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 668 (28/12/2017) - Cost £1

Probation Reforms Falter, Disclosing Deep - Rooted Problems

Government reform of probation has created a 'two-tier and fragmented' system in which private companies are performing significantly worse than public sector elements, according to the Chief Inspector of Probation. Unexpected changes in sentencing, severe financial stresses and cutbacks, and IT failings, have undermined the ambitions of private Community Rehabilitation Companies (CRCs) to bring innovative approaches to probation and the protection of the public from harm, Dame Glenys Stacey found. Dame Glenys's first report since she took over the role of Chief Inspector in March 2016, which is published today, contains some positive findings. Youth Offending Teams (YOTs) are working well and the public sector National Probation Service (NPS), responsible for supervising higher risk offenders, is good overall, though with room for improvement. However, the picture from inspections over the last 18 months of CRCs – the 21 private companies responsible for the majority of 260,000 people currently supervised, those classed as medium or lower risk – was "much more troubling." Her report identifies a number of "deep-rooted" organisational and commercial problems which, together, mean the CRC model is not delivering the service the government hoped for. Dame Glenys said: "We find the quality of CRC work to protect the public is generally poor and needs to improve in many respects. Government initially thought the majority of cases to be supervised by CRCs would be categorised as low risk, but in fact they hold a good proportion of medium risk cases." Around two-thirds are medium risk, requiring more resource and effort than government envisaged.

Most CRCs are struggling. "Those owners ambitious to remodel services have found probation difficult to reconfigure, or re-engineer. Delivering probation services is more difficult than it appears, particularly in prisons and in rural areas. There have been serious setbacks." Most CRC owners have invested in new IT systems to support offender management. But the report notes: "They have then wrestled with government data protection and other system requirements and found themselves wrong footed, as the essential IT connectivity long promised by the Ministry of Justice is still not in place, with no clear notion of when it will be. Pressing financial concerns are now making these developments unaffordable for some CRCs." (Out-dated and "creaky" IT systems were also a problem for the NPS.) Dame Glenys added that for all CRCs "unanticipated changes in sentencing and the nature of work coming to CRCs have seriously affected their commercial viability, causing some to curtail, change or stall their transformation plans, mid-way. CRCs have reduced staff numbers, some to a worrying extent." Staff absences and other workload issues, combined with remote offender monitoring "are undermining a central tenet of effective probation work – a consistent, professional, trusting relationship between the individual and their probation worker."

Her report identified key concerns: * CRCs are responsible for delivering the bulk of Rehabilitation Activity Requirements (RARs) but HMI Probation inspectors found poor quality RAR work, with too little purposeful activity for offenders. * Some CRC operating models allow up to 4 in 10 individuals to be supervised remotely (by six-weekly telephone contact). Dame Glenys said face-to-face work with offenders was vital. * Tried and tested, evidence-based ways of reducing reoffending include 'accredited programmes' designed to help individuals with problems such as perpetrating domestic abuse, or else poor thinking skills. Dame Glenys said: "It was not the intention of government to reduce their use, but regrettably few reports to court now propose one, and even fewer are ordered…This is baffling: no one wishes to see a range of high quality services with strong empirical support wither on the vine, by simple neglect, but that is happening." * The change in sentencing (with fewer accredited programmes and more RARs) has had profound, adverse financial implications for CRCs, whose plans envisaged being paid for using a higher number of accredited programmes. The fewer accredited programmes ordered, the longer individuals wait for a place on one, and the less CRCs are able to retain the competence to deliver them well. * CRC-provided resettlement services to prisoners being released – known as Through the Gate services – are generally poor, providing little real help with housing, jobs, addiction and debt. About one in ten people were released without a roof over their heads.

Dame Glenys said: "Regrettably, none of government's stated aspirations for Transforming Rehabilitation have been met in any meaningful way. I question whether the current model for probation can deliver sufficiently well. In some CRCs, individuals meet with their probation worker in places that lack privacy, when sensitive and difficult conversations must take place, and some do not meet with their probation worker face-to-face. Instead they are supervised by telephone calls every six weeks or so, with some CRCs planning for biometric monitoring systems. I find it inexplicable that under the banner of innovation, these developments were allowed. We should all be concerned, given the rehabilitation opportunities missed, and the risks to the public if individuals are not supervised well."

Call to End Dysfunctional Probation Privatisation

This grim report will come as little surprise to those who warned the government against its ill-conceived privatisation of probation prior to the 2015 General Election. Nor will it surprise those who have followed with concern the serious decline in probation work since then. So, dysfunctional have the government's probation changes become that active sabotage would look much the same. Whatever the government's original intentions, its changes to the probation system have not worked. The government now needs to be as determined in remedying the problems in the probation system as it was in creating them in the first place. It should launch an open and inclusive review of the current arrangements as soon as possible, seeking the views of a range of stakeholders, including: the private probation companies and their sub-contractors, staff representatives, voluntary and community sector providers and independent researchers and policy analysts. In the longer-term, the government should draw a line under the mistakes of the past and commit to placing probation on a coherent and sustainable footing. This will probably involve ending the failed privatisation experiment and reestablishing a unified, public sector probation service, organised locally and coordinated nationally. *Richard Garside, Director of the Centre for Crime and Justice Studies today*

Prisoners: One Million Pounds + Paid in Compensation for Parole Board Delays

To ask the Secretary of State for Justice, how much compensation has been paid to prisoners as a result of delays in parole hearings in each year since March 2010. We have worked closely with the Parole Board to help them progress cases more quickly, and to eliminate the backlog of delayed cases by the end of this year. This should lead to a decrease in the number of compensation claims in future years. We have provided additional funding for 100 new Parole Board members – a near 60% increase - and established a dedicated MoJ unit to help progress complex cases. We are ensuring prisoners can secure release by showing genuine progress while fulfilling our most important duty - protecting the public. The amount of compensation paid to prisoners as a result of delays in parole hearings in the years 2009/10 - 2016/17 is set out below. [2015-16 £554,000] [2014-15 £144,000] [2013-14 £91,000] [2012-13 £87,000] [2011-12 £243,000] [2010-11 £49,000] [2009-10 £30,000]

Sentence Reduced After Sheriff Failed To Take Into Account 'Coercion' In Mitigation

Scottish Legal News: A man who was jailed for 33 months after pleading guilty to being concerned in the supply of cannabis has had his sentence reduced following an appeal. The Appeal Court of the High Court of Justiciary imposed a sentence of 27 months after ruling that the sheriff failed to take into account an "important" aspect of the appellant's plea in mitigation, which was to the effect that he had been "coerced" into committing the offence.

Circumstances of the offence: Lord Brodie and Lord Drummond Young heard that the appellant Andrew Sinclair pled guilty at a first diet at Aberdeen Sheriff Court in July 2017 to being concerned in the supplying of the class B drug, in contravention of section 4(3)(b) of the Misuse of Drugs Act 1971 - a charge aggravated by the fact he was on bail at the time. The court was told that the appellant was driving a car on the A90 when he was stopped by police, who found a package in the boot of the car containing cannabis resin with a value of about £10,000, which had the potential to realise approximately £32,000 if subdivided into small street level deals. The appellant's explanation for the offence was that he had a drug habit and had accrued a drug debt of almost £3,000. He was offered an opportunity to clear the debt by acting as a courier, but having initially declined that offer he was physically assaulted and hospitalised. After further threats were made against both the appellant and his family he eventually agreed to act as a courier.

'Excessive sentence': Having heard the Crown narrative of the circumstances and the plea in mitigation on behalf of the appellant, and having considered the Criminal Justice Social Work Report, the sheriff imposed a sentence of two years and nine months' imprisonment of which six months was attributed to the bail aggravation; the sentence being discounted from what would otherwise have been a sentence of 42 months having regard to the guilty plea. However, the appellant appealed on the grounds that the sheriff erred by the selection of a headline sentence which in the circumstances was "too high". It was specifically accepted on his behalf by advocate Craig Findlater that a custodial sentence was appropriate, it being acknowledged that the nature of the offence called for such a disposal. But it was argued that a 36-month sentence was "excessive" in the circumstances of the case.The appeal judges held that the custodial term selected was not excessive, but quashed the sentence imposed after ruling that the appellant's plea in mitigation was not reflected in the sheriff's decision.

'Coercion may sound in mitigation': Delivering the opinion of the court, Lord Brodie said: "Subject to a qualification to which we will come, we see it as being difficult to say that 36 months imprisonment is an excessive sentence for being concerned in the supplying of class B drugs with a value of at least £10,000, albeit only on one day and albeit where the offender has no analogous previous convictions. The qualification is this. An important, albeit not uncommon, feature of the present case is the appellant's explanation that he only became involved in the offence due to coercion (in this case that coercion having gone the distance of an assault in which his ankle was deliberately broken and a threat was directed at his family) associated with a drug debt. Irrespective of the position adopted by the Crown, it would have been open to the sheriff to explain that he was not prepared to accept what was put forward on behalf of the appellant and to insist on a proof in mitigation if the appellant's explanation was to be adhered to. He did not do that. Accordingly we consider what was put forward on behalf of the appellant as having to be taken as having been true."

The judge added: "The proper course when faced with such coercion is to report the matter to the police but courts have recognised that where that course is not followed the fact that the offender acted under coercion may sound in mitigation...Here, on the appellant's account, which we must accept, he was subject to quite severe pressure, including being seriously assaulted. We do not see that as a fact which is reflected in the sheriff's decision-making. Accordingly, we have been persuaded to quash the sentence imposed by the sheriff and substitute an alternative sentence. We shall adopt the structure which the sheriff adopted, that is we shall start with a headline sentence in respect of the substantive offence but we will fix that headline at 28 months rather than the 36 months adopted by the sheriff; we shall reduce that by 25%, which is the same discount applied by the sheriff, to produce a figure of 21 months; to that we will add an undiscounted element of six months in respect of the bail aggravation. The result of that is to substitute for the sentence imposed by the sheriff a sentence of 27 months to run from the same date as that adopted by the sheriff.

Scotland Yard to Carry Out 'Urgent Assessment of Disclosure' After Rape Trial Collapses

Guardian: Scotland Yard is carrying out an "urgent assessment" after a rape prosecution collapsed due to the late disclosure of evidence that undermined the case. The trial of Liam Allan, 22, was halted at Croydon crown court on Thursday and the judge called for a review of disclosure of evidence by the Metropolitan police, as well as an inquiry at the Crown Prosecution Service, the Times reported. Police are understood to have looked at thousands of phone messages when reviewing evidence but it was not until the prosecution was close to trial that Met officers disclosed messages between the complainant and her friends that cast doubt on the case against Allan. The Crown Prosecution Service (CPS) said it offered no evidence in the case on Thursday as it was decided "there was no longer a realistic prospect of conviction". Speaking outside court, Allan told The Times: "I can't explain the mental torture of the past two years. I feel betrayed by the system which I had believed would do the right thing – the system I want to work in."

A Scotland Yard spokesman said: "We are aware of this case being dismissed from court and are carrying out an urgent assessment to establish the circumstances which led to this action being taken. We are working closely with the Crown Prosecution Service and keeping in close contact with the victim whilst this process takes place." A spokesman for the CPS said: "A charge can only be brought if a prosecutor is satisfied that both stages of the Full Code test in the Code for Crown Prosecutors are met, that is, that there is sufficient evidence to provide a realistic prospect of conviction and that a prosecution is required in the public interest. All prosecutions are kept under continuous review and prosecutors are required to take account of any change in circumstances as the case develops. In November 2017, the police provided more material in the case of Liam Allan. Upon a review of that material, it was decided that there was no longer a realistic prospect of conviction. Therefore we offered no evidence in the case against Liam Allan at a hearing on December 14 2017. We will now be conducting a management review together with the Metropolitan police to examine the way in which this case was handled."

Cops Stop and Search Black People More—But Find Fewer Drugs Than on White People

Socialist Worker: That's according to analysis released on Tuesday 12th December 2017, which reveals the institutional racism at the heart of the policy. The research was released by HM Inspectorate of Constabulary and Fire & Rescue Services. Echoing every other study ever done, "It suggests that the use of stop and search on black people might be based on weaker grounds for suspicion than its use on white people," it said. During drug searches the find rate was 33 percent when the person was white and 26 percent when the person was black. There was a similar difference in the find rate when the official grounds for a stop and search simply involved smelling cannabis—37 percent white and 29 percent black. The Inspectorate said the figures had to be "taken alongside the fact that black people are more than eight times more likely than white peo-

ple to be stopped and searched". And that they "require an explanation that the service is unable to provide". Instances of police racism—from stop and search to deaths in custody—are not due to a few bad apples in the police force. They flow from the police's role within capitalist society—to keep down working class and black people. They carry out such "legitimacy reviews" because they know that many working class and black people question the cops and their racism. Any reforms will only change the very worst aspects of this system.

Another Young Black Man Has Died In Police Custody.

Police say Nuno Cardoso suffered a "medical episode"—but his family said he had no known health conditions other than a milk allergy. Thames Valley police said he fell ill while in a police car and was later treated in hospital where he died on 24 November. An Independent Police Complaints Commission case has been opened into his death. Nuno was 25 and was just a few weeks into a law degree at Ruskin College, Oxford, when he was arrested at his halls of residence. Dozens of friends and family held a vigil on the Peckworth estate in Kentish Town, north London, where he grew up. His sister Paula said, "We are still waiting for police to say what happened. They say [it was] something medical but we don't know any more yet." Nuno's mother Doroteia dos Santos said, "We have lived here for so long, we feel British. I don't want the police to exclude us." Doroteia, who works for British Transport Police, said the police needed to question the number of deaths in custody. "It's happening more and more, and we are really starting to get tired of this," she said. "They stop and search all the boys. Not just because they have dreadlocks or lock hair, but every black and mixed race boy in this country—they have the same problem."

Absence of Crucial Witness Meant Russian Manslaughter Conviction Was Unfair

In Chamber judgment1 in the case of Zadumov v. Russia (application no. 2257/12) the European Court of Human Rights held, unanimously, that there had been: a violation of Article 6 §§ 1 and 3 (d) of the European Convention on Human Rights. The applicant, Roman Zadumov, complained that he had been found guilty of manslaughter after a decisive witness statement was read out in court but the witness herself did not appear at the trial. The Court found that the domestic court had not done all it could to make sure the witness appeared at the trial. It noted she had had mental health issues, but had been due to be released from hospital during the hearings. There had therefore been no justification for her absence. That failure had been critical as her evidence had been decisive in Mr Zadumov's conviction. Despite its finding of a violation, the Court did not consider that the issue of witnesses being absent from trials was a systemic or structural problem and held that the legislation at the time had had sufficient guarantees. It therefore saw no need to indicate any possible general measures on that issue to the Russian authorities. The Court also made no award in respect of non-pecuniary damage as Mr Zadumov could seek to have the proceedings reopened.

Just satisfaction (Article 41): The Court noted that under its case-law the most appropriate form of redress for a violation of the right to a fair trial was the reopening of proceedings, should it be requested, as that was capable of providing full restitution, as required under Article 41. The payment of monetary awards under Article 41 was designed to make reparation only for such consequences of a violation that could not be remedied otherwise. Since Russian legislation provided for such a possibility if Mr Zadumov wished it, it considered that the finding of a violation was sufficient just satisfaction.

Ministry of Defence Breached Geneva Convention During Iraq War

Leigh Day Solicitors: A High Court judge has today, Thursday 14th December 2017, ruled that the Ministry of Defence (MoD) implemented a flawed and unlawful approach to the detention of civilians during the Iraq war, breaching not only the Human Rights Act but also the Geneva Conventions. Mr Justice Leggatt also ruled that British soldiers subjected Iraqi civilians to inhuman and degrading treatment which included soldiers taking turns running over the backs of detained civilians and hooding them for periods of time. The judgment follows the first two High Court civil trials which heard allegations of abuse and unlawful detention in relation to four Iraqi civilians who gave evidence in an English courtroom for the first time. The four 'lead' cases in the judgment were chosen from a total of over 600 which remain unresolved following the war in Iraq. In his judgment Justice Leggatt made clear that "none of the claimants was engaged in terrorist activities or posed any threat to the security of Iraq". [para 929]

Sapna Malik, a partner in the international claims team at Leigh Day who represented two of the claimants, said: "These trials took place against an onslaught of political, military and media slurs of Iraqis bringing spurious claims, and strident criticism of us, as lawyers, representing them. Yet we have just witnessed the rule of law in action. Our clients are grateful that the judge approached their claims without any preconception or presumption that allegations of misconduct by British soldiers are inherently unlikely to be true. Our clients' evidence has been tested at length in court and the Ministry of Defence has been found wanting. It is vital that those wronged by the UK Government, whether in this country or overseas, are able to seek justice and redress. Their ability to do so in our courts is not a witch hunt but a testament to the strength of our democracy."

Shubhaa Srinivasan, a partner in the international claims team at Leigh Day who represented MRE and KSU, said: This judgment is a testament to why justice should be allowed to take its course. Our clients welcome the judge's findings that recognises their fundamental rights have been breached by the Ministry of Defence and this deserves due recognition under the law by way of awarding damages as an effective remedy. The judge arrived at this decision after extensive and impartial scrutiny of the evidence in two separate trials. The decision sends a clear message that no one, including the British Government should be above the law" In total, Leigh Day has issued 967 claims on behalf of Iraqi citizens against the MoD alleging unlawful detention/ mistreatment and in some cases, including Baha Mousa, unlawful killings. Of these four have been discontinued or struck out and 331 have been settled by the MoD. The judgment in these four 'lead' cases should allow for the MoD and Leigh Day to assess the merits of the remaining 628 cases. The third group of cases is due to be heard at a trial next year as the allegations involve UK joint liability with US forces and therefore the Court will hear separate legal arguments in relation to these cases.

Background: The trials collectively lasted over two months and heard evidence from over 50 MoD witnesses and the four Iraqi claimants, their cases are summarised below:

Kamil Alseran: The first of the two civil trials took place in June and July 2016, it was originally going to involve three claims arising from different phases of the Iraq conflict, but one of them was settled with the MoD shortly before the trial began. At this first trial both Kamil Alseran and Abd Ali Hameed Ali Al-Waheed gave oral evidence. Kamil Alseran, was a 22-year-old Iraqi civilian when he was captured in his home at the end of March 2003 as British Forces advanced on Basra. Whilst he was interned at a temporary camp at Al-Seeba, he and other prisoners were made to lie face down on the ground by British soldiers who then took it in turns to run over the prisoners' backs, using them as stepping stones, as they ran along the line of prisoners in heavy military boots. According to Mr Alseran and other supporting witnesses, the soldiers were laughing and some were taking pictures as this occurred.

Mr Justice Leggatt said: "In the present case the context of Mr Alseran's capture and detention was a war. That context cannot excuse cruelty or brutality but account needs to be taken of the acute stress and constant danger under which soldiers are operating in combat conditions." [Para 232] "…the incident at Al-Seeba in which soldiers deliberately ran over the backs of prisoners clearly crossed the threshold level of severity to amount to a breach of article 3. Those assaults involved the gratuitous infliction of pain and humiliation for the amusement of those who perpetrated them. They have caused Mr Alseran deep and long-lasting feelings of anger and mental anguish and were an affront to his dignity as a human being. I find that they constituted both inhuman and degrading treatment. They also constituted a clear breach of the Geneva Conventions, which require prisoners at all times to be humanely treated: see article 13 of Geneva III and article 27 of Geneva IV." [Para 233] Following this abuse, Mr Alseran was taken to a prisoner of war internment facility, Camp Bucca, where he was unlawfully detained from 10 April 2003 until his release on 7 May 2003. The judge described the system adopted at the Camp to detain civilians as 'flawed' and in violation of article 5 of the European Convention on Human Rights and the Geneva Conventions.

Mr Justice Leggatt states in the judgment: "The system for review of detention at Camp Bucca was flawed because the approach adopted was to treat an individual who claimed to be a civilian (such as Mr Alseran) as a prisoner of war unless there was no doubt that the person was a civilian. That approach was based on a wrong understanding by the MOD of the Geneva Conventions. The correct approach would have been to consider whether there was evidence that the individual claiming civilian status was a combatant or had taken part in hostilities. If – as in Mr Alseran's case – there was no such evidence, then there was no power to intern him, whether as a prisoner of war or as a civilian internee. Had the correct test been applied, Mr Alseran should and probably would have been released by 10 April 2003." [Para 9v] Mr Alseran was awarded £12,500 for the ill treatment following his capture at Al-Seeba and his unlawful detention whilst at Camp Bucca.

Abd Ali Hameed Ali Al-Waheed: Mr Al-Waheed was arrested in a house raid carried out by British soldiers in Basra city on the night in February 2007. He was 53 years old at the time and had recently remarried. The soldiers were looking for his brother-in-law who was suspected of involvement in terrorist activities. Mr Justice Leggatt found that Mr Al-Waheed's allegations of mistreatment were greatly exaggerated, noting that his 'psychiatric condition and exaggerated perception of pain' had 'coloured his memories of the past' [Para 620]. However, the judge found that "the injuries to Mr Al-Waheed's head, upper body and right hand recorded in his medical notes were deliberately inflicted by the soldiers who travelled with him to the Basra Airport base and that during that journey Mr Al-Waheed was systematically beaten with one or more implements (probably rifle butts) and was punched in the face." [para 654]. His injuries were so severe on arrival at Basra Airport that a military doctor who examined him referred the matter to the Royal Military Police as he was so concerned about his injuries and how he had sustained them.

In addition to this assault, Mr Justice Leggatt found that Mr Al-Waheed, an Iraqi civilian, had been subjected to inhuman and degrading treatment including sleep deprivation, "harsh" interrogation involving a deliberate attempt to humiliate the detainee, by insulting and shouting personal abuse at them, and periods of complete deprivation of sight and hearing. According to the judge Mr Al Waheed's evidence in relation to how the questioning was conducted was not challenged by the MoD and was consistent with descriptions of the "harsh" interrogation technique which was permitted by the MoD at that time but which has since been banned by the British Army and which the judge held violated article 3 of the European Convention on Human Rights [para 676].

The judge found that "the practice of depriving detainees of both sight and hearing was inconsistent with the MOD's published doctrine." Further that he was "driven to conclude that the reason why the practice was adopted was that suggested by the Provost Martial (Army) in his reports written at the time: namely, that it was done as a form of deliberate 'conditioning', in order to maximise vulnerability and the 'shock of capture'. It also seems to me that a practice which prevented detainees who were already defenceless from being able to see (or hear) exactly what was being done to them or by whom was not only calculated to make the detainees feel more vulnerable but also – by dehumanising them and giving their captors a cloak of invisibility – to increase the risk of physical abuse." [para 665]

The judge observed how initial reports regarding the circumstances of Mr Al-Waheed's capture were 'pure fiction' [para 590]. Further, that despite an MoD review committee deciding on 22 February 2007 that Mr Al-Waheed had no connection with his brother-in-law's activities and did not pose a threat to security and that he should be released, he was not let go until 28 March 2007 a period of 33 days which Mr Justice Leggatt ruled as a violation of article 5 of the European Convention on Human Rights. Mr Justice Leggatt awarded Mr Al Waheed a total of £33,000 for the beating which he suffered after his arrest, the inhuman and degrading treatment he was subjected to and unlawful detention at Shaibah detention facility.

MRE and KSU: The second trial which heard the claims of MRE and KSU took place in March and April 2017 at which the two men gave oral evidence. The MOD provided evidence from 34 factual witnesses. Between them, the parties relied on evidence from 14 medical experts in eight different specialisms. and KSU were Iraqi citizens who, when the war began, were serving on a merchant ship which was moored in the Khawr az Zubayr waterway north of Umm Qasr. Due to the sexual nature of the assaults on the men, they have been granted anonymity. MRE was 37 years old and was employed as an engineer on the ship. KSU was 27 years old and was employed as a guard. Their ship was boarded on 24 March 2003 by coalition forces and four crew members, including MRE and KSU, were captured. They were transferred to a large warship on which they were held overnight. On arrival onto this ship they were forced to strip naked and subjected to an intrusive physical inspection which involved sexual humiliation. KSU was also burnt on the buttock with a lit cigarette.

Although the Court found that MRE's and KSU's allegations of sexual assault and humiliation were substantially true, the judge concluded that he was unable to determine whether the perpetrators of this abuse on the warship were British or American soldiers. The following morning MRE and KSU were taken back by boat to Umm Qasr port to be transported to Camp Bucca. The Court was clear that from the time MRE and KSU disembarked at Umm Qasr port, on the day after their capture, until their release from Camp Bucca, which occurred on 10 April 2003, the two men were in the custody of British forces, and suffered mistreatment during this period. For the duration of the journey from the port to Camp Bucca the Claimants were hooded with sandbags, The Court found this was inhuman and degrading treatment which violated article 3 of the European Convention on Human Rights as well as amounting to an assault.

On hooding, the judge said: "I consider that the court should now make it clear in unequivocal terms that putting sandbags (or other hoods) over the heads of prisoners at any time and for whatever purpose is a form of degrading treatment which insults human dignity and violates article 3 of the European Convention. It is also, in the context of an international armed conflict, a violation of article 13 of Geneva III, which requires prisoners to be humanely treated at all times." [Para 495]. The judge accepted the evidence of MRE that he suffered fear and anxiety from

having his head completely covered with a bag. He also accepted the evidence of KSU: "that having a sandbag put over his head and then being forced to the ground and made to shuffle forwards on his knees before being shoved and kicked into a vehicle caused him to feel terrified and humiliated. He said in his evidence: "I could not understand why they would do such a thing to another human being. They were treating me like I was an animal." It is difficult to disagree with that description." [para 498]. A piece of glass within the sandbag penetrated MRE's eye whilst he was hooded and caused damage to his vision. MRE was struck on the head on the dock at Umm Qasr and later kicked in the knee by a British soldier while detained at Camp Bucca. The Court agreed that both assaults were proven. The blow to the head constituted inhuman treatment which violated article 3 of the European Convention.

On their detention at Camp Bucca, Justice Leggatt said: "The claimants were entitled under international humanitarian law and article 5 of the European Convention to have their cases assessed and a decision whether to intern or release them made promptly following their arrival at Camp Bucca on 25 March 2003. Making all due allowance for the wartime conditions, such an assessment should have taken place within, at most, ten days of their internment. Their cases were not considered, however, until 10 April 2003 – when the decision was made to release them. In the result, they were unlawfully detained for six days. Their detention during this period violated article 5 of the European Convention and also gave rise to a claim in tort (as the British government did not authorise detention which was in breach of international humanitarian law and the Human Rights Act)." [para 13 vi]

Both men were awarded £10,000 for the hooding, for his eye injury as a result of the hooding MRE was awarded an additional £1,000, a further £15,000 for the blow to his head and £1,440 for associated cost of medical treatment. For the six days of unlawful imprisonment, both men were each awarded damages of £600.

High Court Slams IPCC for Failure to Follow Due Process

Kate Maynard Hickman and Rose Solicitors: "The Court of Appeal has delivered a well-deserved blow to the IPCC for failing to follow due process. As the IPCC prepares to morph under a new name and structure, the Court of Appeal has found that the IPCC unlawfully failed to uphold a police complaint appeal and direct the Metropolitan Police to fully investigate a police complaint of discrimination in stop at Heathrow under anti-terror legislation. For the public to have any confidence in the police complaints system, the IPCC must ensure proper procedures are followed. It's the IPCC's job to bring the police to account when they do not properly investigate police complaints. Where there are widespread fears that people are being stopped at our borders solely on the basis of their ethnicity or religion, the IPCC must do better."

Factual summary: The Court of Appeal found that the IPCC unlawfully failed to uphold a police complaint appeal and direct the Metropolitan Police to fully investigate a police complaint of discrimination when the complainant was stopped at Heathrow under Schedule 7 of the Terrorism Act (a provision that enables police to stop and detain people for up to 9 hours without having any grounds to believe them involved in terrorism).

The complainant lodged a police complaint that the stop was a result of discrimination against him on the ground of his race and religion. His complaint was referred to the Metropolitan Police Service. Inspector Bhatowa was appointed to investigate the complaint. His investigation report contained hardly any information, merely asserting that correct procedures had been followed. The complainant appealed to the IPCC on the basis that he had

not been provided with adequate information about the findings of the investigation.

The IPCC accepted the defective report and rejected the complaint appeal. The Court of Appeal said that the IPCC should have upheld the appeal and directed the police to produce a full investigation report. It was not appropriate for the IPCC to brush an appeal aside if it can see that relevant procedures have not been followed.

The IPCC will now have to re-consider the police complaint appeal.

Background information: The Equality and Human Rights Commission Research Report No 72 ("The Impact of Counter-terrorism measures on Muslim Communities"), published in 2011, stated that the exercise of Schedule 7 powers were "having some of the most significant negative impacts across Muslim communities. The Government's Independent Reviewer of Terrorism Legislation stated in his report The Terrorism Acts in 2012 that he was in 'no doubt' that the disproportionate likelihood of being stopped 'has contributed to ill-feeling in these communities, and to a sense that their members are being singled out for police attention at the border.' See paragraph 10.14 of 'The Terrorism Acts in 2012'

Extract from the judgment: In so far as Ground 2 involves a challenge to whether the IPCC applied the harm test under those provisions correctly, I consider that the judge was entitled to find on the evidence before him - particularly the witness statement of Ms Goddard, even though she did not refer distinctly to the relevant provisions in relation to the harm test - that she did have it properly in mind when considering how to proceed. This provided the foundation for a further submission made by Mr Johnson, namely that it was lawful for the IPCC to dismiss the appellant's appeal because it had investigated the background and satisfied itself that the only information which could safely be provided to the appellant, in accordance with the harm test, was that which was in fact provided to him in the form of the investigation report. In Mr Johnson's submission, it would have been a sterile exercise for the IPCC to uphold the appellant's appeal in circumstances where it had satisfied itself that he could not safely be provided with any more information relating to his treatment at Heathrow.

I do not accept these submissions, for a number of reasons. In the first place, it was or should have been clear to the IPCC that the appropriate authority in this case had been provided with a defective investigation report which did not provide that authority with the full information it required in order to exercise its functions under para. 24 of Schedule 3. Nor did it appear that the appropriate authority had ever itself considered the application of the harm test. In a context like this, where it is said that a complainant cannot be provided with full information about the findings made in relation to his complaint, it makes it doubly important that a complainant and the public at large can be assured that proper procedures have been followed and that the case has been considered correctly, even if only behind a screen which is required to be in place to safeguard the public interest.

In such a case, the IPCC's function of acting to secure that public confidence is established and maintained in the existence of suitable arrangements for the handling of complaints and in relation to the due operation of those arrangements (see section 10(1)(d) of the 2002 Act) requires it to check that the arrangements in place are in fact suitable and that they have been followed correctly. It is not appropriate for the IPCC to brush an appeal aside if it can see that the relevant procedures have not been followed, that appropriate information has not been passed to the relevant decision-maker (the appropriate authority) and that the appropriate authority has not properly and with full information applied its mind to the matters which ought properly to be for its decision. Rather, the IPCC should make a decision on the appeal that

ensures that the relevant procedures will in fact be followed.

Secondly, the IPCC had itself already provided the appellant with information to suggest that there was a tag on his passport. It is therefore difficult to see how it could think that proper application of the harm test meant that such information could not be provided to the appellant by the appropriate authority. Thirdly, in the absence of any closed procedure in court, the court below was not (and we are not) in a position to look into the background facts. This has the result that it is not open to the IPCC to argue that the claim for judicial review should in any event have been dismissed pursuant to section 31(2A) of the Senior Courts Act 1981 on the grounds that it is highly likely that, if the IPCC had not erred in law, the outcome for the appellant would not have been substantially different.

It may be that, once the proper procedures are followed by the investigating officer and by the appropriate authority in this case, the net result will be that the appellant is not provided with more information about the circumstances of his complaint than he has already received and that the appropriate authority again decides that there is no evidence that a criminal offence or a disciplinary offence has been committed. But it is important that the investigating officer and the appropriate authority should carry out their tasks properly before such a conclusion is arrived at. It is also important, if public confidence in the operation of the procedures put in place by the MPS pursuant to Schedule 3 is to be maintained, that the IPCC should check that they have in fact been properly followed, even if the appellant cannot be told more.s

Therefore, the appeal should be allowed on Ground 1 and 2, and the case remitted to the IPCC for further consideration in accordance with the guidance given by this court. If Jackson and Flaux LJJ agree, then in my view it is neither necessary nor appropriate to consider Ground 3.

Racial And Economic Justice Are Two Sides Of The Same Coin

Liz Fekete, Institute of Race Relations What's in a word? Or two words in this case? When it comes to 'racial disparities or disproportionality', what is understood depends on the eye or ear of the beholder. For anti-racists, 'ethnic disparities' or 'racial disproportionality' are investigated as a way of understanding deeper structural processes. But for cultural racists - all those whose thinking is infected by cultural stereotyping – the over-representation of BAME people in arrest and incarceration figures is proof of cultural deficit – the dysfunctionality of the Black family, the religious fanaticism of the Muslim community, the nomadic lifestyle of Gypsies and Travellers, etc, etc.

I start here because although the title of the event is 'The Lammy Review: only one half of the picture', I think we need to pause and ask ourselves whether the discussion we are having on disproportionality is in danger of becoming lopsided in ways that open up spaces for cultural racist thinking. Two things concern me. First, the complete lack of any mention of institutional racism in either the Lammy review or the government's Race Disparity Audit. Second, the de-contextualisation of the statistics on racial disparities from history. The Centre for Crime and Justice Studies has brought us here (29 November) to discuss the pathways prior to criminal justice involvement that prefigures the likelihood of arrest – the processes 'upstream', as they put it in the advance publicity. But to understand the statistics, you have to go back to the source. And the source is in history.

The Policing Of 'Suspect Communities': As long as I can remember, neighbourhoods, where BAME communities live, have been treated by the police as a 'threat', with 'suspect communities' subjected to a different style of policing – not so much policing by consent as policing by enforcement. We are still living with the consequences of policies and procedures that started in at least the 1960s when policing was informed by racist stereotypes about the rebellious or un-integratable nature of former colonial subjects.

This was well documented in a number of reports and books, such as Policing the Crisis, Blood on the Streets, Policing Against Black People, the first major report I worked on after starting work at the Institute of Race Relations in 1982, soon after what was, in effect, uprisings against the police in Brixton, Birmingham, Manchester, Leeds and other cities. At that time, Sir Kenneth Newman, the head of the Royal Ulster Constabulary, had been drafted in to lead the Metropolitan Police, with the specific purpose of bringing the lessons of public order policing from Belfast to London. He immediately introduced 'targeting', drawn directly from anti-terrorist operations in Northern Ireland, under which police resources were concentrated in black areas with particular estates, clubs and meetings places regarded as 'symbolic locations', subjected to intense surveillance and military-style operations. It may be true that the overt racist stereotyping that informed a colonial-style public order approach to BAME communities is a thing of the past, but the logic of Sir Kenneth Newman's approach of targeting BAME neighbourhoods as 'high crime' areas persists in policing today. I am reminded of its logic each time I look at the Prevent programme or the Gangs Matrix. Nothing has changed. The logic of policing is still to treat poor, BAME neighbourhoods as a 'threat', as suspect communities – to criminalise their inhabitants.

Just look at measures like the 2010 Birmingham covert counter-terrorism operation Project Champion which was only dismantled following the threat of judicial review proceedings by Liberty. It involved a £3 million surveillance initiative to install 200 cameras and automatic plate reading cameras in the predominantly Muslim neighbourhoods of Sparkbrook and Washwood Heath. And we should also remember that only recently the Metropolitan Police were planning to trial automatic facial recognition at the Notting Hill Carnival. As a number of organisations pointed out in a joint letter to Cressida Dick, 'The choice to use Notting Hill Carnival to trial, yet again, this invasive technology', which can 'carry racial accuracy biases', 'unfairly targets the community that Carnival exists to celebrate.' 'This is not policing by consent'.

The Consequences Of Decontextualisation: A couple of weeks ago I went to a research symposium about improving outcomes for young black men in one London borough. It was very well-meaning and there were many academic papers which ran through the statistics on disproportionality. But, soon, some people in the audience were getting angry about an abstract discussion that seemed 'far too cosy'. One man said that as an academic he saw the importance of amassing evidence on disproportionality, but as an activist and as a father he was incensed that we were discussing the same data and talking about the same malpractices that we have been working to end for 20 or 30 years.

Despite all the heroic struggles that have been mounted against racism in the criminal justice system - the abolition of SUS, the fight to get racist violence treated as a crime, the abolition of the Special Patrol Group, making racism in the police a disciplinary offence – it feels as though we are having to reinvent the wheel all over again, as JENGbA is doing with its campaign to abolish the joint enterprise laws. But the danger now, with the 'explain or reform' recommendation within the Lammy Review, is that opportunities could be afforded for retrograde research, instigated or influenced by that sector and those politicians which have campaigned for years in the pages of the Daily Mail and the Sun against the findings and recommendations of the Macpherson report. We should not forget that it was these voices which described those who rioted in Tottenham after the police shooting of Mark Duggan in 2011 as 'feral youth', inhabiting a subversive culture that ignores 'civilised boundaries' where 'whites have become black'. Macpherson's definition of institutional racism might be improved upon, but no one should be allowed go back on the report's pathbreaking findings.

The Expansive Nature Of Criminal Justice: We have to bear in mind the history, while also taking account of what is different today from in the 1980s and 1990s. Here, the first thing I would like to point out is that multi-agency policing, which includes the embedding of police in schools and local authorities, means that the criminal justice system now has a longer reach. The criminal justice system today is not just what is experienced on the street, in the police cell, the courts and the prison- you can end up on the Gangs Matrix after a visit to the job centre, or be referred to Prevent by your school teacher or be reported to the Home Office as an immigration offender by your landlord, your employer or your bank! The criminal justice system is all pervasive in that society has moved from criminalising acts to detecting pre-crime risks and threats through algorithms (based on racist presumptions) for instance.

The second thing I would like to say is that if we are seriously considering pathways to criminalisation, we also need to look at the expansion of the law. From 1997 to 2006, New Labour brought in over 3,000 new criminal offences, nearly one for each day in office. And it was under the same government that use of stop and search underwent a truly massive expansion, not to mention the escalation in immigration policing, the fastest growing and least accountable form of policing in Britain today. How many of these new crimes, bringing into the scope of the law behaviour that was previously not considered criminal, have ended up criminalising BAME communities? I think that that figure would be very high, given that the increase in so many criminal offences are in the fields of immigration, youth culture and countering extremism.

For example, it is now a criminal offence to drive while in the country illegally, for landlords to let properties to undocumented migrants, or to camp in an unauthorised site (while the government cuts back on authorised sites for Gypsies and Travellers). I remember a few years ago, when I was living in East Ham, someone from the Council knocking on my door and asking me to take part in a crime survey ranking the importance of crimes committed locally, the last one listed being young people congregating on street corners. I pointed out to the man on my doorstep that standing on the street corner wasn't a crime and shouldn't be included in the survey, and he said that was a very interesting point of view, Madam! I suppose I shouldn't have been surprised given the creation of ASBOs and Public Space Protection Orders, breach of which is now a criminal offence. Only last week, we read that Stoke-on-Trent council has started a consultation on a public space protection order that will make it an offence for a person to 'assemble, erect, occupy or use' on public land a tent unless part of a council-sanctioned activity.

The Counter-Terrorism and Security Act 2015: placed local authorities, schools, nurseries and social services departments under a specific duty to report signs of radicalisation. Just last week we heard that OFSTED was instructing its inspectors to question primary school girls who wear the hijab, to see whether this was a sign of 'sexualisation' or whether schools are failing to uphold the Equalities Act. The idiocy of these policies beggars belief, and you have to laugh or you would cry. But we cannot let this pass. Can you imagine the stress to young BAME people that the expanded logic of criminal justice causes, whether in the field of Prevent, gangs or policing immigration. In 1994, IRR, which was already working with Gerry German at the Communities Empowerment Network, wrote 'Outcast England: how Schools Exclude Black Children'. We warned about the racist stereotyping of black culture that was used to legitimise school exclusions of black children that were casting children out of school and into crime. Nothing, absolutely nothing has changed, in fact, it has got worst. Cultural racism towards Muslims has the imprimatur of the state, thanks to Prevent

The same with Black youth 'criminality' thanks to the Gangs Matrix. Racism and

Islamophobia, stigmatising people because of their colour or their religion, are stress factors in young people's lives, and the stress of racism engendered by the extension of criminal justice in schools, is just one factor that could lead to alienation or even mental health issues amongst young people. Many other factors affecting both young people and adults are identified by Justice in its latest report which reveals the many ways in which defendants with learning disabilities and mental illness have been repeatedly failed by the criminal justice system. There may be, as Justice welcomes, renewed efforts 'to create an integrated criminal justice and mental health sector', but this should not preclude us from questioning the ways in which economic injustice, racism, criminal justice expansion and immigration enforcement exacerbate stress.

Racial Justice And Economic Justice Go Hand In Hand: Poverty, mental illness, unemployment, poor housing, immigration status, homelessness, debt, if these are divorced from questions of economic justice, they can be recast as personal failings – and the best we can hope from government is that they will just ever so slightly ease off the pressure, so to speak, reduce the time for the universal credit rollout from six weeks to five, as if that will keep people out of debt and despair. The stresses placed on all poor people in this market economy are phenomenal, and unless we direct the racial disproportionality discussion towards, yes, a discussion of institutional racism but also an awareness of economic injustice – one that broadens us out to the white working class too - then we risk opening up the terrain for cultural racists and the kind of 'Victorian' thinking that does not understand the relationship between crime and poverty but in fact blames the poor for its own poverty and for crime.

It's time for us to come out and say boldly that a range of factors, including school exclusions, unemployment, poverty, the legal system, racism and incarceration are bound up with the political economy and a failed economic model. Racial injustice and economic injustice are two sides of the same coin.

Confiscation Order Against Colin Coates Who Benefited From 'Criminal Lifestyle'

Scottish Legal News: A man convicted of murder and embezzlement has been made the subject of a confiscation order after a High Court judge ruled that he had made almost £120,000 as a result of his "criminal lifestyle". Colin Coates, who was sentenced to life imprisonment with a punishment part of 33 years after being found guilty in 2013 of the abduction, torture and murder of Lynda Spence in 2011, as well as extortion offences, was ordered to pay a nominal sum of £1 after the Crown brought proceedings against him under the Proceeds of Crime Act 2002. The order allows the court to increase the recoverable amount when further assets become available.

Confiscation order: Judge Tom Hughes heard that on the date of the respondent's conviction the Crown lodged with the court a prosecutors statement and moved for a confiscation order. On behalf of the Crown, advocate depute Daniel Byrne submitted that the accused had been convicted of blackmail and extortion, which were "lifestyle offences" in terms of section 142 of the 2002 Act 2002, and therefore the respondent was deemed to have a "criminal lifestyle". The court heard evidence from Jill Yahi, a forensic accountant employed by the Crown Office in the Proceeds of Crime Unit, who explained that the respondent had benefited from his "general criminal conduct" to the extent of £119,967.34, but added that there was an "available amount of nil" as he had been sequestrated. The court was referred to a witness statement given by Coates' ex-wife Angela Wotherspoon, who said he had been "changing properties from my name into his own name" by forging her signature, as a result of which he was able to re-mortgage two properties for a total of £120,000 and transfer the funds into an associate's bank account. Ms Yahi also explained that Coates had received

mortgage payments of almost £25,000 and nearly £82,000 of bank credits from “unknown sources” in addition to £14,200 from extortion in the two charges of which he was convicted.

‘Unfair hearing’: But the respondent, who represented himself at the determination hearing, challenged the Crown’s application. He argued that he had not received “adequate disclosure” from the Crown and there was therefore a “breach” of Article 6 of his right to a fair hearing in terms of the European Convention on Human Rights. He also refused to accept the evidence of his ex-wife as she had not come to court to give evidence. The respondent took the view that he was now being “punished twice for the same crimes” and as a result he claimed he was being “treated unjustly by the courts”. However, the judge dismissed his human rights challenge and ruled that on the balance of probabilities the evidence of his criminal lifestyle from Ms Yahi was “sufficient to establish the case for the Crown”.

‘Criminal lifestyle’: In a written opinion Judge Hughes said: “I accept that it was established that the respondent has a criminal lifestyle as defined in terms of section 142(1)(a) of the said Act. As a result of that, various assumptions in terms of section 96 of the said Act apply. The respondent has failed to adequately challenge this. I accept the Crown evidence regarding his total expenditure over the relevant period following the deduction of his ascertainable income from known sources. I take the view that the amended Crown’s statement of information with the calculations of the benefit amount and the available amounts are accurate. I find that he has benefited to the extent of £119,967.34. I have been asked to make a nominal award for the recoverable amount at this time of £1 in terms of section 93(2)(b) of the said Act. This obviously permits the court, at a later date, to operate sections 104 to 109 of the said Act which permit variations of the order for a re-calculation of the available amount as and when additional information becomes available.”

Eight Sentenced for Smuggling Drugs Into Prisons by Drones

BBC News: The ringleader of a gang who smuggled drugs and phones into prisons using drones has been jailed for seven years and two months. Former armed robber Craig Hickinbottom, 35, organised the flights from behind bars, Birmingham Crown Court was told. His gang put goods worth more than an estimated £1m into jails as far apart as the West Midlands and Scotland. The packages were attached to fishing lines, and flown over prison walls. Seven others were also sentenced. The group were convicted of organising 49 drone flights, although police believe the actual number may be higher. They were also found guilty of four "throw-overs" of contraband. They were caught by chance, by cameras set up to film wildlife outside Hewell Prison in Worcestershire. Footage shows two of the men in a field, preparing a drone for flight, before sending it over the hedge to the prison grounds. Inside, the packages were retrieved by inmates using tools such as an extendable broom handle with a hook. Prison CCTV then showed others visiting their cells and walking out with packages. Drone pilot Mervyn Foster, 36, of Tipton, West Midlands, was jailed for six years and eight months for his part in the plot. Both he and Hickinbottom pleaded guilty to conspiring to bring contraband into prison, and conspiracy to supply psychoactive substances. The court was told the offences were committed between July 2015 and May this year at jails in Worcestershire, Staffordshire, Birmingham, Yorkshire, Cheshire, Liverpool, and Perth. Passing sentence, Judge Roderick Henderson said: "Prisons are difficult enough places to run - they contain people who are dangerous and vulnerable. "Supplying things into prison that should not be there - drugs, phones, tools and the like - threatens proper management... and creates real risks of violence and loss of control and discipline".

CCRC Are They Fit for Purpose

Hi MOJUK, I would like to say thank you for your publication of my case in your magazine ‘Inside Out’, issue 661. I would also like you to know that all the evidence you mentioned in the article regarding my case was submitted to the CCRC when the CCRC had reviewed the new evidence which my legal team, and myself submitted; we felt reasonably sure that there were more than enough grounds for my case to be sent to the court of appeal.

However, the CCRC failed to investigate any of the new evidence that I submitted. I have always believed, it is the duty of the CCRC to properly investigate all and any new evidence which may be submitted as part of the case the CCRC are reviewing. The thorough investigation of all and any new evidence by the CCRC must be my fundamental right to seek justice for myself. On my first appeal, I did not have any counsel to assist me. I was not allowed to be present at my appeal hearing, even though I was my own counsel representing myself. So how can that be just. the prosecution presented evidence which had no relevance to myself. The evidence presented by the prosecution was concerning the case against my nephew. The evidence which I had submitted as part of my grounds of appeal, were not answered by the court of appeal. My second Appeal. I was represented by. a barrister who I had never met or had any contact with. I did not have any conference with that barrister. The Barrister had been engaged for one month before my appeal to read my case and put forward his interpretation to the court of appeal. The barrister did not put any of the strong points which formed my grounds of appeal to the court. Instead he chose to make my appeal on his interpretation of my case, without having any consultations with me. So, my grounds of appeal were never dealt with in either of those appeals. I am now left with the feeling that I have been denied my fundamental right to seek justice through the appeal court. I have at present a judicial review hearing pending. concerning the CCRC decision.

Roger Khan, A5724AY, HMP Whitemoor, Long Hill Road, March, PE15 0PR

38 Prisoners Executed in Iraqi Prison

Expressing deep shock at a mass execution of 38 men at a prison in the Iraqi city of Nassiriya, the Office of the UN High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR) has called on the country to establish an immediate moratorium and carry out an urgent and comprehensive review of its criminal justice system.“The mass execution once again raises huge concerns about the use of the death penalty in the country,” Liz Throssell, an OHCHR spokesperson, told the media at a regular news briefing in Geneva Friday. “Given the flaws of the Iraqi justice system, it appears extremely doubtful that strict due process and fair trial guarantees were followed in these 38 cases,” she added.

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.