposals for changes to the law, Lucraft's report, published on Thursday, proposes that the lord chancellor, David Lidington, "gives consideration to amending the exceptional funding guidance (inquests) so as to provide exceptional funding for legal representation for the family where the state has agreed to provide separate representation for one or more interested persons".

The chief coroner noted that in "a small number of inquests" the family of the deceased wish to have representation but do not have the means to pay for it themselves and are unable to obtain legal aid funding. "In some cases, one or more of the agencies present such as the police, the prison service or ambulance service, may be separately represented," he explained. "In some of these cases, individual agents of the state such as named police officers may also be separately represented. While all of these individuals or agencies may be legally represented with funding from the state, the state may provide no funding for representation for the family."

The "inequality of arms may be unfair or may appear to be unfair to the family", Lucraft

observed. “It may also mean that the coroner has to give special assistance to the family

Deborah Coles, the executive director of the charity Inquest, which supports relatives at coroners’ courts, welcomed the report. “The new chief coroner has supported the call for legal aid,” she said. “We now have unequivocal evidence that this needs to happen. The government can no longer fail to act. We have had former chief coroners, the Angiolini report into deaths in police custody and the report by the chair of the Hillsborough Independent Panel all calling for bereaved families to have legal representation in deaths related to the state or its agencies. It’s now time for the government to make this a political priority. Access to justice should not be determined by your financial situation. These families perform a public service in scrutinising the deaths that have occurred. It’s for the benefit of all of us.” The government has previously argued that the relative informality of inquests and their inquisitorial, as opposed to adversarial, nature does not, save in exceptional cases, require bereaved families to be legally represented. A Ministry of Justice spokesperson said: “It is vital that inquests are sympathetic to the needs of the bereaved.” They said ministry guidance on legal aid was changed in November “to ensure that the starting presumption is that it should be available for representation at an inquest”.

Women Prisoners Caught In ‘Cycle of Victimisation’

Jon Robins, ‘The Justice Gap’: Almost six out of 10 women in prison have been victims of domestic violence, according to a new study identifying links between experience of abuse and offending. According to the Prison Reform Trust, women in prison have often been victims of much more serious offences than those of which they have been convicted. More than half of women in prison (53%) report having experienced emotional, physical or sexual abuse as a child compared to 27% of men; and 57% report having been victims of domestic violence.

The Government is intending to transform the approach to tackling domestic abuse through its Domestic Violence and Abuse Bill. ‘Many women in prison have been victims of much more serious offences than the ones they are accused of, with a growing body of research indicating that women’s exposure to physical, emotional and sexual abuse, including coercive control, is for some a driver of their offending,’ says the PRT report. According to the group, a key difference between women and men in prison is that ‘family relationships tend to be a protective factor for men’; however, for women relationships are ‘more often a risk factor’. Baroness Corston’s study of women in the criminal justice system published in 2007 found that coercion by male partners and relatives was ‘a distinct route into criminality and prison for some women’.

According to the offender assessment system used by prisons and probation to assess risk and need, more than two thirds of women in custody or managed in the community by the National Probation Service (67%), and 61% of those managed in the community by the community rehabilitation companies, indicated that they had been victims of domestic violence. Over a third of these women claimed to have a problem with their current partner. Of young women offenders in custody, four out of 10 have suffered violence at home and under a third (30%) have experienced sexual abuse at home.

Almost six out of 10 women surveyed in HMP Bronzefield, the largest women’s prison since the closure of HMP Holloway, (58%) said they had experienced domestic abuse and more than one third (34%) said they were experiencing it at the time they were sent to prison. The report also noted that imprisoning women resulted in ‘an estimated 17,240 children being separated from their mothers each year’. Fewer than one in 10 children were cared for by their father when a mother went to prison and only 5% remained in their own homes.

‘It is time for concerted action to help break the cycle of victimisation and offending that blights the lives of too many women and their children,’ commented Jenny Earle, director of the Prison Reform Trust’s programme to reduce women’s imprisonment. ‘Our recommendations have been developed in consultation with women who have been personally driven to commit crimes by violent partners, and the services that support them. If implemented we would see both a reduction in the incidence of domestic abuse and fewer women unnecessarily imprisoned.’

The report called for a provision under the Domestic Violence and Abuse Bill for ‘an effective defence’ for women whose offences arose from coercion within an abusive relationship and where women used reactive violence against a primary aggressor. It also called on the Sentencing Council to ensure courts take account of the vulnerabilities of women affected by domestic abuse as well as the impact of imprisonment on them and their families. It also recommended that the police, prosecution, probation and the courts make ‘routine’ inquiries into women’s histories of domestic abuse to ‘ensure informed decision making’. It proposed that police triage and diversion schemes for women involved in low level offending should not exclude women accused of domestic abuse offences; and that Police and Crime Commissioners should place ‘clear expectations’ on the police to improve their response to women offenders affected by domestic abuse including through out of court disposals.

MoJ Scraps Legal Aid Restrictions for Victims of Domestic Violence

Owen Bowcott, Guardian: Time limits preventing victims of domestic violence from obtaining legal aid for court hearings will be scrapped from January, the Ministry of Justice has announced. The heavily criticised restrictions, which have resulted in large numbers of women confronting abusive ex-partners without representation, will also be relaxed to accept evidence from victim support organisations. The changes deliver on signals that the system would be reformed given by the MoJ and revealed by the Guardian earlier this year. Confirming the new guidelines for the Legal Aid Agency, the justice minister, Dominic Raab, said: “We have listened to victims’ groups and carefully reviewed the criteria for legal aid for victims of domestic abuse in family cases. “These changes make sure that vulnerable women and children get legal support so their voice is properly heard in court.”

Legal aid has usually been available to victims of domestic violence and child abuse, or those deemed at risk, as long as they could provide evidence of abuse within the past five years. Removal of the five-year limit and admission of fresh categories of evidence will help large numbers of women and some men who have been deprived of legal advice and representation in family court disputes over custody and contact with children. The narrow evidence requirements were first imposed under the Legal Aid, Sentencing and Punishment of Offenders (Laspo) Act of 2012. The MoJ has launched a broader, formal review of the impact of the legislation on access to justice.

Statements from domestic violence support organisations and housing support officers will in future be accepted as evidence of past abuse, as well as those from social services, law enforcement agencies and medical professionals. Earlier this year the government announced a £17m fund to support 41 projects across the country to tackle violence against women and girls. Steve Hynes, the director of the Legal Action Group who has campaigned against legal aid cuts, welcomed the change: “It’s taken a long time because of the general election and other delays. I’m very pleased they have made the announcement. “They realised it’s a priority. It wasn’t working. Women who experienced domestic violence were not qualifying [for representation]. The amount of civil legal aid granted has fallen by 80% since Laspo was introduced.”

Elspeth Thomson, chair of the legal aid committee at the family law organisation Resolution, said: "We've been calling for changes to the evidence gateway since Laspo was implemented in 2013 and welcome this news. Parliament has committed to protect victims of domestic abuse so ministers have a duty to ensure that those who need legal aid are able to access it. "These changes, made in consultation with Resolution and others, are a step in the right direction, allowing the justice system to better support at-risk and vulnerable people at perhaps the most difficult time of their lives – when the family unit is breaking down. Ultimately, these are real people, not statistics, and we must protect them and their access to the justice system."

Estelle du Boulay, the director of the Rights of Women, said: "The changes … will make a significant difference to women experiencing or at risk of domestic abuse to access legal aid in private family law cases. The previous system was so clearly unjust, leaving many genuine survivors unable to access the legal aid they were entitled to, because the evidence requirements were narrow, onerous and unrealistic. We fought the government through the courts to bring in these reforms. We are particularly grateful to the many women survivors who provided testimony that enabled us to prove our case. Their voices have finally been listened to today."

Cris McCurley, a family law lawyer at the law firm Ben Hoare Bell who has sat on the independent advisory group helping the MOJ throughout the review process, said: "In spite of the UN convention on the elimination of discrimination against women committee ruling that the [UK] government had to urgently review and ensure victims of violence would get legal aid for private family law proceedings in October 2013, these changes have only come about as a result of the hard work, dedication and courage of Rights of Women in pursuing their case against the MOJ on domestic violence eligibility for legal aid all the way to the court of appeal." The president of the Law Society of England and Wales, Joe Egan, said: "Legal aid is a lifeline for those who have suffered abuse. It is often the only way someone can bring their case before the courts. Today's positive decision is the end result of work the Law Society and other organisations have been doing with the MoJ for many months." Sophie Walker, the leader of the Women's Equality party, said: "The Ministry of Justice's decision to lift these damaging restrictions on legal aid is welcome – and long overdue. "Too many women have been denied justice over the last seven years as a result of the government's short-sighted cuts."

Prison Inspectors Given Powers to Alert Minister to Urgent Problems

Alan Travis, Guardian: The justice secretary, David Lidington, has unveiled a series of measures that the government hopes will urgently tackle failing prisons in England and Wales. From Thursday 30th November 2017, the chief inspector of prisons has been given new powers to alert the justice secretary directly of any urgent and severe problems he finds during a jail inspection. This "urgent notification protocol" requires the minister to publish an action plan within 28 days to tackle the concerns raised. A team of specialists will also be assembled to ensure immediate action is taken and implement a longer-term plan to ensure sustained improvement. The stronger inspection powers had been part of the prisons and courts bill that was dropped after the Conservative government lost its Commons majority in the general election. However, the protocol – which covers both private and public jails – has been agreed without the need for legislation by Lidington, HM Prison and Probation Service, and inspectors. Peter Clarke, the chief inspector of prisons, said the new process should provide an effective and speedy response to the most serious incidents and circumstances.

Clarke's recent reports have documented an alarming deterioration of conditions in English

and Welsh prisons, including high levels of violence, increasing drug use and record levels of assaults and self-harm. Lidington said: "Openness and transparency are powerful instruments of change and I believe we should be accountable so the public can see exactly what we are doing to turn prisons into safe places where offenders can change their lives. "A team of specialists will now respond when HM Inspectorate of Prisons (HMIP) trigger urgent notification to urgently drive improvements and ensure that prisons are safe, secure and providing a regular regime. To implement these action plans and improve safety, the recruitment of an additional 2,500 prison officers is key and we are already halfway towards reaching that target."

Clarke said Lidington had accepted that he and his successors would be held accountable for delivering an "urgent, robust and effective response to when HMIP assesses that treatment or conditions in a jail raise such significant concerns that urgent action is required." Clarke said it was the responsibility of the prison service , and not inspectors, to implement and monitor improvements. "HMIP will take account of a range of factors to decide when, in the judgment of the chief inspector, a prison should next be inspected. If for any reason an HMIP recommendation is not accepted, we would expect the rationale to be explained and published." Under the protocol the chief inspector will decide at the conclusion of an inspection whether there are significant concerns that need to be brought to the attention of the secretary of state. Formal notification will be made within seven days and a letter detailing the concerns will be published 24 hours after it has been sent privately.

HM Chief Inspector of Prisons Welcomes new 'Urgent Notification' Agreement

Peter Clarke, HM Chief Inspector of Prisons, has welcomed a new process allowing him to publicly demand urgent action by the Secretary of State for Justice to improve jails with significant problems. Commenting after the Secretary of State for Justice David Lidington announced a new 'Urgent Notification' protocol, Mr Clarke said: "I welcome the new 'Urgent Notification' protocol which the Secretary of State for Justice has announced. This has the potential to be an important outcome of prison inspections, and to strengthen the role of HM Inspectorate of Prisons. Our job is to report on the treatment and conditions experienced by prisoners, and these new arrangements should mean that in the most serious cases there will be an effective and speedy response. In particular, I welcome the principle of transparency and accountability underpinning this new protocol. The Secretary of State has accepted that he and his successors will be held publicly accountable for delivering an urgent, robust and effective response when HMIP assesses that treatment or conditions in a jail raise such significant concerns that urgent action is required. The protocol requires the Secretary of State to respond to an urgent notification letter from HM Chief Inspector of Prisons within 28 days. The Chief Inspector's notification and the Secretary of State's response will both be published."

Mr Clarke said HMIP supported the inclusion of measures in the Prisons and Courts Bill to require greater accountability and transparency in the response to HMI Prisons' recommendations. "We regretted the fact that the provisions in the Bill relating to prisons were lost after the general election, but welcomed the commitment by the Secretary of State to achieve their objectives so far as possible without legislation. The Urgent Notification process announced this week is the culmination of many months of discussions between HMIP, the Ministry of Justice and HM Prison and Probation Service (HMPPS)." Explaining the impact of the new arrangement, which is incorporated into the existing protocol through which HMIP inspects prisons, Mr Clarke added: "Whenever the new process is invoked, we will expect swift and effective action to be taken in response. However, the implementation and monitoring of improvements is a clear responsibility of HMPPS, not the Inspectorate. HMI Prisons will take account of a range of factors to decide when, in the judge-

ment of the Chief Inspector, a prison should next be inspected. If for any reason an HMIP recommendation is not accepted, we would expect the rationale to be explained and published."

Q: Was the previous system of inspections, followed by a report and recommendations, too slow?

A: HMIP places great importance on fairness and rigorous fact-checking in its reports, to ensure the evidence on which we base recommendations is sound. Currently, the process from inspection to published report takes around 18 weeks. That said, there is nothing in the current system to prevent the leadership of a prison, and HMPPS/MoJ, from starting to take urgent action to address serious problems raised in an inspection. Inspectors share their major concerns with the jail's leadership at the end of the inspection, supported by a written copy of the main findings. HMIP's concern has not been so much about the speed of the system but rather that recommendations are either not acted on at all, or are inadequately addressed.

Q: How will the urgent notification process work in practice?

A: The test will be whether an inspection raises significant concerns that in the judgement of the Chief Inspector need to be brought to the attention of the Secretary of State. That judgement will be made after the conclusion of an inspection, and formal notification made to the Secretary of State within 7 days. 24 hours after the letter has been sent privately, it will be published on the HMIP website and distributed to the media and through social media. The letter will be supported by the end-of-inspection briefing material shared with the prison. These notes will also be made public.

Q: Why can't HMIP monitor work to improve a jail subject to an urgent notification.

A: HM Inspectorate of Prisons does not have the capacity continuously to monitor the prisons we inspect. This is the clear responsibility of line management from HMPPS. HMIP resources are fully committed to carrying out more than 80 inspections each year of prisons and other places of detention.

Q: When will the prison subject to an urgent notification be re-inspected?

A: In line with current practice, the timing of inspections will remain a matter for the judgement of the Chief Inspector. Some inspections may be announced, though the vast majority are currently unannounced. The monitoring of UN action plans is a matter for HMPPS but the action plan would, plainly, be something HMIP looks closely at in any repeat inspection.

Q: How many urgent notifications will there be?

A: In an ideal world, there wouldn't be any because treatment and conditions in all our prisons would meet acceptable standards. Sadly, though, that has not been the case in recent years and conditions – particularly relating to prisoner safety – have deteriorated alarmingly in some prisons. However, it is simply not possible to predict the number of urgent notification letters. It will depend on the circumstances in a jail and the judgement of the Chief Inspector.

People With Mental Illness Let Down By Criminal Justice System

Jon Robins, 'The Justice Gap': Mental health experts, not the police, should be identifying vulnerable people, according to a report by the human rights group JUSTICE which also calls for specialist prosecutors to make charging decisions. The group backs the Law Commission's recommendations that the test of fitness to plead and fitness to stand trial should be 'placed on a statutory footing'; the insanity defence be amended to a defence of 'not criminally responsible by reason of a recognised medical condition'; and called for further review of the defences where mental capacity is in issue 'taking into account the difference between substantial and total lack of capacity'. Andrea Coomber, director of JUSTICE, said that there

were 'fundamental problems' with the criminal justice system's response to vulnerability and 'too few people receive reasonable adjustments to enable them to effectively participate in their defence'. According to JUSTICE people in the criminal justice system were 'far more likely to suffer from mental health problems than the general population'.

Sir David Latham, chair of the JUSTICE working party and former chairman of the Parole Board, said vulnerability should be properly identified and 'where identified, properly approached so that the person either receives reasonable adjustments to give them the capacity to effectively participate in their defence, or if appropriate, is not prosecuted'. 'Where a person is diverted from prosecution or prison, suitable and effective treatment and support must be available to ensure that the person remains outside of the criminal justice system,' he said.The report referenced a 1998 study that found that 90% of the prison population had one or more of the five psychiatric disorders (psychosis, neurosis, personality disorder, hazardous drinking and drug dependence). The group quoted more recent research that, when prisoners were screened on arrival, almost one in four (23%) had some prior contact with mental health services. According to the National Institute for Health and Care Excellence, around 60% of prisoners had personality disorders, compared to 5% of the general population; 11% of those serving community sentences had psychotic disorders compared to 1% of the general population; and 76% of female and 40% of male remand prisoners had a common mental health disorder. The National Appropriate Adult Network estimates that 'between 11-22% of arrested adults are mentally vulnerable' and need the help of an appropriate adult.

Justice report in brief: 1. The investigative stage: Mental health experts, not police officers, should be identifying people with vulnerability as a result of mental ill health or learning disability; 2. Decision as to charge or prosecution: A specialist prosecutor should be appointed for each CPS area to make charging decisions in cases of vulnerability; 3. Pre-trial and trial hearings: Magistrates' courts, youth courts and the Crown Court should have a dedicated mental health judge; 4. Legal capacity tests: A capacity based test of fitness to plead and fitness to stand trial, placed on a statutory footing should be available in all courts and the "insanity" defence should be amended to a defence of 'not criminally responsible by reason of a recognised medical condition'; 5. Disposal and sentencing: A sentencing guideline on mental health and vulnerability should be created and a broader range of disposals made available.

The Law is an Ass: Eight Donkeys Jailed For Eating Flowers Outside Prison

Zoe Drewett for Metro.co.uk: Eight donkeys were kept in prison for four days after they chomped on some expensive plants. Don't worry, the animals have now been given bail. The cheeky chaps were orignally detained for allegedly eating thousands of pounds worth of plants that were supposed to go outside the Urai Jail in the Jalaun district of the northern Indian state of Uttar Pradesh. They had reportedly munched their way through 500,000 Indian ruppees (around £5,800) worth of plants left outside. The prison's head officer R.K. Mishra told Indian media: 'These donkeys had destroyed some very expensive plants which our senior officer had arranged for planting inside jail. 'Despite warnings the owner let loose his animals so we detained the donkeys.' But they did not inform the donkeys' owner, named only as Kamlesh, what had happened to his livestock and he was not present to see the animals being apprehended. Kamlesh spent several hours frantically searching for the donkeys before being tipped off as to their whereabouts, Indian press claims. When he approached jail bosses about his detained donkeys, they refused to let them go. It was only after he enlisted the help

of local politician Shakti Gahoi, who came to the jail to speak on his behalf, that the donkeys were released. The animals were thought to be no worse off for their four days spent in detention. Urai jail superintendent Sita Ram Sharma told the Times of India: 'There is no such law wherein we can arrest donkeys. 'They were confined for four days to teach their owner a lesson. We let go of the animals after Kamlesh gave us a written statement that from now on he will not allow his animals to roam in residential areas or places of public importance.' These donkeys had, on many occasions, caused road mishaps in the area, Sharma claimed.

Elite Prison Squad Deployed to Jails 580 Times Last Year

Guardian: An elite group of specially trained prison officers had to be deployed to jails in England and Wales 580 times last year, figures show. Members of the national tactical response group (NTRG) were sent to incidents including a riot at HMP Birmingham, as well as hostage situations and "incidents at height". The number of callouts to prisons has been increasing year-on-year, according to the figures, which were released by the Ministry of Justice after a freedom of information request by the Press Association. The Prison Officers' Association (POA) said the data showed the reality of prisons needing national support to maintain security and control after "year-on-year budget cuts".

Labour said the data underlined just how counterproductive Tory cuts to the prison service have been, leading to "an epidemic of violence" in jails. But the MoJ said a majority of the deployments were to non-violent incidents and were often precautionary. In 2010, the NTRG were called to jails 118 times, while in 2014 there were 223 callouts, with the figure rising to more than 340 in 2015. The 40-member squad had already been deployed 110 times from January to April this year, according to the most recent figures available. Incidents included occasions of "concerted indiscipline", barricade events and incidents at height, such as when a prisoner climbs on to a cell block's anti-suicide netting or an internal roof. During their busiest month in May 2016, the NTRG were sent out 67 times to 39 jails, dealing with inmate disorder, hostage events and incidents at height, among others. In the case of two jails – HMP Lindholme in Doncaster and HMP Nottingham – the specialists had to be called in nearly every month last year.

Separately, figures showed so-called Tornado teams – separate to the NTRG – were deployed 19 times last year, compared with 15 occasions in 2015 and seven in 2010. In the seven months to July this year, Tornado squads had been sent to 10 incidents. Of those, eight happened in the July, involving HMP Humber in Yorkshire, HMP Hewell in Worcestershire, HMP Aylesbury in Buckinghamshire, HMP Erlestoke in Wiltshire, and HMP The Mount in Hertfordshire. The figures do not include more recent problems with disorder, including at the high-security HMP Long Lartin jail in Worcestershire where Tornado teams were confronted by dozens of prisoners in October. Commenting on the figures, the POA said: "The POA are not shocked by the numbers of callouts as this demonstrates that prisons are in need of national support to maintain security and control. However, the figures can be distorted due to some callouts requiring nationally trained staff. The reality is that year-on-year budget cuts have reduced staff and as a result prisoners feel more in charge as organised crime continues to increase."

Labour's shadow justice secretary, Richard Burgon, said: "These figures underline how counterproductive the Tories' cuts to the prison service have been. Deployment of these costly riot squads has soared following the government's decision to axe thousands of prison officers, which has created an epidemic of violence in our prisons. "This dangerous situation is likely to go from bad to worse given that a quarter of the prisons that the MoJ itself rates as being of concern have experienced a further cut in prison officer numbers over the past year." An MoJ spokesman said: "We have specially trained teams that provide support to prisons on a range of incidents – from offenders climbing onto an internal roof to a large-scale disturbance. The majority of callouts are for non-violent incidents when the officers only attend as a precaution or when the situation was already resolved by prison staff."

HMP Holme House –Very Serious Drugs Problems

36 Recommendations from the last inspection had not been achieved and 10 only partly achieved. HMP Holme House, near Stockton on Tees, a local prison holding nearly 1,200 adult men had a "very serious" drugs problem, with nearly 60% of prisoners saying it was easy to get hold of drugs. A quarter of prisoners had acquired a drug problem in the jail. Spice, the synthetic cannabis, was a particular problem. "The prison was not as safe as it had been and at the heart of our concerns was a very serious problem with drugs," Mr Clarke said. "The threat to the well-being of individuals was manifest and rarely have we seen so many serious and repeated incidents of prisoners under the influence of clearly harmful substances.Despite this, the prison did not have an integrated or effective supply reduction strategy in place. Stopping drugs from entering the prison was the prison's main priority in our view." Despite the high caseloads, though, support for drug and alcohol-addicted prisoners was "very good."

HMP Holme House was inspected in July 2017, at a time of significant change. It was part of a group of prisons designated as "reform prisons" and it was intended that Holme House would lose its local prison function and become a category C training prison. The full impact of changes was emerging but had yet to be fully realised. Holme House was last inspected in late 2013 and inspectors found a significant deterioration in outcomes across most assessments. The prison was not as safe as it had been and at the heart of concerns was the very serious problem with drugs. "Mandatory testing suggested a positive rate within the prison of 10.45%, which was bad enough, but this rose to nearer 36% when synthetic cannabinoids or new psychoactive substances (NPS) were included. Nearly 60% of prisoners thought it was easy to get drugs in the prison," Mr Clarke said. Violence had risen since 2013 but some good work had been done to try to reduce it, though this needed to progress with greater urgency. Inspectors were concerned that there had been six self-inflicted deaths since 2013 but not all the recommendations made following the Prisons and Probation Ombudsman's (PPO) investigations had been implemented effectively.

Holme House, a modern prison, had relatively clean internal communal areas, though too many cells were poorly equipped and often in an unhygienic condition, or were overcrowded. Many prisoners had difficulty in accessing the basics of daily living - including bedding, clean clothes and cleaning materials - although the recent introduction of in-cell telephones was a step forward in supporting family ties. Most prisoners felt respected by staff but relationships were often strained and consultation was limited. The identification of and support offered to minority groups were reasonable overall, but there was evidence of worse outcomes for black and minority ethnic prisoners. This needed to be understood and addressed. Fully employed prisoners could expect to be out of their cells for about 9.5 hours a day, but time out of cell was much worse for those without employment, with 35% of prisoners locked in their cells during the day. Regular regime restrictions, in large part due to staff dealing with incidents, were causing significant disruption. Inspectors made 62 recommendations.

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.