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 681 (29/03/2018) - Cost £1

Defendants Convicted on Misleading Scientific Evidence in 20% of Court of Appeal Cases

Charlotte Hughes, 'The Justice Gap': Seven years of court appeals shows that misleading scientific evidence presented at trial – and not necessarily new evidence presented afterward – drove hundreds of overturned criminal convictions, according to a study. The research, published by Science & Justice, the journal of the Chartered Society of Forensic Sciences and reported in The Timesy, suggests that in at least 20 percent of Court of Appeal cases, defendants have been convicted on the basis of misleading scientific evidence. After looking at nearly 1,000 cases involving criminal evidence heard in the Court of Appeal, it found that in 218 cases, or 22 per cent, lawyers argued that the conviction was unsafe because of misleading scientific evidence as identified in the transcripts of proceedings. The cases included serious crimes, such as sexual assault, assault, murder, robbery, fraud and drug offences.

The study also found that scientific evidence is generally used to support theories presented to a judge or jury that can be used to secure the conviction of a defendant. 'What the results mostly show is that wrongful convictions are not always just an issue of flawed science or bad lawyering, but rather, flawed communication and interpretation, an issue both sides should take responsibility for,' the UCL team writes. Such evidence is often misunderstood, misinterpreted and miscommunicated in trials, avoiding the issue of the validity or relevance of the evidence and given disproportionate weight. The study concluded that, whether a suspect was ultimately guilty or not did not change the fact that misleading evidence had been used in many of these trials.

Mark Solon, founder of the expert witness training company Bond Solon, told the Times: 'These new findings are worrying. They show there is a real risk that courts may not reach the correct conclusions as a result of juries either not understanding expert evidence or experts themselves compromising their evidence at the behest of their instructing lawyers. Either way, there is a real risk of miscarriages of justice and a need for extra vigilance and strictly enforced codes of practice on the part of judges and professional bodies to ensure high ethical standards and clarity in the way evidence is put before the court.

Out of the 1,000, a total of 201 convictions were overturned and in 80 cases there was no retrial ordered. The study found that only some 24 percent involved new relevant information presented at the appeal. Causes of the other 'unsafe' rulings were split. Some 36 percent were due to the presentation of evidence in court being generally misleading in the proceedings, including whether it was relevant, had probative value or validity, or was hearsay. Twenty-six percent were due to the directions of the trial judge with respect to those same issues, and with standards of proof. Prosecution and police errors, absence of evidence, and jury issues accounted for another 15 percent of the cases. It was suggested by the authors, Nadine Smith, Ruth Morgan, and David Lagnado from University College London, that many of the misleading aspects of evidence could have been prevented by making the relationship between evidence and hypotheses clearer. They added that the occasions where there has been use of misleading evidence could be higher because many cases were excluded from the study sample, either because they did not go to appeal or because errors were not argued to 'undermine the safety of the conviction'.

CCRC Refers 'Joint Enterprise' Murder Conviction of Laura Mitchell to Court of Appeal

The Criminal Cases Review Commission has referred the joint enterprise murder conviction of Laura Mitchell to the Court of Appeal. Laura Mitchell was tried for murder and violent disorder on the basis of joint enterprise at Bradford Crown Court in September 2007. She pleaded not guilty but was convicted and sentenced to life imprisonment with a minimum term 13½ years, and to a concurrent sentence of three-and-a-half years for violent disorder.

Laura Mitchell, Michael Hall, Henry Ballantyne, and Jason Fawthrop were tried together as secondary parties to the murder of Andrew Ayres who died after a fight outside a pub on 28 January 2007. Laura Mitchell, Michael Hall, Henry Ballantyne were convicted and Jason Fawthrop was acquitted. Another man, Carl Holmes, admitted to being the principal and pleaded guilty to murder. Ms Mitchell sought leave to appeal against her conviction. Leave was refused by the full court in February 2009. Ms Mitchell applied to the CCRC for a review of her case in January 2014.

Two specific developments in the law relating to joint enterprise took place during the Commission's review of this case. The first, on 18 February 2016, was the publication of the Supreme Court judgment in R v Jogee, Ruddock v The Queen [2016] UKSC 8, [2016] 2 WLR 681. The judgment made significant changes to the law in relation to secondary parties in joint enterprise cases. The second, later in 2016, was the Court of Appeal's consideration of applications (see note one below) for leave to appeal on "Jogee" type points (i.e. points related to the change in joint enterprise arising from the case of Jogee and Ruddock). The Court of Appeal's judgment in that case, R v Johnson and others [2016] EWCA Crim 1613, was handed down on 31 October 2016.

Having reviewed Ms Mitchell's case in detail, and in light of recent developments in the law, the Commission has decided to refer the case for appeal because it considers there is real possibility that the Court of Appeal will find that it would be a substantial injustice to maintain Ms Mitchell's conviction and will quash it as unsafe. The Commission's referral is based on the change in the law in relation to the liability of secondary parties brought about by the judgment of the Supreme Court in R v Jogee, Ruddock v The Queen [2016] UKSC 8, [2016] 2 WLR 681, the scope of which was further clarified by the Court of Appeal in R v Johnson and others [2016] EWCA Crim 1613.

Ms Mitchell was represented in her application to the CCRC by Mr Simon Natas, ITN Solicitors, 5 Stratford Office Village, 4 Romford Road, London, E15 4EA. Note: Ms Mitchell's co-defendant, Michael Hall, applied to the Court of Appeal for leave to appeal out of time, further to the ruling in Jogee. His application was one of the five cases dealt with by the Court in R-v-Johnson and others [2016] EWCA Crim 1613 in which applications for leave to appeal were refused.

Jermaine Baker Family Response to CPS Decision Not to Prosecute Officer

The Crown Prosecution Service (CPS) Monday 19 March 2018, announced its decision not to prosecute the police officer who fatally shot Jermaine Baker in Wood Green on 11 December 2015. This decision is in response to the family's application for a Victim's Right to Review (VRR) of the original CPS decision of not to prosecute on 14 June 2017.

Ms Margaret Smith, Jermaine's mother said: "My family and I have had a long and painful wait for this decision. It is not only very disappointing, but also impossible to square with what we know about the available evidence. We remain determined that the police officer who shot Jermaine must answer for his actions, and to that end we look now to the Coroner's inquest to ensure that the shocking circumstances in which Jermaine lost his life are finally brought under public scrutiny."

Deborah Coles, Executive Director of INQUEST said: "This is a disappointing but not surprising decision given the institutional failure to prosecute police officers. This will further undermine confi-

dence of bereaved families in the processes for holding police to account. At its core are concerns that the rule of law does not apply to the police for abuses of power in the same way as it does to an ordinary citizen. This serves only to create a culture of impunity which frustrates the prevention of abuses of power, ill treatment and misconduct. The unexplained delay by the CPS in reaching their decisions is unacceptable and has caused huge distress to Jermaine's family. The inquest must now take place without delay to bring to light the actions of the police following the fatal use of force."

Michael Oswald, solicitor for the family said: "More than two years since Jermaine's death, his family still have not had seen any semblance of accountability in respect of the circumstances in which he lost his life. Their wait has been all the more painful because they have been prevented from telling the public the shocking truth about how he died as they understand it on the information available to them. They look forward now to a full and thorough inquiry by the Coroner so that those matters can finally be brought to light. The public will then be able to come to their own conclusions about today's decision by the CPS."Start here . . .

Family Court Secrecy Lets Judges Get Away With Mistakes

Olivia Rudgard, Daily Telegraph: Secrecy in family courts could be allowing judges to get away with mistakes, the most senior family judge in England and Wales has said. Speaking at an event on Tuesday evening 13th March 2018, Sir James Munby, president of the high court's family division, said that judges were "grotesquely overworked" and "tired" and so more likely to make errors. He said more openness would allow journalists and the public to scrutinise their decisions. Judges should not be "immune from criticism" and that journalists should be able to argue that "the whole thing is flawed, the premises are all wrong, the facts are all wrong" if they think the judge has erred, he added:"The simple fact is that at present journalists can't do that without access to the evidence and without reporting what went on in court and saying well, this judge seems to be listening to a different witness than I, and the impression I got from listening to this witness was X,Y,Z and the judge says A,B,C. So I think there are very real problems there. We've got to be much more honest about this, and if we are honest about it, things go wrong." Most family court hearings are heard in private but accredited journalists are allowed in unless specifically excluded. However, there are restrictions on what can be reported and whether they have access to documents. Sir James added that he often felt that families did not understand what had happened during court proceedings. "I have a terrible feeling that if you actually stopped some of the parents in these care cases as they were going out of court at the end and you asked them what was going on, what's been happening, what's the answer, they'd be unable to explain. And that is an indictment of our system, not of them," he said.

Hillsborough Relatives 'Disgusted' by CPS Decision Over West Midlands Police

David Conn, Guardian: Relatives of the 96 people killed at Hillsborough in 1989 have severely criticised a decision by the Crown Prosecution Service not to charge any former West Midlands police officers with criminal offences relating to the force's original investigation into the disaster. Margaret Aspinall, the chair of the Hillsborough Family Support Group whose 18-year-old-son James was killed in the disaster, said she was disgusted. She also criticised the CPS for failing to properly explain its decisions and the evidential threshold required to bring criminal charges. Two former West Midlands police officers, who have not been named, were referred by the Independent Office for Police Conduct to the CPS for consideration of possible charges of perverting the course of justice, misconduct in a public office, or conspiracy to do so. Bereaved families and survivors of the lethal crush at the 1989 FA Cup semi-final at Hillsborough, where South Yorkshire police was responsible for safety, have long protested about the quality and conduct of the West Midlands police investigation.

The director of public prosecutions decided in August 1990 to bring no charges in relation to the disaster. Currently six people, including four former South Yorkshire police officers, are facing criminal charges, after a 23-year campaign by bereaved families and survivors resulted in new police and IOPC investigations in 2012. The allegations against the two former senior West Midlands police officers, confirmed by the CPS, were that they "failed to investigate the cause of the Hillsborough disaster properly, either deliberately to assist South Yorkshire Police (SYP) or otherwise negligently, and/or that a misleading or incomplete file was submitted to the DPP in 1990". Explaining the decision not to prosecute, which means that no former West Midlands police officers are to be charged for any offences relating to the original investigation, the CPS said: "The evidential threshold for criminal prosecution is not met in relation to either suspect. Whilst there was found to be some cause for concern in the actions of both suspects, there is insufficient to reach the high threshold required to prove a criminal offence."

The CPS explained that there was evidence that "some aspects of the investigation were not carried out to a high standard". It added: "However, there is a lack of evidence showing any deliberate plan or action by the suspects to hinder it." The statement also said there was a "difficulty in attributing responsibility for all of the failings to these suspects," and that: "There is no evidence that, as alleged, one suspect intentionally provided an inappropriate selection of evidence to the DPP." At the same time, the IOPC announced that it had decided not to refer three former senior South Yorkshire police officers to the CPS for prosecution, following a further review of allegations that they engaged in a cover-up after the disaster. The allegations, the IOPC said, were that: "These three senior officers participated in a strategy to minimise South Yorkshire police culpability for the disaster by wrongly blaming Liverpool fans. In particular, it is alleged that officers sought to deliberately mislead the [1989] Lord Justice Taylor inquiry, the [civil] contributions hearing and the original inquest proceedings."

The IOPC's strategic lead for the Hillsborough investigation, Rachel Cerfontyne, explained that the CPS had previously decided not to charge these officers. "Although there was some indication that two of the three former officers may have committed a criminal offence, it was not deemed appropriate to refer their cases because the CPS had already rejected the possibility of bringing criminal charges based on substantial evidence that was reviewed in 2016. No further evidence or legal matters have since been identified that could realistically alter that view," Cerfontyne said.

Responding to both decisions, Aspinall said that families had always been outraged by the West Midlands investigation, and the way some of their officers conducted it. "We are disgusted and disbelieving that no charges are being brought against any West Midlands officer," she said. "The CPS have not explained to families what their 'threshold' is for charges – or what more evidence they needed. It is really important that justice is seen to be done, and that a strong message is sent to all police officers. I am disgusted by this." Becky Shah, whose mother, Inger, was killed at Hillsborough, has always vehemently complained about the West Midlands police investigation, saying that officers asked if her mother had been drinking and sought to portray her negatively. "To find now that nobody from the West Midlands force is to be charged … I have no words for it," Shah said. "I am livid."

In a letter of explanation sent to bereaved families, Sue Hemming, the head of the special crime and counter-terrorism division at the CPS, wrote: "I appreciate that my decision will be disappointing to you, but I would like to reassure you that in reaching this conclusion, we have spent a significant amount of time reviewing and considering the evidence that was submitted to us. As you know, the standard of evidence required for any criminal prosecution is high."

Legal Aid Scheme: Prisoners: Written Parliamentary Question

Gloria De Piero: To ask the Secretary of State for Justice, what assessment the Government has made of the implications for the public purse of the judgment in the case of R (Howard League for Penal Reform and the Prisoners' Advice Service) v the Lord Chancellor.

Answered by: Lucy Frazer: In response to the Court of Appeal judgment, the Government decided to reinstate criminal legal aid funding to three discrete areas of prison law, namely: pre-tariff reviews where the Secretary of State seeks the advice of the Parole Board on whether life and Imprisoned for Public Protection prisoners may be transferred to open conditions; Category A Reviews; and referrals to close supervision centres. At the same time, the Government also decided to bring referrals to separation centres within scope of criminal legal aid. The regulations giving effect to these changes came into force on 21 February 2018. The impact assessment published alongside the regulations confirmed that this policy change would result in increased expenditure from the Criminal Legal Aid Fund estimated to be in the region of £1.1 million per year

Prisons: Telephones and Computers: Written Parliamentary Question

Richard Burgon: To ask the Secretary of State for Justice, what data was collected to monitor performance during the pilot scheme on placing telephones and basic computers into prison cells.

Answered by: Rory Stewart: Under the pilot, telephones and basic computers were introduced into prison cells in two prisons: HMP Wayland and HMP Berwyn. HMP Berwyn already featured both capabilities when it opened on 27th February 2017. Telephones were introduced into HMP Wayland in December 2016 and computers in January 2017. The purpose is for prisoners to manage some of their own day-to-day tasks that would normally be managed by officers on paper, freeing up officers to focus their time on the important task of reforming offenders. Ministers will need to see evidence that new technologies have tangible benefits, in terms of improving rehabilitation, cutting crime and protecting the public before making any further decisions. The pilot is still running in both prisons. We are monitoring and evaluating the benefits to assess the impact on prisoner safety and rehabilitation, and on officers' ability to do their jobs more effectively. As part of our evaluation of the pilot we are collecting data on rates of self-harm, assaults and adjudications. We are also collecting qualitative feedback on the pilot from users of the technology.

Challenge To Home Secretary's Decision Not To Deport Irish Nationals

Since 2012, foreign national prisoners who have been serving indeterminate sentences have been able to take advantage of the 'TERS' scheme (Tariff Expiry Removal Scheme). This means that most foreign nationals are eligible to be immediately deported home as soon as they complete their tariff, and no longer have to go through the parole process. The scheme is good news for anyone wanting to go home and not have to endure the parole process which has experienced significant delays in recent years. It is particularly beneficial to any foreign national prisoner serving an imprisonment for public protection (IPP) sentence and ultimately stagnating as they struggle to get access to rehabilitation courses in order to progress. The TERS scheme is in theory open to all foreign nationals.

On 19 February 2007, the Home Secretary decided that it was not in the interest of the UK to deport Irish nationals except in special circumstances. Deportation of Irish nationals is now only considered in very serious cases and where the prisoner received a 10 year sentence or a five year tariff. Annex H of PSI 52/2011determines the criteria in order to be considered an 'exceptional' case for deportation to Ireland under the TERS scheme. It is possibly the only instance where it is advantageous for a prisoner to have a long tariff and to be able to demonstrate that they are high risk to the public, as this is the usual way to be considered as 'exceptional' for the TERS scheme.

The Secretary of State for the Home Department argued that Irish prisoners should be considered separately from other European Economic Area (EEA) nationals because the UK shares a land border with Ireland. The fear is that there would be nothing to stop Irish prisoners returning to the UK once deported. However EEA nationals are regularly deported to the EU and there is nothing to stop them travelling to Ireland and returning to the UK in the same way, except for the existence of the deportation order. Irish nationals who are deported would also be subject to a deportation order and this means that if they did clandestinely return to the UK they would be liable to strict penalties and a very long time in prison.

The Secretary of State for the Home Department claimed that there is no blanket ban for deporting Irish prisoners as they can apply under the 'exceptional route'. Duncan Lewis has received information, from a freedom of information request, that less than five prisoners have been deported to Ireland between 2014 and 2016. This means that less than 2% of applicants to be deported were successful.

Duncan Lewis Solicitors recently won permission at the Royal Courts of Justice to challenge this decision with a leading Judicial Review. We hope to open the way for Irish nationals to be deported home, rather than facing prolonged and unnecessary detention, often in high security prisons.

Leading Human Rights Barrister and Legal Aid Lawyer of the year 2017, Philip Rule said that; "It is a very important step forward that the court will now consider the suggested justification for this discriminatory treatment of Irish nationals. The impact on prisoners' private life, and that of their families and children, of a system that is keeping some people here in what is a foreign country in prison, and then on licence after any eventual release, rather than deporting them home cannot be overestimated. It is clear that political agreement meant it seems to benefit the Irish has in fact been used to disadvantage and discriminate against Irish nationals, and that here has been a failure to consider each individual case in a fair and open manner. Irish prisoners seek deportation because they want to go home and be with their families. Article 8 of the Human Rights Act recognises the vital importance of family and a private life. Preventing deportation to Ireland is neither necessary nor proportionate and should be challenged by those affected".

Deportation and Direct Action In Britain: the 'Terrorist Trial' of the Stansted 15

Open Democracy: The 15 Stansted defendants were initially charged with aggravated trespass, in the same way that Plane Stupid activists who occupied the emergency runway at Heathrow airport in July 2015, and Black Lives Matter activists who occupied the runway at London City airport in September 2016, were also charged. In both these cases, the activists aimed to stop commercial flights, and make a political statement about the relationship between social inequality and climate change; in the second case, the activists specifically argued that the climate crisis is a racist crisis, contrasting the privileged users of London City airports with the populations of the global south impacted by climate change and the predominantly BAME inner city populations in the vicinity of the airport impacted by toxic air.

Activists used the same established non-violent direct action techniques of tripods and lock-ons as used at Stansted; three of the Stansted 15 had also participated in the Heathrow action. In the Heathrow case, though she subsequently failed to carry out her threat following a public outcry, the Magistrate had initially threatened to send the 13 defendants to prison. This was because the occupation had caused widespread disruption to passengers: 25 flights were cancelled and significant

delays caused to other flights, so that 92,000 people were 'victims' of the action.

In the London City case, the defendants were handed conditional discharges, and a small fine, again for aggravated trespass. Initially, the Stansted 15 – who used the same techniques, and occupied an arguably much less significant part of the airfield for a similar amount of same time – were charged with the same offence of aggravated trespass as at London City and Heathrow. This charge still stands. They also, however, face a much more serious charge. In the summer of 2017, the Crown Prosecution Service successfully applied to the Attorney General to introduce a new charge, that of 'endangering an airport'. Under s1 of the Aviation and Maritime Security Act 1990. This is the first time that activists taking non-violent direct action have been charged under this Act, or have been charged under an Act of similar severity. Its consequences cast a long shadow over the trial.

The Aviation and Maritime Security Act does not mention 'terrorism' in any of its statutory clauses. However, it was explicitly devised as a response to the placing of a bomb by Libyan security forces on a Pan Am transatlantic flight in December 1988, which exploded over Lockerbie in Scotland, killing the 259 passengers and crew on board and a further 11 people on the ground. Opening the debate for the second reading of the Bill in the House of Commons in January 1990, the Secretary of State for Transport, Cecil Parkinson, argued that the government had: never shied away from taking the measures necessary to crush the threat of terrorism - be it on the international stage or at home. This Bill will be another valuable weapon in the battle. [...]. Clause 1 deals with what are essentially terrorist acts at airports [...] making it an offence under our law to carry out armed attacks at international airports and to cause damage or disruption at such airports.

For the defendants, the direct consequence of being charged under the Act is that they are facing potential sentences not of small fines and suspended prison sentences, but of life imprisonment. As such, it marks an alarming attempt by the British State to stigmatise non-violent direct action as domestic terrorism, and to foreclose on legitimate social attempts to question the Home Office's detention and deportation practices. It marks an alarming attempt by the British State to stigmatise non-violent direct action as domestic terrorism.

It follows years of controversy about the extensive operations of undercover police officers in non-violent social movements. This is now the subject of an official public inquiry and in activist circles, there is much talk of the criminalization of dissent. The severity of the charge faced by the Stansted 15 should therefore be seen as a potentially important moment in defining the scope for non-violent protest in the UK.

Immigration Detention: One Step Forward, Two Steps Back

Sophie Walker , UK Human Rights Blog: Despite many instances of lengthy periods of immigration detention, one of the main methods of achieving release of long-term detainees via immigration bail has now been curtailed. Under Section 4(1) of the Immigration and Asylum Act 1999, detainees could apply for the Home Office to provide them with accommodation if they were unable to rely on a friends or family for housing. Armed with a letter from the Home Office confirming the accommodation was in place, a detainee had a much stronger chance of being released on bail.

Not Anymore. On 15th January 2018, Schedule 10 of the Immigration Act 2016 was introduced. It repealed and replaced Schedules 2 and 3 of the Immigration Act 1971, bringing with it sweeping changes to immigration bail, as well as repealing Section 4(1) of the Immigration and Asylum Act.

Section 9(2) of the Schedule 10 provides that "the Secretary of State may provide or arrange for the provision of, facilities for the accommodation of that person at that address" if the

following conditions are met: • "A person is on immigration bail subject to a condition requiring the person to reside at an address specified in the condition": s.9(1)(a) • "The person would not be able to support himself or herself at the address": s.9(1)(b) • There are "exceptional circumstances" to justify it: s.9(3) Guidance on Immigration Bail published 12 January 2018 by the Home Office limits a finding of "exceptional circumstances" to cases that fall within three narrow categories: people granted bail by the Special Immigration Appeals Commission (SIAC), foreign national offenders considered high risk or very high risk of causing serious harm to the public or at high risk of offending against the individual, and where the failure to provide accommodation will amount to a breach of Article 3.

What This Will Mean: These changes mean it is considerably more difficult to obtain release for immigration detainees and will result in ever more people being held for long stretches of time.

Here Are Some Reasons Why: First, the new legislation requires the tribunal to grant bail on the condition that the Home Office will provide accommodation. But immigration tribunal judges tend to only grant bail when accommodation is already in place. In bail hearings, if it often argued on behalf of the Applicant that s/he is a low absconding risk as friends and family will encourage and put pressure on them to remain in contact with the Home Office. These arguments lack force if there is no way of knowing where the Applicant will live and how often they can see their friends and family.

Second, the Home Office Guidance states that accommodation will only be provided for a limited period of time (around 3-4 months) unless there are exceptional circumstances to justify it continuing. An immigration judge may be unwilling to grant bail without a plan in place for where the Applicant will live when s/he is no longer eligible for accommodation support.

Third, the Home Office considers that the threshold for when Article 3 will be engaged is high. The Guidance accepts that accommodation support will be provided where the failure to do would amount to a breach of the prohibition on inhuman or degrading treatment. In the case of R (Limbuela) v Secretary of State [2005] UKHL 66, it was held that in ordinary circumstances, a decision to deny a person accommodation who is then forced to sleeping rough without food or shelter, amounts to inhuman or degrading treatment. However, the Guidance sets the bar for when the Home Office will consider Article 3 much higher than the House of Lords in Limbeula, stating it "only expected to cover people with serious physical or mental health problems who would not otherwise not fall to be supported under other agreements" (p. 51). Those detainees able to meet such a standard will be few and far between.

Fourth, it is now even harder for detainees with a criminal history to obtain bail. A case will only give rise to "exceptional circumstances" if the person has been assessed by probation as being a high risk or very high risk of causing serious harm to the public, or to be at high risk of reoffending. The majority of those who have served time in prison will not fall within these categories – they are reserved for the most serious of offenders. It may also present difficulties to representatives who may be placed in a position of having to argue that their client is at very high risk of causing serious harm to the public or at high risk of reoffending when applying for accommodation support or bail, but then having to argue the opposite in the person's immigration appeal. For those convicted of most drug offences, dishonesty offences such as fraud and low-level offences of a violent or sexual nature, they will be unlikely to be eligible for accommodation. The same is true for detainees who do not have criminal history.

If the Home Office cannot show that a detainee's removal is likely within a reasonable period, and yet the detainee is not able to provide a suitable bail address (either because probation have not authorised release to that address, or where the person has no friends, family or com-

munity support), then they are unlikely to be released. But as the power of detention will no longer be being exercised in order to remove that person, but rather because of the lack of available accommodation, their continued detention is highly likely to be rendered unlawful.

Such a suggestion receives support from a recent High Court case, albeit one under the old legislative regime. In R (MS) v Secretary of State for the Home Department [2017] EWHC 2797 (judgment on 10th November 2017), Mr Martin Griffiths QC stated: I do not think that detention could be justified simply on the basis that release would place the Claimant on the streets. If it is unacceptable to place the Claimant on the streets, he should be provided with bail accommodation. Detention is not a proper substitute for such accommodation once detention cannot otherwise be justified (para 79).

Conclusion: The latest legislative changes limiting the provision of accommodation support for detainees demonstrate that the Home Office has yet to be swayed by those calling for the UK to radically reduce the numbers held in immigration detention. However, given that the latest Home Office guidance addressing the changes to immigration bail raises more questions than it answers, this is an area that will no doubt be subject of judicial attention in the not too distance future.b

Poorest Priced Out of Justice By Legal Aid Rules, Says Law Society

Owen Bowcott, Guardian: Some of the poorest families in England and Wales are being denied legal aid because they cannot afford the financial contributions they are required to make, according to the Law Society. A study commissioned by the body that represents solicitors criticised the fact that many on low incomes are being deprived of access to justice by the very system that is supposed to support them. The report, titled Priced out of Justice?, looked at means testing regulations which control eligibility for legal aid and how applicants resisting eviction from their homes, for example, are unable to obtain legal representation. "Many people living substantially below [the minimum income standard (MIS)] are excluded from legal aid entirely or are awarded it but required to make contributions that bring their income even further below [that standard]," the report's author, Prof Donald Hirsch of Loughborough University, maintained.

Around 30% of the UK population, equivalent to 19 million people, live below the nationally recognised minimum income standard (MIS). Poverty is commonly defined as as living in a household with below 60% of the median income. Legal aid is supposed to provide a safety net for those on low incomes. The government spends around £1.6bn a year on legal aid. The figure has been repeatedly cut by successive governments. The Law Society said the situation is getting progressively worse because means test thresholds, which govern eligibility for legal aid, have been frozen since 2010 while the cost of living has continued to rise. Some of those affected are below the poverty threshold.

Hirsch pointed out that the assumption that someone could sell their home to cover a legal bill is out of line with other forms of state means-testing, such as help with care costs where the value of a home is ignored if the applicant lives there. The Law Society is asking the government to restore the means test to its 2010 real-terms level. It also wants to exempt those on means tested benefits from capital assessments. The Law Society president, Joe Egan, said: "No one in modern society should have to choose between accessing the justice system and a minimum living standard. The financial eligibility test for civil legal aid is disqualifying people from receiving badly needed legal advice and representation even though they are already below the poverty line." Campbell Robb, chief executive of the Joseph Rowntree Foundation, said: "It is simply unacceptable that millions of people are unable to access legal support because they live on a low income. We must loosen these constraints so people are protected from harm when things go wrong and can build a better life."

Violation of Article 10 Persons Convicted of Burning a Photo of Spanish Royal Couple

In the Chamber judgment in the case of Stern Taulats and Roura Capellera v. Spain (application no. 51168/15) the European Court of Human Rights held, unanimously, that there had been: a violation of Article 10 (freedom of expression) of the European Convention on Human Rights. The case concerned the conviction of two Spanish nationals for setting fire to a photograph of the royal couple at a public demonstration held during the King's official visit to Girona in September 2007. The Court found in particular that the act allegedly committed by the applicants had been part of a political, rather than personal, critique of the institution of monarchy in general, and in particular of the Kingdom of Spain as a nation. It also noted that it was one of those provocative "events" which were increasingly being "staged" to attract media attention and which went no further than the use of a certain permissible degree of provocation in order to transmit a critical message in the framework of freedom of expression. Moreover, the Court observed that the act in question had not constituted incitement to hatred or violence. Lastly, it held that the prison sentence served on the applicants had been neither proportionate to the legitimate aim pursued (protection of the reputation or rights of others) nor necessary in a democratic society.

Children and Young People in Custody – "Significantly Impacted by Deteriorating Behaviour"

Fewer children and young adults have been in custody in recent years but the lives of those remaining have been "significantly impacted by deteriorating behaviour" that has not been tackled, according to Peter Clarke, HM Chief Inspector of Prisons. Current behaviour management schemes have been ineffective, particularly, in reducing violence, which is at historically high levels in all types of institution. Mr Clarke said: "The impact of poor behaviour by others on those who wish to make progress in education, training and rehabilitation can be severe."

HM Inspectorate of Prisons has published a new thematic report - Incentivising and promoting good behaviour - based on a review commissioned by the Youth Justice Board and focusing on children held in secure training centres (STCs) and young offender institutions (YOIs), and young adults aged 18–20 held in YOIs. The review looked at the "fundamentally important issue of the relationships between those detained and the staff charged with their care." Mr Clarke said: "Those relationships are crucially influenced by staff turnover, which can lead to a lack of consistency in approach, staff shortages and, all too frequently, a lack of sufficient time out of cell. The issue of inconsistency in behaviour management is important as it damages the all-important element of trust in the relationship."

Inspectors found that "far too often the rewards and sanctions associated with behaviour management schemes were focused on punishment rather than incentive, and were prone to generate perceptions of favouritism. Too often, during inspections, we have seen rewards and sanctions schemes that are overwhelmingly punitive, and the response to poor behaviour is to become locked in a negative cycle of ever greater restriction."

The review reached other key conclusions: Time out of cell: A combination of staff shortages and increasing levels of bullying and violence had led to many young people spending long periods of time in their cells with little to occupy them. Young people and staff agreed more time out of cell would have the greatest impact on promoting positive behaviour. 1) Interventions for young people who display the most difficult behaviour: The proportion of children and young people in custody who have been convicted of more serious offences has increased. The report noted: "Too often we find institutions which accept poor behaviour as unavoidable instead of setting and maintaining high standards. However, there are now some young people within the estate who do not respond positively to existing behaviour man-

agement schemes and who require a higher level of support than is currently offered." 2) Bullying and violence: Witnessing or experiencing bullying and violence are part of everyday life for young people in custody. 3)Young people from a black or minority ethnic background: They were less likely to report being treated fairly by the rewards and sanctions scheme than white young people. "As young people from a black and minority ethnic background make up a large proportion of the population in custody it is important that the reasons for these perceptions are understood and addressed to improve behaviour".

Peter Clarke said: "Institutions holding children and young adults have undergone notable change over recent years as the population of both groups has reduced. While this reduction is welcome, there is evidence from inspection that outcomes for those that remain have been significantly impacted by deteriorating behaviour.It is widely accepted that the amount of time a child or young person spends unlocked and out of their cell has an important impact on their behaviour. There is also a need to confront bullying and violence, and not to fall into the trap of believing that it is inevitable, given the smaller and sometimes more concentratedly challenging nature of the children's and young people's population in custody."

ECtHR Rules Hooded Men Were Not Tortured, But Irish Judge Dissents

ECtHR has dismissed, by a 6-1 majority, a request to revise its 1978 ruling that fourteen men interned in Northern Ireland in the 1970s were subjected to inhuman and degrading treatment, but not torture. Ireland sought the revision in 2014 after an RTÉ programme revealed the UK government had withheld evidence regarding the long-term impact of the "five techniques" used to interrogate the "Hooded Men". Five techniques were illegal interrogation methods, developed by the British military in operational theatres. They have been defined as prolonged wall-standing, hooding, subjection to noise, deprivation of sleep, and deprivation of food and drink.

In a judgment delivered on 18 January 1978 ("the original judgment"), the Court held, in so far as relevant in the context of the present revision request, that the use of the five techniques of interrogation in August and October 1971 constituted a practice of inhuman and degrading treatment, in breach of Article 3 of the Convention, and that the said use of the five techniques did not constitute a practice of torture within the meaning of Article 3.

However, in the majority judgment, handed down on Tuesday 20th March 2018, the ECtHR said it "doubts whether the documents submitted by the applicant Government in support of the first ground of revision contain sufficient prima facie evidence of the alleged new fact and considers that the documents submitted in support of the second ground did not demonstrate facts which were 'unknown' to the Court when it delivered the original judgment".

It adds: "Even assuming that the documents submitted in support of the first ground for revision demonstrate the fact alleged, namely that Dr L. misled the Commission as regards the effects of the five techniques, the Court considers that it cannot be said that it might have had a decisive influence on the Court's finding in the original judgment that the use of the five techniques constituted a practice of inhuman and degrading treatment in breach of Article 3 of the Convention but did not constitute a practice of torture within the meaning of that provision."

Judge Síofra O'Leary, who joined the court in 2015, wrote in her dissenting opinion: "The majority has opted for an extremely narrow version of what the Court was dealing with in 1976-1978 and has excluded or severely narrowed the relevance of the Commission and Court proceedings which led to the two concluding paragraphs of the original judgment on which almost exclusive reliance is placed."

She said it was "In my view, it was the Court and the Convention system and not the respondent State which was primarily under scrutiny in the context of this revision request. I regret that my colleagues in Chamber were not able or willing to see this. Revision must remain exceptional and requests should, where appropriate, be defeated by the very legitimate and fundamental principle of legal certainty. However, in the present case it is difficult to avoid the impression that it is the Court which has sought to shelter itself behind that principle. By doing so it risked damaging the authority of the case-law which that principle seeks to safeguard and overlooking its own responsibilities pursuant to Article 19 of the Convention. I can only conclude with regret – in a similar vein to my predecessor in the original case – that there is much in the general approach of the original and revision judgments that must discourage Member States from invoking Article 33 of the Convention and, regrettably, much to encourage future respondent States with reference to which that article may be invoked.

European Prisons Are Almost Full

Council of Europe: European prisons are on average close to full capacity, with inmates occupying over 9 out of ten available places, according to the Council of Europe Annual Penal Statistics (SPACE) for 2016, published today. The survey shows that the incarceration rate grew from 115.7 to 117.1 inmates per 100,000 inhabitants from 2015 to 2016. This rate had previously fallen every year since 2012, when it reached 125.6 prisoners per 100,000 inhabitants. The incarceration rate is mainly influenced by the length of the sanctions and measures imposed. In that perspective, the average length of detention, which can be seen as an indicator of the way criminal law is applied, increasing slightly to 8.5 months.

The countries where the incarceration rate grew the most were Bulgaria (+10.8%), Turkey (+9.5%), the Czech Republic (+7.6%), Serbia (+6.6%) and Denmark (+5.5%). The prison administrations where it fell the most were Iceland (-15.9%), Northern Ireland (-11.8), Lithuania (-11.1%), Belgium (-10.1%) and Georgia (-6.7%). On the other hand, overcrowding remained a serious problem in many countries. Thirteen out of 47 prison administrations reported having more inmates than places to host them. The highest levels of overcrowding were observed in "The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia" (132 prisoners per 100 places available), Hungary (132), Cyprus (127), Belgium (120), France (117), Portugal (109), Italy (109), Serbia (109), Albania (108), the Czech Republic (108), Romania (106) and Turkey (103). The proportion of foreign inmates shows an overall downward trend in recent years, although the proportion grew from 10.8% in 2015 to 11.6% in 2016. On the other hand, pre-trial detainees represented 37.3% of all foreign inmates in 2016, compared to 34.4% one year before. Women continued to represent a small proportion of the overall prison population (5.3%, with 24.2% of those being pre-trial detainees).

Over one fourth of all sentenced prisoners (26.4%) were serving sentences of one to three years. The proportion of prisoners serving a final sentence of less than one year fell slightly, from 13.5% in 2015 to 13.3% in 2016, consolidating a trend seen over several years. The percentage of prisoners serving sentences of more than 10 years grew from 11.4% to 13%. Pre-trial detainees accounted for 20% of the total prison population.

Theft once again became the crime for which most offenders were held in custody (18.9%), after several years during which it was drug offences. In 2016 drug offences were the second most common offence for which people were incarcerated (17.5%), followed by robbery (12.6%) and homicide (12.1%). For the first time, the survey contains information about inmates convicted for road traffic offences, which represented 2.6% of all prisoners.

Daily expenditure per inmate continued to vary greatly across Europe. Overall, the 44 prison administrations which provided this information spent €51 per inmate per day in 2015. In 2015, the 44 prison administrations that provided this data for the survey spent a total of more than €18 billion.

1,628,626 individuals were under the supervision of agencies in charge of alternative measures to imprisonment in 2016 in the 47 countries that participated in this survey. Almost 10% were awaiting trial, a percentage that has grown slightly in recent years (up from 6.7% in 2014). “The high number of persons serving community sanctions and measures casts doubts about whether they are being used as alternatives to imprisonment or if they are becoming a supplementary sanction”, said Marcelo Aebi, director of the study.

Early Day Motion 1093: Councillor Gurpal Virdi, the Police and the CPS

That this House calls for an inquiry into the investigations and prosecution decisions that preceded the acquittal of retired Metropolitan Police Sergeant Councillor Gurpal Virdi, to establish how there could be a trial without evidence from PC Markwick and PC Mady, how PC Makins could be a prosecution witness when his statement contradicted specific claims by the complainant, how the Crown Prosecution Service could have believed the false allegation of indecent assault with a collapsible baton a decade before they were introduced, and to establish why the Independent Police Complaints Commission referred Mr Virdi's complaint to the Metropolitan Police Department of Professional Standards whose peculiar original investigation led to the false statements about Mr Virdi and to the unjustified prosecution.

Gurpal Singh Virdi - One Man's Fght for Justice

On Wednesday 15 April 1998, Detective Sergeant Gurpal Singh Virdi was arrested and accused of sending racist hate mail to himself and ethnic minority colleagues. Dismissed from the Metropolitan Police Service, his reputation in ruins, Virdi took his case to an employment tribunal, which judged that he had been a victim of racial discrimination. Completely vindicated, Virdi was reinstated to the job he loved – but his travails were far from over. Constantly overlooked for promotion, he realised that by challenging the Met he had effectively ended his career.

Following his retirement from the force and keen to serve his local community, Virdi decided to run for election as a Labour councillor – but, prior to the election, he was arrested again. The allegations levelled against him were horrifying: he stood accused of sexually assaulting an underage prisoner nearly thirty years earlier. Yet when the case went to trial, a jury took less than fifty minutes to clear Virdi of all charges. But the damage had been done. Behind the Blue Line is Virdi’s deeply shocking account of how one of Britain’s biggest institutions brought the apparatus of the state to bear in a campaign to destroy the life of one of its own officers. “Behind the Blue Line is the story of a good public servant. Without rancour, it details the obstacles, the prejudice and the official carelessness that can get in the way of a dedicated officer’s career. We can learn from it. We must learn from it. These events should never beable to happen again."

The Voice caught up with Gurpal for a Q&A session.

Q: Your book ‘Behind The Blue Line’ can be described as a no holds barred account of what happened to you, would you agree with this view and what are you hoping that it will do?

Gurpal Singh Virdi: I disagree to some extent, as I am barred from revealing the full extent of the truth due to the unfair anonymity laws in the UK. The book does however, within limits, take the reader through a journey that any one of us can face – false allegations. Despite being requested, there is no public inquiry, no IPCC (now IOPC) investigation, no accountability of wrongdoing by senior officials of the police and CPS - the book is the only way

forward to give my side of the story in order to expose the reality of what happened. Sir Peter Bottomley and Dr Richard Stone have supported me by writing forwards in this book, both are seeking an inquiry. I am in agreement in fighting burning injustices.

Q: You have been through a traumatic series of events, to what extent were your family affected?

SV: It has been very traumatic in that my health has suffered but more so, my wife, Sathat, who is now on medication. My children are very supportive as were family members and some friends. My niece’s wedding had to be cancelled. The main thing is that we are all together and stronger.

Q: Is your trust in the Police force gone for good now, or is there a way back?

SV: I have always been a supporter of the police as there are many officers who work hard and are dedicated to keeping us safe. I was suspicious of the police when senior officers threatened me after I had made a submission to the Stephen Lawrence Inquiry. My trust in senior officers has diminished as they were overseeing this case and should have intervened to stop it but instead they sanctioned it. The government and police would benefit from my experience and forward thinking, no doubt this job will go to someone else.

Q: Hopefully you look back on your early career as a serving officer with pride, do you ever wonder where your career might have gone had things been different?

SV: Ever since I can remember, I wanted to join the police or the army following family footsteps. It is a tradition within the Sikh culture that the third child will go into public service. After witnessing the race riots and police brutality of the 70’s and 80’s, I was more determined to join the police to make a difference. I enjoyed my service as I enjoyed working for the public to improve their lives and make them feel safe. I did not enjoy the bullying and racism that occurred behind the scenes within the police. My career as a BAME officer was doing fine despite the discrimination until I got to Sergeant rank at Ealing where I challenged some of my colleagues and senior officers about their bigoted attitudes. Many of the White officers of similar service had reached very senior ranks whilst my career stopped back in 1998 at Sergeant rank despite me passing my Inspector’s exams. I was going no further.

Q: Were you surprised at the extent that the authorities went to in order to “discredit you ”?

SV: You would think that after so many high profile public inquiries, in particular, the VIRDI Inquiry, that the police would learn lessons and improve but in reality, most of the recommendations from these inquiries gather dust. I challenged the unfair promotion system through the Employment Tribunals although I did not benefit, many of those behind did. I am proud of that. I wasn’t that surprised at the extent because that is what the establishment does. Unlike others for monetary gain when settling their claims of discrimination, I refused to sign confidentiality clauses. I can talk about my experiences, this has been the motive of the DPS in the Met to target me. Since being reinstated in 2002, I was constantly being investigated for one thing or another. The establishment does not like to see positive BAME role models who can fight for their communities and expose wrongdoing, instead they want ‘puppets’ that can be controlled. It should be noted that no White officers has been treated in this manner. It should be noted that no retired White officer has been subjected to such vile, malicious and false allegations. It should be noted that there has been no Gold Group for a White officer in similar circumstances. Furthermore, it should be noted that the Police Federation refused to support me or to fund my case. This was a wholly unreliable and sustainable case.

Q: Did your experience and understanding of the police help you prove your innocence in both cases?

SV: Being a detective did help as I knew how the process worked and how to establish the truth. In both of my high-profile cases, I had a good team of solicitors and barristers.

Q: Are you cautious about interacting with the police? And do you believe that you

would be treated fairly if you were ever a victim of crime or had to report a crime?

SV: Naturally, I am cautious as my wife and I have been victims of crimes and the local police have not investigated matters properly. In this case, towards the end of the book, I make allegations of perjury and making false statements. The investigating officer shuts down the investigation as he was asked to assess the 'legitimacy' of the allegations. That says it all. So, the simple answer is, I will not be treated fairly.

Q: When things were at their worst were you ever tempted to give up or were you determined to see it through?

SV: I left the police service to start a new life in politics, the Met made such vile and malicious allegations topped up with relentless negative publicity. I was put in corner therefore determined to see it through.

Q: At the time of the initial arrest was there anything leading up to that period that indicated what was about to happen?

SV: I was concerned that if I stayed within the police, something would have happened as I was constantly being targeted with malicious allegations because I was raising matters of equality and fairness. My family were getting stressed as well, so I reluctantly left the job that I loved and enjoyed. I had done everything by the book so I had nothing to fear. When I left I thought that was the end of the matter. The knock on the door did come as a shock.

Q: What does the future hold for Gurpal Virdi, are there any other books in the pipeline?

SV: Due to the negative publicity and allegations made, my political career is over. I wanted to teach, that is over. I wanted to live aboard, that is over. I cannot get any suitable employment. The Met has really messed me and my family. I enjoyed writing this book and have plans for more writing.

HMP Gartree – Stability has Deteriorated no Longer Safe Enough

The long-term stability at HMP Gartree - holding prisoners serving indeterminate sentences, most posing a high risk of harm - had deteriorated through staff shortages and difficulties in adapting to a changing population, prison inspectors found. The category B prison in Leicestershire had previously specialised in the management of indeterminate-sentenced prisoners who were near their tariff expiry date – the point at which they were eligible to be considered for parole.

However, according to the report by HM Inspectorate of Prisons (HMIP) on a November 2017 inspection, population pressures nationally in the prison system "had led to prisoners being sent to the prison much earlier in their sentence, often within the first couple of years." At the time of the unannounced 2017 inspection, half of the 704 men in Gartree were in the first few years of sentence and had more than 10 years left to their tariff date. More than 90% of men in Gartree were assessed as presenting a high or very high risk of harm to others.

Peter Clarke, HM Chief Inspector of Prisons, said those in the early stages of their sentence "were not necessarily ready to complete offending behaviour work and faced the real prospect of many years at the prison before onward progression into the wider prison system. "Our last two inspections of Gartree, in 2010 and 2014, found a safe, stable and respectful establishment which managed its high-risk population well. At this inspection, we found that outcomes for prisoners had deteriorated…particularly in safety. The stability we have praised in the past had been undermined by staff shortages that seemed to impact on nearly all aspects of prison life; this was evidenced by managerial drift and by delays in fully coming to terms with the challenges posed by a changing population."

Gartree was no longer safe enough. Almost a quarter of prisoners said they felt unsafe, up from 10% in 2014. Violence and victimisation had increased, with a significant increase in assaults on staff, some of them very serious. Almost half of prisoners thought that illicit drugs were easily available. Incidents of prisoners self-harming had risen dramatically, almost four-fold since 2014. Mr Clarke said: "Gartree holds some very challenging prisoners, often with complex mental health problems and long-term needs, and a large proportion of the self-harm incidents related to these men. However, there was no strategy which considered the particular difficulties confronting those serving indeterminate sentences to understand the causes of, and tackle, this dramatic rise in incidents."

A total of 90% of men in Gartree were serving a life sentence, while others were serving an indeterminate sentence for public protection (IPP). Most on IPPs were over their tariff expiry date.

Staff shortages meant that prisoners spent far too much time locked up – 44% during the during the day – and this severely undermined work, training and education. The core responsibility of HMP Gartree was the management and progression of some very dangerous men but, Mr Clarke said, "many prisoners had too little contact with their offender supervisors and too little was done to motivate and encourage them to reduce their risk and progress." However, public protection was a high priority and well managed. The few prisoners who were released received bespoke release planning.

Mr Clarke said: "Gartree was a prison that was not as good as it could or should be. It had some difficult prisoners to manage but also had some significant advantages: a relatively stable population; long-term prisoners, among whom many would have a significant personal investment in the need to cooperate and progress; and a clear institutional function and purpose. It was clear to us that staff shortages had played a substantial part in Gartree's deterioration, but that was not the whole story. There were evidently a number of processes that needed tightening but, more significantly, there was a need for renewed managerial and strategic focus to re-energise the prison, tackle some of the challenges and avoid a drift into complacency."

Aiding and Abetting:

Lord Beecham: To ask Her Majesty's Government what assessment they have made of concerns about the application of the principle of joint enterprise in criminal cases; and whether they intend (1) to initiate a review of the state of the law in this area, and (2) to collect and publish statistics of murder and other cases in which that principle has been applied since 2014.

Answered by: Lord Keen of Elie: This Government does not believe that any changes to the law on joint enterprise are currently needed, but will keep the matter under review. The Supreme Court judgment in R v Jogee amended the law in this area and it is for our independent courts to interpret the law, as laid down by the Supreme Court. The Crown Prosecution Service has amended its guidance on secondary liability for prosecutors in line with the Jogee judgment, and has consulted on that guidance which aims to provide a clear direction for prosecutors in this area of law.

Hostages: Sally Challen, 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.