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 675 (15/02/2018) - Cost £1

The Long Read - Murder In Hampstead: Did A Secret Trial Put The Wrong Man In Jail?

Wang Yam: New evidence shows that an MI6 informant convicted of a notorious murder may be innocent, but due to a gagging order, his case cannot be heard. Duncan Campbell and Richard Norton-Taylor argue the facts: Lacey a police dog, was not interested in the chaotic debris in the hallway, or the swarm of bluebottle flies on the stairs, as she made her way through the house at No 9 Downshire Hill in Hampstead on a warm June afternoon in 2006. But as she approached a room to her right, which was piled high with an assortment of papers, she let out a bark and started digging at the mess in front of her with her paws. What had caught the interest of Lacey, a black-and-tan German shepherd attached to the Metropolitan police's dog unit, was a decomposing body. The body turned out to be that of the householder: a wealthy and reclusive author and photographer called Allan Chappelow, aged 86. His skull had been crushed and many of his ribs broken. There were extensive fractures to his neck, which suggested that he had been strangled, and the top half of his body was covered with congealed wax and burn marks. And so began a murder investigation that remains, in many aspects, unresolved to this day.

The police had been dispatched to the dilapidated house in one of north London's most desirable streets, a short stroll from Hampstead Heath, after Chappelow's HSBC bank branch became concerned about suspicious transactions carried out with his card. Within weeks of finding the body, detectives had traced the person who had been using the stolen bank details: a 45-year-old Chinese exile called Wang Yam, who was now in Switzerland. They believed he had stolen Chappelow's bank details from the letterbox at the front of his house and, perhaps when confronted, killed him. In September 2006, Wang was detained by the Swiss police, brought back to England and charged with fraud, theft and murder.

Between his arrest and the start of the trial, it emerged that Wang had acted as an informant for MI6 in London for a number of years. Wang was well placed to be an informant for Britain's foreign intelligence agency. He had family links with China's first communist leaders, he was opposed to repressive measures taken by Beijing, and he was something of a computer expert. When he finally stood trial at the Old Bailey in 2008, journalists were ordered to leave the court on the grounds of national security. It was the first murder case in modern times to have been held in such secrecy. Wang claimed that, at the time of his arrest, he had infiltrated a group of gangsters and fed information to what was described in open court as the "appropriate authorities".

While he admitted he had fraudulently used Chappelow's bank details, Wang has always denied involvement in the murder. After two trials – the jury could not agree on the murder charge in his first trial – he was convicted of murder, theft and fraud, and jailed for life with a recommendation that he should serve at least 20 years. But there is new evidence that casts doubt over Wang's conviction. Before, during and after the trial, the government went to extraordinary lengths to ensure that details of Wang's links with MI6 would remain secret. Two cabinet ministers told the trial judge that Wang's entire defence must be heard behind closed doors. A contempt order issued by the judge prevents the media from speculating about the reasons for the secrecy.

In 2013, Wang contacted the Guardian from prison, protesting his innocence of the murder. In January 2014, we wrote about the inconsistencies in the case against him. Following our publication of the story, a fresh witness, who lived only a few doors from Chappelow, got in touch. This new witness told us that, after Wang was already in custody awaiting trial, he too had encountered someone interfering with his letterbox. When he confronted the intruder, he was threatened with a knife. This evidence was given to local police, who did not make the connection with Chappelow's murder and so did not pass it on to the murder inquiry or the defence team. Now in the 11th year of his sentence, Wang, who is being held at Lowdham Grange prison in Nottingham, still protests his innocence. Since the trial, another witness has come forward with accounts of Chappelow's private life that suggest other factors may have been involved. Neighbours have offered more information; one, Thomas Harding, has even written a book on the case, Blood on the Page, which throws new doubts on the safety of Wang's conviction. Investigators found signs that someone else had recently been in the house: cigarette butts, footprints, a recently used sleeping bag, and condoms. No DNA, fingerprint or footprint evidence linked Wang to the murder scene, and it remains a mystery as to who had been in the house.

But if Wang was not responsible for the murder, who was? Very little was known about the dead man, Allan Chappelow. What reasons might someone have had for killing him? Allan Chappelow inherited the Hampstead house after his father died in 1976, and, for most of the rest of his life, he lived there alone. He seems to have shown as little interest in its upkeep as he did in his own appearance, which neighbours described as unkempt. Harding, who investigated Chappelow's background for his book, remembers him as "the peculiar old man" who lived down the street. The house, which stood out like a rotten tooth among its gleaming neighbours, gradually deteriorated into a chaotic shambles, and by the time of Chappelow's death, it looked more like an abandoned squat than the home of a literary author: the kitchen was an unhygienic jumble of tins and utensils, the wallpaper peeling, the roof leaking, piles of manuscripts and book proofs littered the rooms, and his bedroom was like a dosser's. The garden was overgrown and untended. Chappelow was the product of an educated, socialist family, whose liberal-leaning father, a successful decorator and upholsterer, had moved to Denmark rather than be conscripted into military service during the first world war. At the end of hostilities, the family returned to London and bought 9 Downshire Hill. Allan grew up in a politically progressive home; his parents were active members of the Fabian Society.

At the onset of the second world war, the bookish Chappelow was faced with the same dilemma as his father, as well as his schoolboy hero, George Bernard Shaw, who had refused to fight in the first world war and was strongly opposed to the second. He applied for conscientious-objector status and was sent to work as a farm labourer in Hampshire.

After the war, he took a degree in moral philosophy at Cambridge; after graduating in 1949, he took photos of people in the public eye whom he admired. Through family connections, he met and photographed the writer HG Wells and the economists and reformers Sidney and Beatrice Webb. In 1950, he set off on his motorbike – an enduring passion – to Shaw's home in Hertfordshire to ask if he could interview and photograph him. Shaw rebuffed him, saying "an old skeleton at 93 and a half is all that is left of me. Better leave well alone." Undeterred, Chappelow wrote back to him: "Shame on you! Pshaw! Why you're SUPERMAN!" He returned, and was eventually granted an audience. Chappelow's interview with and photograph of Shaw were published in the Daily Mail. A trip to Russia in 1952 to satisfy his own curiosity led to a well-received book, Russian Holiday, published in 1955 at the height of the cold war. It concluded with a plea for tolerance: "the average Russian … is an amiable, good-

natured human being with much the same basic needs as the man in the street of any other nation …Ignorance breeds fear. Fear breeds hate. Hate breeds hysteria. And hysteria can lead to war." But Shaw remained his chief interest. Two volumes, Shaw the Villager and Human Being (1961) and The Chucker-Out (1969), with an introduction by Vera Brittain, followed. His income from his writing was small, but he led an ascetic life and had few expenses. There were few visitors to 9 Downshire Hill, and no evidence of any long-term relationship. Most relatives assumed he was gay; a video of a gay pride march found among his belongings might seem to support this. But he was not a complete recluse. He travelled abroad on package holidays and, shortly before his death, went to Texas to carry out more Shaw research at the university. The last family member to see Chappelow was his cousin, Patty Ainsworth. They met in Austin, Texas, where Chappelow devoured the Shaw papers in the university archives. Chappelow told Patty and her husband that he had lived in the same house for six decades and was "proud of it".

Even in its sorry condition, the house and his estate was valued at £4m. Chappelow died intestate, and the police had a job on their hands to contact any relatives. The first suspicion, given his address and his apparent isolation, was that someone killed him because they wanted his money. Wang Yam certainly needed money. A Chinese dissident and graduate in computer technology, he had moved to London and applied for asylum in 1991. But in spite of his education and experience, once settled in the UK, he turned out to be a terrible businessman, and went bankrupt twice, owing vast sums. Wang was proud to tell people that he was the grandson of Ren Bishi, a leading military figure in Chairman Mao's Long March, but in the oppressive atmosphere after the Tiananmen Square massacre, he and his wife, La Jia, decided to leave China for a new life in the west. He had told the Hong Kong border guard that he had "political problems" and wanted to leave China. He was asked where he wanted to go and told them "anywhere that speaks English." (His English, many years after his move to Britain, remains sometimes eccentric: he refers to the prosecution as "the persecution".)

In August 1992, he flew to London and contacted Philip Baker QC, who had a record of working with Chinese political refugees. Backing Wang's application for political asylum, Baker wrote: "He has escaped from the country without permission, at a time when he was working on a top-secret military project." Only a few weeks after arriving in London, Wang was granted political asylum, and the following year his wife was able to join him. To the intelligence services, he must have seemed a prime catch: a well-connected Chinese man who was also a computer expert. He has told the Guardian and senior MPs that he has assisted the authorities in many ways. After arriving in Britain, Wang set up a company called Quantum Electronics Corporation, which he described as a laptop computer design, distribution and repair company. This ended in bankruptcy in 1999. In 2002, he set up another company, dealing in mortgages, which went bankrupt two years later, and led to bailiffs coming to his door to take goods in lieu of his massive debts. In 2005, he filed for personal bankruptcy, owing tens of thousands of pounds. His marriage to La Jia, with whom he had a daughter, ended. By the time of his arrest, he was in a relationship with another woman, and they had a son. His life was a mess both financially and personally. His chaotic and dishonest financial behaviour may well have worried his MI6 handlers.

It was in the early months of 2006, with his personal finances in chaos, that Wang helped himself to the mail that had accumulated in Chappelow's letterbox and embarked on a spate of fraudulent transactions. As a thief, Wang was as sloppy and inefficient as he was in

business, even using the stolen card to pay a small bill at the nearby Curry Paradise, not far from Chappelow's house. It was his careless use of the card that helped the police to trace him, and led to his arrest in Switzerland in September 2006. He did not fight extradition, and was brought back to England and held in custody until his trial. The case against him rested almost entirely on his involvement with the bank thefts and fraud. There was no DNA or fingerprint evidence in either Chappelow's or Wang's house to link him to the murder. The cigarette butts and footprints found at the scene belonged to neither man. During the trial, all that could be reported openly was that MI6 had demanded secrecy, that Wang was a "low-level informant" for the intelligence services, and that "part of his defence rested on his activities in that role". Yet so anxious was MI6 to prevent the details of his defence from emerging in court that, in December 2007, just before Wang's first trial opened, Jacqui Smith, then home secretary in Gordon Brown's Labour government, signed a public interest immunity (PII) certificate – a gagging order – in order to prevent Wang's evidence from being heard, on grounds of national security, and "to protect witnesses".

Wang's lawyers appealed to the European court of human rights in Strasbourg, on the grounds that Wang had been deprived of the right to a fair trial as a result of the gagging order. In response, in December 2013, William Hague – then the Conservative foreign secretary under David Cameron – signed another PII certificate, claiming there would be "a real risk of serious harm to an important public interest" if Wang's defence was disclosed. Wang's legal appeal was quashed in December 2015 by the supreme court, which ruled that there was a danger of the details of Wang's defence being leaked by the European judges – whatever promises they might make to keep them secret. PII certificates are a long-established weapon in the government's armoury of secrecy. The way they are open to abuse was first exposed by the Scott inquiry, which was commissioned in 1992 in response to the "arms-to-Iraq" scandal. Ministers had signed PII certificates to prevent evidence emerging about links between the directors of the weapons manufacturer Matrix Churchill and the security and intelligence agencies. MI5 and MI6 had used the company directors, who took frequent business trips to Iraq, to spy on what Saddam Hussein was up to. In a landmark judgment in 1992 on PII certificates, Lord Justice Bingham stated: "Public interest immunity is not a trump card vouchsafed to certain privileged players to play when and as they wish".

Ministers were so desperate to prevent Wang's evidence from seeing the light of day that, after Jacqui Smith's gagging demand in 2007, they obtained a sweeping court order from high court judge Sir Duncan Ouseley, which ruled that journalists could not even speculate about what was said "in camera" (in a courtroom closed to the public and the press). When media organisations including the Guardian challenged this, Gavin Millar, QC for the Guardian, told Ouseley: "There have been plenty of trials in the past in which issues have been raised about national security material. It is extremely rare for such cases to be heard in camera."

It was even suggested that the government could abandon the trial if it did it not get its guarantee of secrecy. Wang's own barrister, Geoffrey Robertson QC, was strongly opposed to Wang's case being held in secret, telling the court that Wang wanted the public to hear his defence, which was that his criminal activities – theft and financial fraud – were carried out in order to infiltrate a gang, and feed information to the "appropriate authorities". The prosecution's warning that, if the trial was held in the open, they might drop all charges and allow a potential murderer to roam the streets was described by Robertson as "forensic blackmail".

Wang believed that the "trump card" had been used too casually by the government in his case.

He said that he felt "totally abandoned" by MI6. In 2013, he wrote to the Guardian from Whitemoor prison in Cambridgeshire, stating the grounds for his claims of innocence: "I believe the only way to my freedom is to let the public know my defence. No cover-up." In a later letter, he asked: "Do you remember 'Dreyfus affair' happening in 19s (sic) France? Cover-up never works but will backfire."

On 24 January 2014, the Guardian ran a story headlined "The author, the dissident and a trial held in secret". In it, we raised questions about the evidence, and the manner of its suppression. Within days, an email from a man called Jonathan Bean arrived. It said: "I read your article today with interest. I lived a few doors down from this back in 2006. The following Feb, I was in our house and heard a rustling in our porch. I opened the door to find a man with a knife going through our post. He pointed the knife at me and I shut the door. He then shouted through the door that he had been watching our house and knew that I had a wife and baby. He said if I called the police he would kill them. He waited in the porch for half an hour. I hid in the house but did not call the police until he had left. The police showed a strange lack of interest and just told me to change all my bank accounts. We then stayed with friends and moved to New York 2 weeks later. It is clear to me that there was a violent person or gang operating in the street, and the lack of police interest was very bizarre."

According to Bean's account, someone was burgling letterboxes in the same street, armed with a weapon, and threatening to kill if challenged. It is easy to imagine the effect that might have had on the jury in Wang's first trial, which was split on the murder charge. Bean agreed to meet Wang's lawyers in 2014, and his evidence was passed to the Criminal Cases Review Commission (CCRC), who investigated and referred the case back to the court of appeal in April 2016. The CCRC do not lightly refer cases: of 23,150 applications made to them in their 20 years of existence, only 636 have been referred to the court of appeal. (Of these, 421 have been granted.)

Meanwhile, another man, Peter Hall, on reading of the renewed interest in the case in the Camden New Journal in 2015, also got in touch with Wang's lawyers. Hall said that, between 2000 and 2006, he was a regular visitor to a place on Hampstead Heath known as the "spanking bench", and a participant in the sometimes violent sexual activities that went on there by night. At the time of the murder, in late 2006, he had seen Chappelow's photo in the press, and had recognised him as a regular visitor to the bench, whom he knew as "Allan". Hall took no action at the time, as Wang had already been arrested and the case seemed to be closed. But after reading the 2015 coverage, Hall contacted Wang's lawyers and told them that on two occasions he had seen Chappelow depart from the bench with much younger men. This raised another possibility for Wang's defence. If Chappelow did indeed meet strangers on the Heath, might he have brought one of them back to his house?

Both Bean and Hall agreed to give evidence at Wang's appeal. In July last year, Wang's case was heard by the court of appeal, led by Lord Thomas, sitting with Mr Justice Sweeney and Mrs Justice May. The appeal court thanked both Bean and Hall for their evidence but ruled that the trial jury had "clearly concluded that the web of activity undertaken by (Wang Yam) in relation to the deceased's identity and accounts was so thoroughly interwoven with the murder itself that he, and only he, could have been responsible for the latter". They said they could not find any respect in which the new evidence could have changed jurors' minds.

After the failure of the appeal, Hall contacted us to say that he had wanted to spell out exactly the sort of risks that men ran on the Heath, but the court had only wanted to hear about his meetings with Chappelow. Earlier this month, we met him in a cafe in north London. He told us that he felt he had only been able to tell half his story. "I was going to point out how dangerous it can be on the Heath late at night, especially for people indulging in the activities I described," said Hall, a slim-built man of 69 who lives in Hornsey, north London, and worked in advertising and local government until his retirement. The "spanking bench" has, he explained, a worldwide reputation, and attracts both those who like to be spanked and those who like to inflict punishment. A few years prior to Chappelow's murder, another man Hall knew was beaten to death: "This man was a civil servant who was into heavy BDSM (bondage, domination, submission and masochism) and would ask men to beat him up. One night he met two men at the bench and was beaten so badly that he crawled into the undergrowth and died. Two men were subsequently convicted of his murder." Hall also mentioned the case of Mark Papazian, who was convicted in 2006 of the murder of a retired English teacher in his flat in Pond Street, two streets away from Downshire Hill. The jury at his trial was told that Papazian would search the Heath at night, looking for victims, because he fantasised about being a serial killer. In 2004, a man nicknamed "Gold Tooth" in the press, because of his distinctive capped tooth, was convicted of assault, theft and blackmail after a series of violent robberies on the Heath, and jailed for six years. Hall, who said he had taken part in BDSM activities in the past, believes Chappelow's death could well have been a sex encounter that ended in murder. He said that the wax burns and asphyxiation were indications of this kind of sexual encounter, and that he is surprised that the police did not look further into Chappelow's private life. "Most of the crimes that occur on the Heath at night go unreported for various reasons," said Hall. "This (Chappelow's murder) was very unlikely to have been a burglary gone wrong."

Despite what the appeal court said, the jury in the first trial "clearly concluded" nothing: they could not reach a verdict at all, and a small majority of them actually favoured acquittal. Their deliberations might have been very different if the evidence from both Jonathan Bean and Peter Hall had been available. "When I submitted the application to the CCRC, I was confident that the fresh evidence – particularly that obtained by the Guardian – would lead to a referral back to the court of appeal," said Kirsty Brimelow QC, who has represented Wang. "Evidence of a person stealing mail and threatening violence would have had a significant impact upon the jury. Also, the prosecution case focused on Mr Chappelow's life as a recluse who never went out, and could not have met his assailant other than surprising a mail thief. Evidence of another side to his life would have challenged this focus, and in my view may well have changed the verdict. There always must be potential for unfairness with secret hearings."

Geoffrey Robertson QC agrees. "Had the fresh evidence been available at the first trial, I do think it likely that Wang Yam would have been acquitted. I had, for example, raised the possibility of an assailant picked up on the Heath, but without the evidence that emerged years later that gave credence to the theory, consistent with some of the pathology, of a sado-masochistic ritual gone wrong. You cannot prove Wang Yam innocent – until someone confesses or they identify the DNA on the cigarettes – but doubts about his guilt are reasonable."

The crumbling house in which Chappelow was murdered was later bought by developers, who demolished it and rebuilt a home in the Regency style, complete with an indoor swimming pool, private cinema and staff quarters. It went on the market last year for £14.5m, and has since been sold. This week, a black Range Rover stands in its driveway, there is not a leaf out of place in the garden, and the immaculately painted letterbox has the word "Post" painted helpfully on it. All traces of Allan Chappelow are gone.

Letters of Support/Solidarity: Wang Yam A5928AL HMP Lowdham Grange Old Epperstone Road Lowdham NG14 7DA

Italian Authorities Failed to Protect a Drug-Dependent Victim of a Child Prostitution Ring

In Chamber judgment1 in the case of V.C. v. Italy (application no. 54227/14) the European Court of Human Rights held, unanimously, that there had been: a violation of Articles 3 (prohibition of inhuman or degrading treatment) and 8 (right to respect for private and family life) of the European Convention on Human Rights. The case concerned a person who, as a minor suffering from alcohol and drug addiction, had been the victim of a child prostitution ring and gang rape. She complained that the Italian authorities had not taken all the necessary steps to protect her as a minor and the victim of a prostitution ring. The Court found in particular that the authorities had not acted with the necessary diligence and hadnot taken all reasonable measures in good time to prevent the abuses suffered by V.C. Although the criminal courts had acted promptly, the Youth Court and the social services had not taken any immediate protective measures, even though they had known that V.C. (aged 15 at the time) was vulnerable and that proceedings concerning her sexual exploitation and an investigation into the gang rape were ongoing.

Principal Facts: In April 2013 the applicant, V.C. an Italian national who was born in 1997 was at a party when the police arrived and seized drugs and alcohol. Her parents, when interviewed by the Rome public prosecutor's office, stated that their daughter suffered from drug addiction and psychological disorders and had been contacted via Facebook by a photographer wanting to take pornographic pictures. V.C. was also interviewed by the public prosecutor and refused to be placed in a specialist institution or a foster family. In June 2013 V.C.'s mother informed the public prosecutor that her daughter had again been contacted to appear in pornographic photographs. The prosecutor reported V.C.'s case to the Youth Court and applied to have urgent proceedings instituted with a view to placing her in a specialist facility. In December 2013 the court ruled that V.C. was to be placed in the care of social services and housed in a specialist institution for 12 months. The social services contacted the V.L. centre, which refused to admit her as it had no places available. In the meantime, during the night of 30 to 31 January 2014, V.C. was the victim of a gang rape. Two individuals are currently being tried for this offence.

In April 2014 the court ruled that V.C. was to be placed immediately in the Karisma centre. Subsequently, the centre asked for her to be transferred to a more appropriate facility, pointing out that its facilities were not suited to tackling drug-addiction problems. V.C. left the centre in September 2015 and returned to live with her parents. In December 2016 the social services reported that she had improved and that their intervention was no longer required. The court terminated the proceedings in January 2017. In November 2014 the Rome District Court found two suspects guilty of living on the earnings of prostitution, observing that they had put pressure on V.C. to engage in prostitution even though they were aware of her age. The court found that V.C. had been the victim of sexual exploitation from August to December 2013. The two convicted individuals were also ordered to pay damages to V.C., but she maintains that she has not received the sum awarded.

Decision of the Court: Articles 3 (prohibition of torture and inhuman or degrading treatment) and 8 (right to respect for private and family life). The Court found that the violent treatment suffered by V.C. fell within the scope of Article 3 of the Convention and amounted to interference with her right to respect for her physical integrity, as guaranteed by Article 8. It therefore concluded that the main question arising in this case was whether the authorities had taken all the necessary steps to prevent the violence to which V.C. had been exposed and to protect her physical integrity.

1. Were the authorities aware of V.C.'s vulnerable situation? The Court found that the national authorities had been aware of V.C.'s vulnerable situation and the real and immediate risk she faced. From April 2013 they had known of her erratic conduct, since the public prosecutor at the Youth Court had been alerted to the fact that she had been found in possession of alcohol and drugs. Furthermore, in May and June 2013 the girl's parents had informed the authorities of their daughter's state of distress. They had also mentioned the risk, supported by documentary evidence, of her falling into a prostitution ring.

2. Did the authorities take all reasonable steps to protect V.C.? The Court noted that the criminal courts had acted promptly, but that the Youth Court and the social services had not taken any immediate protective measures, even though they had been aware that V.C. (then aged 15) was vulnerable and that proceedings concerning her sexual exploitation and an investigation into the gang rape were ongoing. The authorities had therefore not carried out any assessment of the risks faced by V.C., for the following reasons in particular.

Firstly, although the public prosecutor had applied on 2 July 2013 to have urgent proceedings instituted and to have V.C. placed in a specialist facility and in the care of social services, the Youth Court had taken more than four months to reach its decision. During that period, the girl had been the victim of sexual exploitation.

Secondly, following the Youth Court's decision in December 2013, the social services had taken more than four months to implement the order for V.C.'s placement in care, despite the requests to that effect by her parents and two urgent requests from the Youth Court for information. In the meantime, the girl had been the victim of gang rape.

Thirdly, having regard to the conduct of the social services in failing to attend the hearings and the time they had taken to find an institution to house V.C. – despite the urgent nature of the request by the president of the Youth Court – the Court found that there had been a real lack of involvement on the part of those services in implementing the Youth Court's decision. The national authorities had had a duty to take account of V.C.'s situation of particular psychological and physical vulnerability and to assess it accordingly by taking prompt and appropriate protective measures. Consequently, the authorities had not acted with the necessary diligence and had not taken all reasonable measures in good time to prevent the abuses suffered by V.C. There had therefore been a violation of Articles 3 and 8 of the Convention. Article 41 (just satisfaction): The Court held that Italy was to pay the applicant 30,000 euros (EUR) in respect of non-pecuniary damage and EUR 10,000 in respect of costs and expenses.

Compensation Paid After Man on Suicide Watch Suffers Severe Brain Injury

Leigh Day Solicitors: A man who suffered brain damage after he was allowed to hang himself while on suicide watch at a London hospital has been awarded compensation. The out of court settlement was reached after the man, who is in his late 40s, and who we shall refer to as 'E' in order to protect his identity, suffered severe brain injuries after he tried to hang himself while he was left alone at a hospital in East London; this was despite being placed on a continuous observation suicide watch. Prior to the incident, E had developed paranoid symptoms and had previously been hospitalised for his own safety under the Mental Health Act. E was admitted to the East London hospital in February 2005 with identified risks of suicide and self harm. As a result all staff were advised not to leave E unsupervised at any time and with any objects that he could use to harm himself. E's family had also explained to hospital staff that E was a danger to himself and they were assured that he would be constantly monitored.

During E's first evening at the hospital he was left unattended and attempted to hang himself. When he was discovered, E was barely conscious and was in cardiac arrest. Following emergency medical treatment E survived but was left with a severe brain injury which initially left him in a vegetative medical condition. E remained in hospital for over a year undergoing rehabil-

itation and, although there was some improvement, when he was discharged he was still suffering severe impairments to his speech, movement and basic brain function. This left him dependent on the support of close family members for almost all areas of his life. In 2013, the Defendant Trust accepted liability and apologised to the family of E for failing to place him under constant observation, however, it has taken another four years to agree the appropriate level of compensation. E's litigation friend and family member, known as 'K', said the therapies and care that E can now access following the successful claim for compensation has had a hugely positive impact on his quality of life. She said: "It is commonly assumed that after ten years a brain injury would have made all the progress it was capable of, but by simply moving E to more appropriate accommodation he seems more connected, aware, and there is a brightness in his eyes where you can see he is genuinely happy. "Thanks to the therapies he can now access you can see E's improvement on a daily basis."

Medical negligence solicitor Sarah Campbell from law firm Leigh Day, who represented E and his family in the closing stages of the claim, said: "It has been a real privilege to work with E and his family on this complex and demanding case. "One of the most rewarding aspects has been to see the positive effect on E after taking part in neurologic music therapy. E's ability to engage and communicate with his therapist through music-making has been wonderful to see, particularly when he was thought by some of the medical experts assessing him to have been left with little or no ability to communicate reliably. "While the trust accepted liability and apologised to E and his family in 2013, the four years it has taken to agree the correct level of compensation to provide E with the round the clock care and support he needs has been a very difficult time for all those closest to E. "I am pleased that we have now brought that period to a close safe in the knowledge that we have been able to secure the necessary compensation to enable E to live as fulfilling a life as possible despite his entirely avoidable injuries" The legal team at Leigh Day worked with Robin Oppenheim QC from Doughty Street Chambers on E's case.

Hatton Garden Raiders Must Pay Back Over £6m, Judge Rules

Caroline Davies, Guardian: The four ringleaders jailed for the audacious Hatton Garden raid must pay back more than £6m between them or each serve another seven years in prison, a judge has ruled. The burglars, who ransacked 73 safety deposit boxes after drilling a hole in the wall of an underground vault in London's jewellery quarter three years ago, were ordered to pay back the money at a confiscation ruling at Woolwich crown court on Tuesday 30/01/2018. The men, career criminals who are all over 60 years of age, staged the raid on Hatton Garden Safe Deposit in 2015 over the Easter bank holiday weekend. If they fail to pay back the money it could mean that some of them, who are unwell, die in prison.

Judge Christopher Kinch QC said each jointly benefited from the £13.69m raid of cash, gold and precious stones. The confiscation orders were based on their "available assets" – the £6,447,079.50 that they are estimated to jointly still have derived directly or indirectly from the heist, plus extra sums dependent on their personal circumstances. John "Kenny" Collins, 77, of Islington, north London, Daniel Jones, 63, of Enfield, north London, and Terry Perkins, 69, also of Enfield, are serving seven-year sentences, while Brian Reader, 78, of Dartford, Kent, is serving six years and three months. Collins was ordered to pay £7,686,039 after the court heard he had assets in "liquid form" and property in this jurisdiction and abroad. Perkins was told he must pay £6,526,571 and Jones was ordered to pay £6,649,827. Reader, who was not in court, was told he must pay back £6,644,951, including the sale of his £639,800 home and development land worth £533,000.

Although the total amount of the orders is £27.5m, in reality the four only have to repay the £6.45m between them, plus their individually assessed amounts. If either Collins, Jones, Perkins or Reader pay the total £6.45m it will be treated as a payment to each co-defendant's confiscation order. If the confiscation order money is paid in full, then nearly £12m will have been paid or restored, including about £3.6m of property that has already been seized and returned to victims of the burglary. The judge said: "A number of these defendants are not only of a certain age, but have in some cases serious health problems. "But, as a matter of principle and policy, it is very difficult to endorse any approach that there is particular treatment for someone who chooses to go out and commit offences at the advanced stage of their lives that some of these defendants were." Tom Wainwright, representing Reader, said his client's sentence "does not have to be very long for it to mean, in reality, he will serve the rest of his life in custody". The gang used a diamond-tipped drill to bore a hole in the 50cm-thick concrete vault wall. Many of the losers from the heist were small independent jewellers, including those who were keeping stock for their retirement.

Collapsed Trial Woman Says She Gave Birth 'Alone' in Prison

BBC News: A woman held in custody for more than 13 months before her trial collapsed has told the BBC she hopes someone will be punished for the failures which led to her giving birth in prison. The trial of Petruta-Cristina Bosoanca - held on trafficking and prostitution charges - was stopped after evidence cast doubt on the complainant's story. Ms Bosoanca, 25, was arrested in December 2016 and was released from HMP Bronzefield on Monday 29th January 2018. She said it was "very difficult" giving birth five months ago to her baby boy, Christian. "There was no-one with me," she said. "In the moments when I was supposed to be happy, I was happy but unhappy at the same time." The trial of Adrian Iordan, Anisoara Lautaru and Ms Bosoanca was stopped on its 17th day, after the complainant in the case had been cross-examined. Some 65,000 lines of text messages were disclosed to the defence on day two. Ms Bosoanca said she repeatedly insisted she was not guilty and that she "needed to show" it. "I knew it, at the beginning I asked for my phone, I asked for the pictures, CCTV, I asked for everything but they (didn't) care," she said. Ms Bosoanca's question now is: "Why they don't discover everything earlier? I was waiting for them to see the truth. They were incompetent all of them," she added. "They kept me far away from my family, from my son."

A senior prosecutor apologised to the court and said the CPS's handling of the case had "fallen below standard". The defendants were accused of conspiring to traffic a young woman to the UK from Romania for the purpose of prostitution. The complainant claimed she had been trafficked and forced into prostitution by the three defendants and had become pregnant after being raped in the UK. It later emerged the woman was already pregnant when she entered the country in 2016, when she was examined three days after the arrest of Ms Bosoanca.

At London's Wood Green Crown Court, Judge Perrins said the defence had requested medical evidence about the pregnancy as long ago as August 2017 and had been repeatedly told that no such medical evidence existed. This repeated failure to properly disclose the police doctor's report was, said the judge, "one of the more serious failings identified in this case and requires further explanation". Facebook messages also showed that the complainant had been discussing the pregnancy and the identity of the father of her child with friends.

The BBC understands that relevant social media material was known to the police from January 2017 but was not disclosed until December 2017. Defence lawyers working through the disclosed evidence said it would have taken four days' solid work to find evidence that undermined the

prosecution case in the disclosed material. Ms Lautaru was arrested in March 2017. The 19-year-old was remanded in custody for most of the time since then. Following the collapse of the case on Friday, a CPS spokesman said: "We are concerned by the outcome of the case and the comments of the judge today. "It is clear there have been failings in this case, and it is being reviewed by senior CPS lawyers as a matter of urgency." The CPS had previously said it would review the case and the judge said he would refer the case to the director of public prosecutions.

UK Mass Digital Surveillance Regime Ruled Unlawful

Alan Travis, Guardian: Appeal court judges have ruled the government's mass digital surveillance regime unlawful in a case brought by the Labour deputy leader, Tom Watson. Liberty, the human rights campaign group which represented Watson in the case, said the ruling meant significant parts of theInvestigatory Powers Act 2016 – known as the snooper's charter – are effectively unlawful and must be urgently changed. The government defended its use of communications data to fight serious and organised crime and said that the judgment related to out of date legislation. Minister Ben Wallace said that it would not affect the way law enforcement would tackle crime. The court of appeal ruling on Tuesday 30/01/2018, said the powers in the Data Retention and Investigatory Powers Act 2014, which paved the way for the snooper's charter legislation, did not restrict the accessing of confidential personal phone and web browsing records to investigations of serious crime, and allowed police and other public bodies to authorise their own access without adequate oversight. The three judges said Dripa was "inconsistent with EU law" because of this lack of safeguards, including the absence of "prior review by a court or independent administrative authority".

Responding to the ruling, Watson said: "This legislation was flawed from the start. It was rushed through parliament just before recess without proper parliamentary scrutiny. "The government must now bring forward changes to the Investigatory Powers Act to ensure that hundreds of thousands of people, many of whom are innocent victims or witnesses to crime, are protected by a system of independent approval for access to communications data. I'm proud to have played my part in safeguarding citizens' fundamental rights." Martha Spurrier, the director of Liberty, said: "Yet again a UK court has ruled the government's extreme mass surveillance regime unlawful. This judgement tells ministers in crystal clear terms that they are breaching the public's human rights." She said no politician was above the law. "When will the government stop bartering with judges and start drawing up a surveillance law that upholds our democratic freedoms?"

The Home Office announced a series of safeguards in November in anticipation of the ruling. They include removing the power of self-authorisation for senior police officers and requiring approval for requests for confidential communications data to be granted by the new investigatory powers commissioner. Watson and other campaigners said the safeguards were "half-baked" and did not go far enough. The judges, headed by Sir Geoffrey Vos, declined to rule on the Home Office claim that the more rigorous "Watson safeguards" were not necessary for the use of bulk communications data for wider national security purposes. The judges said the appeal court did not need to rule on this point because it had already been referred to the European court of justice in a case which is due to be heard in February. Watson launched his legal challenge in 2014 in partnership with David Davis, who withdrew when he entered the government as Brexit secretary in 2016. The European court of justice ruled in December 2016 that the "general and indiscriminate retention" of confidential personal communications data was unlawful without safeguards, including independent judicial authorisation.Security minister Ben Wallace responded to the ruling saying: "Communications

data is used in the vast majority of serious and organised crime prosecutions and has been used in every major security service counter-terrorism investigation over the last decade. It is often the only way to identify paedophiles involved in online child abuse as it can be used to find where and when these horrendous crimes have taken place." He said the judgment related to legislation which was no longer in force and did not change the way in which law enforcement agencies could detect and disrupt crimes. "We had already announced that we would be amending the Investigatory Powers Act to address the two areas in which the court of appeal has found against the previous data retention regime. We welcome the fact that the court of appeal ruling does not undermine the regime and we will continue to defend these vital powers, which Parliament agreed were necessary in 2016, in ongoing litigation," he said.

Death of Emily Hartley - Lack of Professionalism and Failures in Care at HMP New Hall

The inquest into the self-inflicted death of Emily Hartley has concluded with the jury finding a lack of professionalism at HMP New Hall, including in the implementation of suicide and self-harm procedures (ACCT*), contributed to the 21 year old's death on 23 April 2016. She was the youngest of 22 women to die in women's prisons in 2016, the highest annual number of deaths on record. Including Emily, there have been five deaths in HMP New Hall since 2016. Emily had been remanded in custody in May 2015 after she set fire to herself, her bed and curtains. She had a history of serious mental ill health including self-harm, suicide attempts and drug addiction. This was her first time in prison. Emily's death took place behind the building where exercise took place, in an out of bounds area. It took prison staff two and half hours to notice that she had gone missing and to find her body, despite the fact that she should have been checked every half an hour because she was considered at risk. The inquest jury believed at the time of sentencing, New Hall prison was an appropriate place of detention. However they concluded the deterioration in Emily's mental state from January 2016 should have sparked a review and a move to a therapeutic unit, which would have been more appropriate.

In their conclusions, the jury also found: * The failure to apply the ACCT process was a contributing factor to Emily's death. * A lack of professionalism in the implementation of the ACCT process, with insufficient importance given to the procedure by some staff. * An absence of meaningful physical checks in the days leading up to Emily's death which contributed to the deterioration of her mental health. * A lack of professionalism by some staff in the 'care and support' unit of the prison (Holly Ward) where Emily was held, whose behaviour could have been perceived as bullying by Emily. Further demonstrated by contradictory evidence given by these staff at the inquest, which they found to be "fictional". * The exercise yard where Emily died was not fit for purpose, and risk assessments should easily have identified that prisoners could disappear from view.

The Inquest also heard that when Emily left for exercise on the day of her death, she had tried to take an envelope with her but this was confiscated. Her family asked again and again about what it contained, but documents including its contents were only supplied three weeks before the Inquest began. Included was a heart wrenching letter to her family, including her wishes for songs to be played at her funeral: nine months too late. The jury expressed compassion towards Emily's family regarding this failing by the West Yorkshire Police, who cleared Emily's prison room after her death. Emily's family said: "Whilst we were shocked to find Emily sent to prison, the one consolation was that we believed she would be kept safe." Deborah Coles, Director of INQUEST said: "This inquest is a damning indictment of a justice system that criminalises women for being mentally ill. For decades, recommendations from investigations, inquests and the Corston review have not been acted upon. This inquest

adds to the plethora of evidence about the dangers of imprisonment for women, and the need to invest in community services that can address mental ill health and addiction. Ten years ago to the day, at the inquest of Petra Blanksby the very same coroner read out remarkably similar conclusions. Petra was 19 and died at HMP New Hall in 2003; she had also been imprisoned for arson. The coroner urged the prison and health service to invest in therapeutic settings. Yet nothing has changed. This a life or death issue for public policy, which government cannot continue to ignore."

Ruth Bundey of Harrison Bundey solicitors who represented the family said: "Emily's constant struggle to cope with prison and with her mental health issues led her to self- harm again and again by cutting. But her behaviour dramatically escalated 8 days before her death when she used a ligature and showed a mental health nurse a 'suicide file' with a letter for 'who finds me.' This development, showing a dangerous move from 'impulsive' actions to planning for death, was insufficiently shared with staff responsible for her care." The jury agreed.

Prisoner Granted Resettlement Overnight Release (ROR)

Prisoners Advice Service (PAS) received a request for help from prisoner A, a woman who was at risk of being released homeless three weeks hence. Her application for Resettlement Overnight Release (ROR) to see her four children and sort out accommodation for her upcoming release had been refused by the prison. Without accommodation, she could not be reunited with her children upon release. The prisoner's concern to be with her children and resume her role as their sole carer was acute as one of her daughters was undergoing tests for a terminal illness. PAS' Caseworker wrote to the prison challenging the legality of its policy to deny ROR in the last 28 days of sentence, and their failure to consider the rights, and best interests, of the children. Within 24 hours of PAS' intervention, the prison reversed its decision and granted ROR to the prisoner.

Prisoner B, serving a life sentence, had been in prison for 12 years beyond her tariff (minimum custodial period) and was applying to the Parole Board to be transferred to an open prison. She had a history of suffering from severe anxiety prior to Parole Board hearings but had worked very hard at addressing her mental health difficulties over the last two years. By attending one-to-one psychology appointments on a regular basis, she had become better able to manage her stress levels. Having established a relationship with her, it was possible to provide her with support and reassurance throughout the process, particularly leading up to the hearing. PAS represented her at the hearing and helped her satisfy the panel that she could be safely managed in an open setting. As a result, she has now been transferred to an open prison.

Our Community Care Caseworker recently assisted disabled, terminally ill prisoner, C, who was serving a short sentence. Although he was a Category C (lower security classification) prisoner, he was being held in a Category B (higher security) prison - as it was deemed better suited to meet his health needs. Even so, the care he received was woefully inadequate. He was placed upstairs and therefore could not leave his cell or even go outside for fresh air. He also required a special diet to avoid potentially choking, but the food provided was not appropriate for his condition. Our Caseworker sent a pre-action letter to Government Solicitors. This resulted in him being moved to a Category C prison. She then made categorisation representations which got him de-categorised to Category D (lowest security). However, the prison refused to transfer him, claiming that his medical needs needed him to be on medical hold. We eventually resolved this through correspondence and he is now finally in a Category D (open conditions) prison, with suitable medical facilities.

Immigration Detention – Deadly and Punitive

Nicki Jameson & Lucy Roberts, (FRFI): On 20 January 2018, Nottingham Revolutionery Communist Group (RCG) comrades supported a demonstration at Morton Hall Immigration Removal Centre (IRC). The demonstration was bigger than previous ones, with groups from London, Nottingham, Leeds, Sheffield and Manchester attending. Protesters included former detainees of Morton Hall and other IRCs. At earlier demonstrations protesters were able to march around the perimeter of the IRC, shouting their solidarity to the detainees inside; however on this occasion they were prevented by a heavy police presence. The police had erected fences and used cameras and a drone to observe the demonstration. There were four deaths in Morton Hall in the year up to November 2017, and the increased police presence suggests that the state is concerned about abuse in the IRC being highlighted by such protests.

The detainees who died at Morton Hall were: • 6 December 2016 - Bai Ahmed Kabia (49), from Sierra Leone, died in hospital, having been in immigration detention for two years after serving seven and a half months in a criminal prison for fraud offences. He had lived in Britain for 27 years. • 11 January 2017 - Lukasz Debowski (27), from Poland, took his own life. • 2 October 2017 - Carlington Spencer (38), from Jamaica died following a stroke. In a letter to the Glasgow Unity centre, Morton Hall detainees stated that medical staff failed to treat him properly and clinical negligence was a factor in his death. • 19 December 2017 - Arim Bakar, aged 27, from Iraq, appears to have taken his own life. During the same period there were four other deaths in IRCs - one each at Colnbrook and Harmondworth, both situated near to Heathrow airport, one at The Verne in Dorset, and one at Dungavel, South Lanarkshire.

Immigration Prisons: There are currently eight operational IRCs in England and one in Scotland. In 2016 the Home Office announced that the latter would close but reversed this decision in 2017, having failed to get planning permission from Renfrewshire Council for a replacement 'short-term holding facility' near Glasgow Airport. There are already such 'facilities' at Manchester Airport and Larne in the north of Ireland. Last year the Home Office announced that in 2018 The Verne in Dorset will return to being a criminal prison, a function it fulfilled for 55 years before becoming an IRC in 2014. Like The Verne, Morton Hall is a former prison, which is still managed by the Prison Service and staffed by members of the Prison Officers Association. The remaining IRCs are contracted to private companies, which have rightly received significant criticism for their mistreatment of detainees as they scramble to obtain lucrative government contracts at the lowest cost to themselves; however it is worth noting that of the eight deaths listed above, five occurred in state-managed prisons. Since 1993 when Campsfield House became Britain's first privately-run IRC, there have been repeated changes of management, as companies fall in and out of favour with the government, undercut or swallow up one another, rebrand or move into 'custodial services' from other areas of the 'service industry'. Currently Mitie runs three IRCs, G4S two, Serco and GEO one each. Contracting out has accompanied a massive expansion in the immigration detention estate: in 1993 there were 250 places available, rising to 2,665 by the end of 2009 and 3,915 at the start of 2015.

The numbers of people held in immigration detention have dropped slightly since 2015, following the publication of a damning report by the All-Party Parliamentary Groups on Refugees and Migration into Britain's over-use of indefinite immigration detention. However they are still frighteningly high. On 14 December 2017, Amnesty International published a report entitled: A matter of routine: the use of immigration detention in the UK, which concludes that detention is used 'as a matter of default and convenience', causing significant harm to detainees and their families, and recommends a reduction in the use of detention, including by introducing a statutory time limit and

automatic judicial oversight in all cases. According to Amnesty: 'In the year ending June 2017, the number of people placed in immigration detention in the UK was 27,819. Of these, 23,651 were men, 4,120 were women and 48 were children. With few exceptions, there is no statutory time limit on their detention... For most of them, this… lasts at most a few weeks, but some are held for many months and even years. Most detainees are ultimately released back into the community.'

Brexit means Detention: Following the June 2016 referendum, there was a sharp spike in detention of people from European Economic Area (EEA) countries. Data released by Immigration Minister Brandon Lewis in August 2017 in response to a parliamentary question revealed that 3,699 EU nationals were detained in IRCs in 2016 – 1,000 more than in 2015. In December 2017 the High Court ruled that a Home Office policy of deporting rough sleepers from EEA countries was unlawful and hundreds of people detained under the policy may now be entitled to compensation for unlawful detention; however the detention of EEA nationals who have served short prison sentences from which they would ordinarily have been automatically released is continuing. The Revolutionary Communist Group opposes all immigration detention and all Britain's racist immigration laws and apparatus. Britain is an imperialist country, which has colonised and plundered half the world and continues to foment war and carry out invasions around the globe, causing asylum seekers to flee and seek sanctuary. It is a capitalist country, which – whether in or out of the EU - uses immigration powers in an attempt to regulate the flow of labour according to the dictates of the market. The British government has no right, therefore, to criminalise asylum seekers, people who come here seeking work, be it from the EU or elsewhere, or any other category of migrant, and anyone opposing British capitalism and imperialism must stand in solidarity with the struggles of migrants.

Asylum Seekers Win Case Over Smoking In Immigration Detention Centres

Diane Taylor, Guardian: Two asylum seekers have won a legal challenge against the government when a high court judge ruled on Thursday that it was a breach of their human rights to allow smoking in immigration detention centres. The two men, both Muslims, also succeeded in a claim that they should have an option for prayer other than next to uncovered cell toilets, which they described as "deeply embarrassing and humiliating". Mr Justice Holman agreed that forcing Muslim detainees to pray next to toilets when locked in their cells overnight amounted to indirect discrimination and that allowing smoking in "enclosed or substantially enclosed areas" was unlawful. As a result of his ruling, the home secretary, Amber Rudd, must take steps to rectify both problems across all 10 immigration removal centres in the UK. There may be concerns, however, about the potential for unrest among the smoking detainees if they are unable to smoke in their cells. The case was brought by Mohammed Hussein, 23, from Ethiopia, and Muhammad Rahman, 35, from Bangladesh, both former detainees at Brook House immigration removal centre. They said that, despite being smokers themselves, sleeping in small and poorly ventilated three-man cells where all three detainees were smokers was intolerable. The two men argued that observant Muslims were particularly adversely affected by such conditions. They had no choice but to pray next to a toilet while locked in their cells between 9pm and 8am.

Brook House attracted negative media attention last year when undercover filming by the BBC for its Panorama programme exposed alleged abuse of detainees by G4S guards. The Home Office introduced 60 three-man cells to Brook House in April 2017 to expand the number of places from 448 to 508. Around 48% of detainees in Brook House are Muslim. Both former detainees welcomed the judgment. Rahman said that his time in Brook House had felt like a form of "physical and mental torture". "It's totally inhuman," he said. "The room I was in was very narrow. Although I'm a smoker it was very difficult to cope with the volume of smoke in one small room with three smokers in it without proper ventilation. It's hard to imagine what it's like unless you've been locked up there and experienced it. Things need to change. Although I've been released, this experience is continuing to affect me. I'm still having nightmares. I decided to bring this case because I didn't want others to suffer the way I suffered."

Lewis Kett, of Duncan Lewis solicitors, said: "We welcome the findings that the home secretary has had absolutely no regard to the potential discriminatory effect of the lock-in regime at Brook House on Muslim detainees and their right to properly practise their religion. Our clients have been forced to pray next to unsanitary and unscreened toilets in cramped conditions. The home secretary must now immediately take steps to remedy this." The Home Office said: "We respect the rights of detainees to practise their religious faith. Immigration removal centres are equipped with mosques and multi faith rooms for detainees to use for prayer, study and reflection. Communal prayers are available in all centres as well as facilities for prayer in the detainees' rooms such as access to prayer mats. We will consider today's judgment carefully."

Why Personalised Medicine Is Coming, and How It's Going To Help Us Beat Disease.

Modern medicine, for all its wonders, has a rather large blind spot. Though scientific breakthroughs and new miracle treatments are announced on a seemingly daily basis, doctors know that even the most effective drugs in their arsenal won't work for large sections of the population. Drugs commonly prescribed to treat disorders like depression, asthma and diabetes are ineffective for around 30-40 per cent of people they are prescribed to. With hard to treat diseases like arthritis, Alzheimer's and cancer, the proportion of the population who see no benefit from a particular treatment rises to 50-75 per cent. The problem stems from how treatments are developed. Traditionally, a drug is approved for use if it works for a good number of people with similar symptoms in a drug trial – and questions are not asked about those in the study who did not respond to the treatment. When the drug is then released and prescribed to the population en masse, unsurprisingly there are plenty of people – like those in the trial – who discover that the latest 'miracle cure' isn't all that miraculous for them. This 'one size fits all' system of drug discovery – though it helped uncover the most important medicines of the 20th Century – is now increasingly seen as ineffective, outdated and dangerous. It means medicines are developed to work on 'the average person', when in fact all of us – even our diseases and our responses to drugs – are unique. Not only are many drugs ineffective for large subsections of the population, but they can also cause severe adverse reactions in others.

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.