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 699 (25/07/2018) - Cost £1

Paul Cleeland's 45-Year Fight to Clear Name Over Gun Murder

BBC News: A man at the centre of one of the UK's longest alleged miscarriages of justice is making a fresh bid to clear his name after a legal fight spanning more than four decades. Paul Cleeland, 75, of Kent, spent a total of 26 years behind bars for Terry Clarke's 1972 murder in Hertfordshire. Lawyers claim nearly all the evidence against him has been discredited. Damian Collins MP believes the case may be "one of the last great miscarriages of justice from the 1970s". Suspected gangland boss Mr Clarke, a friend of Cleeland's, was shot twice in Stevenage after returning home from a bar on 5 November 1972. Cleeland always insisted he was innocent and that he was at home with his wife when Mr Clarke was killed, but legal challenges over the years failed. In the Administrative Court on Thursday, he will seek permission for a judicial review of a decision by the Criminal Cases Review Commission (CCRC) not to refer his case to appeal.

Retired Kent detective superintendent Nick Biddiss said forensic work had advanced "by light years" since the Hertfordshire force investigated the case in the 1970s. But he also pointed out a number of judges had decided there was nothing wrong with Cleeland's conviction. Now out of jail for 20 years, Cleeland, who represented himself at his trial in 1973, said he was still fighting because "it was wrong". He said: "I was the only one who told the truth. I know in my heart I was telling the truth. "It's when you're the only one telling the truth and people look at you and go 'that poor fellow'."

The pensioner, a twice-married father-of-five, now lives alone in sheltered housing in Folkestone. He has said he cut ties with his family after he was jailed so they could live their lives. Cleeland said his late mother and aunt continued visiting him in prison and campaigning for him into their 70s, adding: "They drove the media and MPs mad." Explaining their ashes had been scattered at sea, he said: "I want to be able to stand by the sea and say to them 'we've done it'."

The National Archives at Kew holds about a dozen files on the case, most of them closed - although three open files contain documents from Cleeland's first trial and retrial. Cleeland's barrister, Edward Fitzgerald QC, has told the Administrative Court the original trial heard evidence Cleeland had a motive to kill; bought the gun and tried to obtain cartridges; that police heard incriminating conversations; and a forensics expert found lead contamination consistent with gunfire on his clothing. But in a note to the court seen by the BBC, the barrister said: "Almost every one of these strands of evidence and all of the forensic strands have now been discredited."

Mr Cleeland's solicitor, Ricky Arora, said: "Mr Cleeland's case is one of the longest running miscarriage of justice cases in the UK but sadly his applications to the CCRC have not been dealt with adequately and therefore he continues to fight to clear his name." Folkestone and Hythe MP Damian Collins has raised his constituent's case with the Home Office and CCRC. He said: "I believe that a good deal of the evidence that was presented in his original trial has been shown to be flawed and therefore I don't believe the conviction is safe." He added: "I think it's right that his case should go back to the Court of Appeal and I believe there are strong grounds to have his conviction overturned." The MP said: "I believe Paul's case could be one of the last great miscarriages of justice from the 1970s." That decade saw a series of high-profile miscarriages of justice which included the cases of Judith Ward, the Guildford Four, Maguire Seven and Birmingham Six and directly led to the formation of the CCRC.

Statement From the Family of Daniel Morgan

The family of Daniel Morgan have made the following statement in the wake of the Court of Appeal judgment handed down on 5 July 2018 in respect of the claim brought against the Metropolitan Police by those suspected of the murder of Daniel Morgan in March 1987.

Daniel's brother Alastair Morgan said: "The concerns that we have raised over the decades about the police corruption at the heart of Daniel's murder have remained wholly unaddressed by this litigation: instead, it has been focussed simply on the conduct of Detective Superintendent David Cook as the Senior Investigating Officer in charge of the last police investigation into the murder and the ensuing prosecution which collapsed in 2011.

"Over the two decades preceding that investigation and prosecution, my family had done everything democratically and legally possible to expose that police corruption, and to secure justice for Daniel, only to be met with stubborn obstruction and worse at the highest levels of the Metropolitan Police. We encountered an impotent police complaints system, and inertia on the part of successive governments. We were failed utterly by all of the institutions designed to protect us, and we saw for ourselves a criminal justice system which proved incapable of coming to terms with the murder or the subsequent criminality of those charged with enforcing the law.

"In the midst of such a tragic mess, we recognise that David Cook and his team did their utmost to redress the catastrophic failures of earlier investigations. In the process, they made themselves unpopular with many in the hierarchy of the Metropolitan Police, especially those who would have preferred to leave unturned the stones behind which the stench of police corruption continued to flourish. That is the context in which that hierarchy appears to have allowed David Cook to be made the scapegoat for the real mischief in this case: 'the repeated failure of the MPS over the years to confront the role played by police corruption in protecting those responsible for the murder from being brought to justice', as acknowledged and admitted publicly in March 2011 by the then Actin g Metropolitan Police Commissioner Tim Godwin.

"In that light, we consider that the ongoing vilification of David Cook amounts to a grave travesty of justice, and we continue to look to the Daniel Morgan Independent Panel under the leadership of Baroness Nuala O'Loan to answer the real question that remains unanswered: Why have those at the highest levels of the Metropolitan Police repeatedly failed to confront the police corruption that has stared them in the face over the decades in relation to this case?"

Neglect Contributed to Death of Terry Smith Involving Excessive Restraint By Surrey Police

Following thirteen weeks of evidence and a total of 48 hours and 53 minutes of deliberation, an inquest jury has today concluded that neglect contributed to the death of Terry Smith. They also found a serious failure to recognise the signs and symptoms of Excited Delirium as a medical emergency and noted the use of prolonged and excessive restraint. From Stanwell, Surrey, Terry was 33 when he died on 13 November 2013, following detention and restraint by Surrey Police.

On the evening of 12 November 2013 Terry was displaying increasingly distressed, strange and agitated behaviour. His family requested an ambulance. Two Emergency Medical Technicians (EMTs), who were employed by private firm ERS Medical, attended along with a police unit. The officers detained Terry under Section 136 of the Mental Health Act 1983. He was restrained at the scene on the ground by multiple officers, using handcuffs, leg restraints and a spit hood. He was taken to Staines Police Station where he continued to be restrained by five to six officers, before being moved into a police van where he stopped breathing. He was taken to hospital by ambulance and was pronounced dead at 9.20pm on 13 November 2013.

The inquest heard evidence from over 50 witnesses including police officers, EMTs, paramedics, the Forensic Medical Examiner (police doctor), police trainers and a variety of medical experts. The jury found Terry's death was contributed to by neglect, and gave a narrative conclusion finding: A serious failure by those who owed duty of care to recognise signs and symptoms of medical emergency. A failure to carry out an adequate assessment at any stage. Inadequate training of those who owed a duty of care, with a serious failure to check their learning. Prolonged and excessive restraint and a failure to understand that the resistance to the restraint was leading to an ongoing depletion of oxygen and an increased level of adrenaline and that this was speeding up the effects of Excited Delirium in his body.

The jury also found Terry's death was contributed to by Neglect, with the following contributory factors. They wrote that the death "was caused or more than minimally contributed to by the failure on the part of Surrey Police to": Ensure that all response and custody officers and staff were sufficiently trained in relation to Excited Delirium. Treat Terry as a medical emergency. Take Terry to hospital from Douglas Road. Assess sufficiently or at all his fitness to be detained at Staines Police Station prior to his detention there being authorised. Ensure that Terry was taken to the Accident and Emergency Department of the hospital, prior to 23.45 hours on 12 November 2013. Monitor and consider sufficiently or at all the length of time for which Terry was under restraint and his response to it, prior to 23.45 hours on 12 November 2013.

Central to this inquest was the controversial issue of Excited Delirium – a medical condition which has often been linked to deaths involving restraint, such as those in custody and detention settings. The exact causes of the condition are the subject of debate amongst medical experts. However, during the inquest the jury heard that police guidance and training, which has been in place for some years, made it clear that excited delirium carries the risk of death and should be treated as a medical emergency.

The patrol sergeant, PS David Richardson, told the other officers at the scene to be aware that Terry may have been suffering from excited delirium. Yet, instead of ensuring that Terry received immediate medical care, he directed that Terry should be taken to a police station and arrested for possession of drugs. The custody sergeant at Staines Police Station, PS Andrew Jamieson, did not assess Terry's condition before authorising his detention. During the inquest he denied having ever heard of the term Excited Delirium before that night. This was despite CCTV evidence which clearly showed him telling others more than once that he believed Terry had Excited Delirium and describing the symptoms. He claimed that he may have heard the term from a colleague or looked it up on the night, but this was contradicted by the CCTV evidence.

A number of the officers involved, including PS Richardson, claimed that they had not received training from Surrey Police that taught that Excited Delirium was to be treated as a medical emergency. Midway through the inquest, and after those officers had given their evidence, information from a 2007 guidance document was disclosed by Surrey Police that clearly stated that Excited Delirium was a medical emergency requiring immediate medical examination at hospital. As a result, the Coroner called a number of new witnesses including police trainers, senior officers – including the former Assistant Chief Constable, and other officers that had attended the training sessions.

The Forensic Medical Examiner Dr Abdi Aziz Ali, who was at the scene, gave evidence that, despite having carried out a cursory and inadequate assessment, he recognised that Terry's condition was a medical emergency. Dr Ali admitted during questioning by the family's legal representatives that he had lied to the Independent Police Complaints Commission (IPCC, now IOPC) investigators about the checks he had carried out. Dr Ali did not ask for the spit hood Terry was wearing to be lifted. The inquest heard evidence that spit hoods have the potential to impede breathing.

Dr Ali told officers that Terry should be taken to hospital, as he had a deep cut on his foot and a suspected drug overdose. He explained to the inquest that he assumed officers would know that he meant that it was a medical emergency, although he did not explicitly state this. Officers then decided that they should place Terry in a 'body cuff'. The body cuff was a relatively new piece of equipment and officers struggled to fit it on, apparently because it had not been put away correctly after its last use. This caused further delays. In the meantime, no one had called an ambulance.

CCTV footage clearly showed Terry breathing irregularly throughout his time in the cell, and from around 11.50pm saying "I can't breathe" on numerous occasions. The jury found that Terry had said he could not breathe no less than 13 times. He can also be heard pleading with the officers, stating "I can't take the pain no more". A number of officers who were there in the cell, inches from Terry as he shouted repeatedly that he could not breathe, denied at the inquest that they had any concerns that he might be having breathing difficulties. Terry was eventually placed, still under restraint, in the back of a police van where he stopped breathing and went into cardiac arrest. An ambulance was called and attended shortly after. He was worked on by paramedics and taken to St. Peter's hospital, where he died the following evening.

The jury heard that guidance says that officers should not, as a matter of general practice, confer with others before giving their accounts after a use of force incident. If the need arises to confer on issues other than their honestly held belief of the situation, they should make records detailing the conferring that took place in order to ensure transparency and maintain public confidence. Most of the officers involved in the incident wrote up their notes around six hours after Terry was taken to hospital, during which time they were in a briefing room discussing what had happened, and had met with a solicitor, police federation representative, and more senior officers. None of the officers made sufficient records about their conferring, despite this being required by the guidance. The jury heard that none of the officers recorded in their notebooks the fact that Terry had been saying that he could not breathe, despite accepting in evidence that this was a relevant factor that should have been recorded. A medical expert appointed by the Coroner told the inquest that excited delirium can be treated effectively by administering a sedative. He was clear that Terry's life could have been saved if he had been taken to A&E at any point before 11.30pm that night, highlighting how avoidable Terry's death was.

Terry's family said: "We feel that we have had some justice. The jury identified that the state and in particular the police seriously failed Terry. We called an ambulance because it was obvious Terry needed medical help. Instead of treating him as a patient, the police treated him like a criminal. The treatment that Terry received from the police has caused us great distress. The manner in which he was restrained was barbaric. The type and nature of the restraint, and in particular the use of the spit hood, was beyond anything we expect to see in a civilised society. It was devastating to hear clear evidence that Terry could have survived if taken to hospital earlier. The police must be held to account for Terry's death. Nothing will bring Terry back. We miss him every single day. All we can hope is that no other person dies in similar circumstances and no other family has to go through what we have."

Deborah Coles, Director of INQUEST said: "The deeply critical conclusions of this jury are reflective of the cruel and frightening ordeal Terry suffered, at the hands of those who owed him a duty of care. When his behaviour became worrying, Terry's family knew he needed an ambulance. Instead Terry was met by police who, rather than seeing a vulnerable man in crisis,

pursued, restrained, bound and hooded him then took him to a police station, not a hospital. They only called for an ambulance when it was too late. Not only were Terry and his family failed on the day he died, they have been failed by the police response afterwards which has been one of lies, collusion and cover up. This conclusion reaffirms what has been made clear in recent reviews as well as in police guidance: medical emergencies should not be treated as a criminal justice issue. Police officers should be better equipped to understand and enact this, as a priority over being equipped with yet more potentially dangerous restraint tools."

Family's solicitor, Nia Williams of Saunders Law said: "Terry's family called for an ambulance because they were concerned about his condition and thought he needed help. Instead Terry spent over two hours being restrained, including being held down by several police officers and with a spit hood over his face. Nobody lifted the spit hood to check his breathing, meaning that throughout this time nobody saw his face. Despite both the patrol sergeant and custody sergeant recognising he was showing the symptoms of Excited Delirium, no officer acted accordingly by getting him to hospital immediately. The evasive manner in which officers gave their evidence throughout this lengthy inquest has been shocking. The sergeants claimed they had not received adequate training on Excited Delirium. Police officers that were stood over Terry in the cell as he repeatedly shouted "I can't breathe" stated in court that at the time they had no concerns about his breathing, or that they did not take his complaints seriously. None of the officers adequately detailed in their statements that they had discussed the incident before writing up their statements or why they had done so.

We have also heard that medical professionals including the doctor on duty at the police station as well as the emergency medical technicians employed by a private ambulance service failed to give Terry the care he needed. A catalogue of failures led to the loss of Terry's life, which could have easily been prevented. We hope that today's conclusion gives some relief to Terry's family, who have been waiting for answers for over four and a half years. We now look to the relevant authorities to consider further action against those involved in Terry's death."

£7m to be Spent on Phones in Prison Cells to Stem Flow of Illegal Mobiles

Jamie Grierson, Guardian: The government is to spend £7m on installing in-cell telephones in prisons across England and Wales as part of a drive to improve rehabilitation and stem the flow of illegal mobiles, the justice secretary, David Gauke, is to announce. The technology is already in place at 20 jails and plans are under way to extend the scheme to another 20 over the next two years, it is understood. Most prisoners queue for public phones on the landings, which can be a trigger for violence or fuel demand for illicit mobile phones, the Ministry of Justice said.

Last year, a report by Lord Farmer found that good family relationships are "indispensable" to the government's prison reform plans. In a speech at an event hosted by the Centre for Social Justice, Gauke will say: "Decency also extends to how we treat prisoners – fairly and consistently, with time out of their cells, activities, and the opportunity to maintain family relationships. "As Lord Farmer made clear in his ground-breaking review last year, supportive relationships are critical to achieving rehabilitation."

Officials emphasised that in-cell phones are subject to strict security measures. All calls are recorded, users can only call a small number of pre-approved numbers and active monitoring can be introduced if there is any suspicion the service is being abused for crime. Prisoners will continue to pay to make calls, the MoJ added. The move forms part of efforts to improve inmates' ability to maintain ties with relatives after they are jailed, which is seen as a key factor in reducing the chances of returning to crime.

The announcement on in-cell phones forms part of a £30 million package to improve safety, security and decency across the prison estate following several years of surging levels of violence, self-harm and drug use. In another step, every prisoner will be given a "risk rating" under plans to choke off the influence of organised crime behind bars. Inmates will be assessed according to their chances of taking part in violence, escapes, disturbances and gang activity. The new digital tool – which is being rolled out following a pilot in 16 jails – compiles data from law enforcement databases and prison incident reports.

Gauke will also: • commit £16 million to improve the fabric of prisons, targeting establishments with the most pressing maintenance issues • reveal the government is considering enhanced "drug-free wings" where prisoners can live in better conditions if they agree to undergo regular testing • announce £6 million has been earmarked for safety measures including airport-style security scanners, improved searching techniques and phone-blocking technology • confirm plans to give governors more power to set "incentives and earned privileges" schemes under which inmates are rewarded for good behaviour.

What About Me? Listening to the Stories of Children With a Mother in Prison

Sarah Beresford, 'The Justice Gap": 'It was a horrible time,' 13-year old Aliyah says, 'I was sad a lot of the time and didn't want to explain to my friends what had happened.' These are the opening words of a new Prison Reform Trust report, What about me?, published this week, which shines a light on the systematic neglect of some of the UK's most vulnerable children – those with a mother in prison. Aliyah is one of an estimated 17,240 children affected by maternal imprisonment each year in England and Wales. As was the case for all the young people whose stories informed the report, losing her mother in this way was a devastating experience. Aliyah, like 95% of children affected, had to leave her family home when her mother went to prison. Staying with her grandmother meant more change in the form of a new school and further loss, as Aliyah's brothers went to another family member.

As her family life disintegrated, Aliyah felt a profound sense of grief, but this is not the kind of loss that brings support and care; time and again children like Aliyah spoke of being bullied at school, shunned by friends, and intimidated on social media. At best, children with a mother in prison are ignored within the very systems and structures that should protect them; at worst, they experience shame and stigmatisation and a sense that they too are 'tarred with the same brush'. As this report emphasises, when children are left to suffer alone without any support, they are at increased risk of mental health issues, anxiety, and marginalisation. Recent research has found a correlation between parental imprisonment and premature death.

Children affected by maternal imprisonment are rarely considered in criminal justice proceedings; instead, most are strategically silenced. Decisions are made about important issues like contact with their mother without listening to how the children themselves feel and without recognising that feelings change over time. Aliyah felt angry with her mum at first and did not want to visit the prison but later changed her mind. Sadly, she was not given the opportunity to revisit her decision, making it much harder to rebuild a relationship with her mother post-release.

Many of the young people who informed this report showed extraordinary resilience in the face of adversity, largely due to the support of voluntary sector organisations offering peer support, mentoring, and simply an opportunity to be listened to. Knowing they are not alone, and having someone who believes in their potential, rather than seeing them as another

problem, makes all the difference.

Several children recognised that their mothers needed support long before they got to prison. Last week's publication of the Female Offender Strategy provides a welcome recognition of the importance of appropriate community support to address women's mental health issues, addictions, and experiences of domestic and sexual abuse. Prison is simply not the answer for women and is hugely damaging to children, as this report makes clear.

While we know that diverting women from custody has better outcomes than a prison sentence, the lack of funding over recent years has meant that many community services are struggling to continue to provide essential support. It is regrettable that the new Female Offender Strategy does not go far enough in its commitment to fund effective community services.

Aliyah is given the closing words of this report: 'It was heart-breaking when mum went to prison. I wish I'd had more support.' One of the report's key recommendations is for child impact assessments to be carried out as soon as a parent enters the criminal justice system to ensure that a child's needs are identified and addressed. This will go a long way to ensuring Aliyah's plea is both heard and addressed. And it will mean that fewer children like her are left asking, 'What about me?'

Kumitskiy and Others v. Russia - Police Entrapment Violation of Article 6 § 1

The applicants, Aleksey Kumitskiy, Igor Glushchenko, Sergey Volchkov, Rustam Akhmadiyev, and Fedor Nikolayev, are five residents of Russia who were born in 1983, 1972, 1970, 1988, and 1986 respectively. The case concerned their complaints about police entrapment. The five applicants were all convicted of various drugs-related offences, with the final domestic decisions being handed down between March 2012 and April 2015. They alleged, among other things, that they had been pressured into selling the drugs in question and that there had been a lack of incriminating information. Relying on Article 6 § 1 (right to a fair trial), the applicants complained principally that they had been convicted unfairly of drugs offences which they had been incited to commit and that their allegation of entrapment had not been properly examined in the domestic proceedings. Violation of Article 6 § 1 Just satisfaction: The Court held that the finding of a violation constituted in itself sufficient just satisfaction for any non-pecuniary damage sustained by the applicants.

Ireland: Forcing Mentally Ill Prisoners to Sleep on Prison Floors Branded 'Unacceptable'

Irish Legal News: The reported practice of forcing prisoners with serious mental illnesses to sleep on prison floors because there are no beds for them in the Central Mental Hospital (CMH) has been branded "utterly unacceptable". Deirdre Malone, executive director of the Irish Penal Reform Trust (IPRT), told Irish Legal News that urgent action is needed to implement expert recommendations made over a decade ago. According to The Irish Times, around 30 prisoners are on the waiting list for a bed in the CMH, where all 94 beds are occupied. Many of the prisoners on the waiting list are instead made to stay on the overcrowded D2 landing of Cloverhill Prison in Dublin, where prisoners often have to double up in cells or sleep on the floor.

Commenting on reports, Ms Malone told Irish Legal News: "It is utterly unacceptable that prisons are being used to warehouse people who should be in the care of a secure health facility. Prison is no place for those who are suffering from severe mental illness. The consequence is that the men are not accessing the appropriate treatment, causing acute individual suffering and potentially leading to deterioration of their condition. This also places unreasonable demands on prison staff."

She highlighted the 2006 murder of prisoner Gary Douch, who was beaten to death by a

cellmate with serious mental illness. Ms Malone said: "The investigation into the tragic death of Gary Douch in Mountjoy Prison in 2006 prompted a comprehensive suite of recommendations around forensic mental health care. "Few of these recommendations have so far been implemented, and they need to be implemented in full. Multiple actions need to be taken urgently, including: building capacity in community mental health services, including community forensic mental health teams; increasing mental health staff with appropriate expertise within the prison system; and increasing provision at the new designated centre at Portrane, so that Ireland can provide adequate forensic mental health beds in line with real need."

Prison Tranfers to: Pakistan:

To ask the Secretary of State for Justice, what agreements are in place with the Government of Pakistan on the transfer of prisoners; and what effect those agreements have had on the number of prisoners exchanged with that country. Any foreign national who comes to our country and abuses our hospitality by breaking the law should be in no doubt of our determination to deport them. More than 42,000 Foreign National Offenders have been removed from the UK since 2010, with over 5,600 removed in 2017/18.

A Prisoner Transfer Agreement is in place to allow Pakistani nationals to be transferred from the UK during their prison sentence so that they continue to serve their sentence in Pakistan (and vice versa for British nationals imprisoned in Pakistan), but it is currently suspended due to the corrupt release of prisoners transferred to Pakistan in 2010. Between the commencement of the Prisoner Transfer Agreement in 2008 and its suspension in 2010, a total of four prisoners were transferred to Pakistan, three of whom were corruptly released. The Government of Pakistan has since taken action to return the corruptly released prisoners to custody and has prosecuted those involved. Work is underway with the Government of Pakistan to resolve the issues presented by the corrupt releases and restart transfers with appropriate safeguards in place. In the meantime, Pakistani nationals continue to be deported from the UK following completion of their prison sentences.

Women Who Kill Their Partners Are Still Being Treated Differently to Men

Julie Bindel, 'Justice for Women': Twenty years ago, Emma Humphreys died of an accidental overdose. In 1985, when Humphreys was 17 years old, she was convicted of murdering her pimp/boyfriend, Trevor Armitage, following threats of rape. Humphreys' childhood had been dominated by violence and abuse. Her stepfather was extremely violent, and she had witnessed regular abuse. From the age of 12, she started to run away from home, and was soon abused into prostitution by men offering her a bed for the night in return for sex. At 16, Humphreys met Armitage, a local punter, and moved in with him. Armitage immediately became violent and controlling. Humphreys was regularly raped and beaten by clients, so her life was pure hell.

At trial, Humphreys was advised not to give any evidence. Unsurprisingly she was convicted and sentenced to life. Little, if anything, was said in court about the violence and abuse she had endured from Armitage as well as other men. There is no sympathy or understanding as to why this child, with no history of violent offending, had been driven to kill.

Seven years into her life sentence for murder, Humphreys heard about the cases of other women who had killed as a response to domestic violence, and contacted Justice for Women. Together we launched a massive campaign to clear her name. Three years later, Humphreys won her appeal and walked out of court to hundreds of cheering supporters, her victory

making headline news all over the world. Her case resulted in a change in the law. Judges could now direct juries in such cases to take into consideration the whole life histories of women like Humphreys who ended up on trial for murder.

Feminist campaigners were buoyant, certain that the tide was turning and that other women in Humphreys' position would be better understood, and treated fairly by the courts. We were wrong: 23 years after Humphreys was freed, very little has changed. Justice for Women is currently dealing with the cases of several women who have killed violent men and subsequently been convicted of murder. It is almost as though the huge campaigns of the past three decades never happened.

Farieissia Martin was 22 when she was convicted of the murder of Kyle Farrell in 2015, and sentenced to 13 years in prison. Martin, who at the time had two small children with Farrell, grabbed a knife when he tried to strangle her. Farrell's violence often left Martin in fear of her life, but she too was frightened to call the police in case social services became involved and removed her children. Farrell's history of violence was not adequately explored during the trial. Justice for Women is campaigning for the case to go to appeal, on the grounds that the evidence of domestic violence was not afforded enough significance during the trial.

Another case is that of Sally Challen, who killed her husband Richard after decades of domestic abuse. Sally met Richard when she was 15 years old and he was 22. Sally was abused and controlled by Richard from the beginning of their relationship. Sally now has a new legal team, and her appeal against the murder conviction will be heard later this year on the grounds that she was subjected to "coercive control" for decades. She was given a sentence of 22 years in 2011. The prosecution suggested that her motive was "jealousy". Richard had a number of affairs, and also was known to have visited brothels on a regular basis. One neighbour said: "'It was well known that he had an eye for the ladies."

This is somewhat different to the way that many men who kill their female partners are treated. Infidelity is regularly used as a defence in such cases, often successfully, by men who kill, and yet women such as Humphreys are given no understanding of or sympathy for their experience of horrendous domestic and sexual violence. In January 2017 new grounds were submitted to the court of appeal, claiming that at the time of the killing Sally Challen was subject to "coercive control", a form of abuse prevalent in domestic violence relationships that has only recently been made a criminal offence.

In 2016, Emma Jayne Magson stabbed her partner, James Knight, after he had attacked and attempted to strangle her. There was a known history of domestic violence perpetrated by Knight towards Magson. On the night he died, Knight was captured on CCTV, pushing Magson into the road. She had grown up witnessing horrific domestic violence, which led to mental health problems in later life. During the murder trial, no mention of this history was made.

Why are so many women charged with murder, as opposed to manslaughter, if there is strong evidence of domestic violence? How different is the attitude to men defending property than to women defending their own lives or the lives of their children against violent men? When Richard Osborn-Brooks was arrested after stabbing a burglar who tried to break into his home, the hashtag #FreeRichardOsbornBrooks was launched alongside a petition calling for the Crown Prosecution Service to take no action against him. He was released without charge. "We have the right to protect ourselves in our own home," tweeted one man, in support of Osborn-Brooks.

The victims of domestic violence, who live in well-founded fear of their lives, have the right to a fair trial. Tragedies could have been avoided had the perpetrators of these crimes been dealt with in the first instance. For the sake of all the Emma Humphreys out there, let us

demand that domestic violence becomes a thing of the past.

Domestic Abuser Wins Appeal Over Lack Of Corroboration Of 'Course Of Conduct' Charge

Scottish Legal News: A man found guilty of a single charge of assault comprising eight separate incidents in a "course of conduct" involving a four-year campaign of domestic abuse of his then partner has had his conviction restricted to just two of those offences, after appeal judges ruled there was "no corroboration" of any other of the assaults libelled. The Appeal Court of the High Court of Justiciary ruled that both the sheriff and the Sheriff Appeal Court (SAC) erred in holding that individual elements of a single "omnibus" charge did not require corroboration where a course of conduct had been established.

'Course of conduct': The Lord Justice General, Lord Carloway, sitting with Lord Menzies and Lord Turnbull, heard that in August 2017 the appellant Robert Spinks was found guilty at Kirkcaldy Sheriff Court of two charges: the first was a stalking offence under section 39(1) of the Criminal Justice and Licensing (Scotland) Act 2010, by engaging in a course of conduct which caused "MK" fear or alarm; and the second was that, on various occasions between January 2013 and March 2017, he assaulted "MK" by punching her on the head, repeatedly seize and compress her by the throat, repeatedly pin her to the ground and against a wall, throw water at her, strike her on the head causing her to strike her head against a wall, repeatedly seize her by the hair, kick her on the body, and spit on her face, all to her injury.

Having found that eight separate assaults were proved, the sheriff imposed a community payback order involving a supervision requirement of two years, a programme requirement for two years and unpaid work of 300 hours. The sheriff had asked himself whether it was legitimate for the Crown to libel charge 2 as a "course of conduct" involving the abuse of a partner in the domestic context, and considered that it was, on the authority of Stephen v HM Advocate 2007 JC 61, a lewd and libidinous conduct case in which the details of the assault on a young complainer did not require to be corroborated. The sheriff's reasoning was that if there was corroboration of an assault, the complainer's evidence would be enough on its own to establish its details. It was legitimate to treat the series of assaults as a course of conduct, because they could be seen as very similar abusive conduct involving a domestic partner.

The Sheriff Appeal Court upheld the sheriff's decision, but neither the sheriff nor the SAC were referred to Dalton v HM Advocate 2015 SCCR 125, a misdirection case in which the court held that, where separate episodes of rape on an adult complainer with substantial periods of time between them were involved, each episode required to be proved by corroborated evidence, even if the same evidence may corroborate more than one offence.

Courts below 'Erred': The appellant appealed on the basis that the Sheriff Appeal Court and the sheriff erred in holding that, where a course of conduct had been established in the context of a single charge, individual elements of the charge did not require corroboration. The SAC had held that no corroboration was required for what were essentially separate offences, occurring over a period of several years - a decision which would allow the Crown to present sufficient evidence for individual offences without the need for corroboration, even if the incidents were of a significantly different character. It was submitted that the court should accordingly follow Dalton and not Stephen. The advocate depute maintained that, where it was established that offences committed over a prolonged period, albeit on separate occasions, were so linked in time, character and circumstances so as to demonstrate that they were parts of a single course of conduct, all that was required was corroboration of some of the episodes to amount to corroboration of the whole; that is to say that separate corroboration of each

episode was not required. The court ought to follow the principle in Stephen, as the course of conduct could be treated as a single crime which could be corroborated if only some, or perhaps only one, of the episodes were supported from a separate source.

Omnibus Charge Does Not Change Law Of Evidence: However, the appeal judges said they were unable to sustain the Crown's submission, which amounted to "a substantial change in the law of evidence". Delivering the opinion of the court, the Lord Justice General said: "A person cannot be convicted of a crime on the evidence of one witness alone. There requires to be corroboration. Where, as here, a complainer speaks to the occurrence of a crime, the crucial facts of her testimony require to be corroborated by testimony from at least one other source. In the case of a single episode of assault, there is no need for every element of the libel to be corroborated. All that is needed is evidence from another source that some form of assault took place and the appellant perpetrated that assault, at least where the assault involves the same type of conduct. The situation is quite different where there are separate incidents. In that situation the normal requirement of corroboration applies to each incident."

Lord Carloway added: "There was corroborative evidence from MS that the appellant spat at the complainer (finding h). The appellant admitted punching the complainer, so there was corroboration of that allegation on one occasion (finding d). There is no corroboration of any other of the other assaults libelled in charge 2. The fact that the Crown case proceeded, presumably without objection, upon an omnibus charge does not affect the law of evidence. Accordingly, the appeal must be allowed and the conviction restricted to that: on one occasion in 2015 the appellant punched the complainer on the head; and on another occasion on 27 March 2017 he spat on her face." The court accordingly adjusted the sentence imposed to a total of 100 hours unpaid work and quashed the programme and supervision requirements.

David Norris 'Fitted up' for the Killing of Stephen Lawrence to get Damages from MoJ

One of Stephen Lawrence's killers has settled a claim with the Ministry of Justice after he was attacked in prison. David Norris suffered a broken nose and ribs at HMP Belmarsh in 2011 where he was being held on remand ahead of his trial for murder. He sued for damages, reported to be £10,000, after the assault. Norris and another man, Gary Dobson, were found guilty of murdering the teenager in a racist attack in 1993. The pair were given life sentences in 2012. A spokesman for the Ministry of Justice said: "We robustly defend all claims and are successful in two thirds of cases brought against us by prisoners." During Norris's murder trial, defence lawyer Stephen Batten QC said he had been beaten up several times while on remand in prison. He told jurors at the Old Bailey that on one occasion his client's nose was broken, his teeth were knocked out, and four of his ribs were broken. BBC News:

July 2018 the Lawrence family and the public alike still do not know who actually murdered Stephen Lawrence over 25 years ago: Both articles below Circa 2012

Gary Dobson and David Norris Conviction an Abuse of 'Due Process'

'MOJUK is not concerned with the 'innocence or guilt' of those in jail. We are concerned only that they have been brought to trial and convicted through 'due process of law'. This since its' foundation has been the corner stone of MOJUK's 'Raison d'être: MOJUK are completely opposed to the jailing of Gary Dobson and David Norris, for the way they have been convicted is a blatant abuse of due process. The Crown Prosecution Service 16 years ago, fouled this case up in every possible way, leading to the acquittal of Dobson. New Labour had to legislate to change the law, so that they could quash the original verdict against Dobson and then charge him all over again.

The real culprits of the murder of Stephen Lawrence are the *Metropolitan Police, there is no dispute about their racism at the time of Stephen's murder 1993 (and many think it still persists) and that racism was their motive for doing sweet nothing to apprehend the killers 18 years ago. The Metropolitan Police that were involved at the time should be tried for culpable manslaughter. Double Jeopardy' a corner stone of justice in the UK that a person cannot be tried for the same offence twice, for hundreds of years, is no longer and the real victim of the decision to convict Dobson and Norris. The forensic evidence that convicted Dobson was extremely weak, comparable with the gunpowder evidence in the Barry George trial. In general the trial could be described as the Crown Prosecution Service (CPS) throwing as much shit as they could at the defendants in the hope that some of it would stick and it did.

Convictions of Dobson & Norris - JENGbA calls for Review of Joint Enterprise law

The Stephen Lawrence murder trial convicted two men out of a wider group of suspects. Their prosecution was brought under the little-understood law of Joint Enterprise. In such cases, those peripherally associated can be found guilty while the actual perpetrators may go free. Joint Enterprise is a means by which slim evidence and "possible foresight" to a crime occurring can be used to convince a jury of more than one persons' guilt when they may have played a lesser or even no part in what occurred.

While this antiquated legal principle may be convenient, its use to convict all regardless of their actual involvement in a crime effectively turns the well-established cornerstone of British justice called *Blackstone's Ratio on its head so it is "better that ten innocent persons suffer than one guilty escape". JENGbA (Joint Enterprise Not Guilty by Association) knows of over 270 cases of prisoners convicted under Joint Enterprise who protest they are innocent of the index offence. The Lawrence case in no way represents a success story for Joint Enterprise law. It shows the failures of Joint Enterprise, and this is because the Lawrence family and the public alike still do not know who actually murdered Stephen Lawrence over 25 years ago, or whether that person is still walking free. The Joint Enterprise doctrine encourages a "wall of silence" amongst those suspected of involvement or knowledge of a crime. This case has highlighted the use of the old law, and its flaws, showing that new guidance is urgently needed to avoid more innocent people languishing in prison while guilty people walk free.

Lawrence Case: the Elephant in the Room

Brendan O'Neill, Spiked, Circa 2012: The double-jeopardy rule survived the Dark Ages, but it could not survive the New Labour years. With every media outlet, from the Sun to the Socialist Worker, editorialising about how the conviction of David Norris and Gary Dobson for the murder of Stephen Lawrence was a 'glorious day' for Britain, I knew it would be a thankless task to go on the radio and ask: 'What about the double jeopardy rule?' On Nick Ferrari's breakfast show on London's LBC radio this morning, I argued that all the people describing this case as a victory for justice are overlooking the fact that it is a victory built upon the wreckage of some pretty important legal principles. One longstanding legal protection in particular - the double jeopardy rule, the idea that no one should be tried twice for the same crime - had to be dismantled in order to get Dobson back in the dock. Having been acquitted of the murder of Lawrence in 1996, Dobson was what we used to call 'autrefois acquit', previously acquitted, which in the past would have meant that he could not have been tried for the murder a second time. That all changed in 2003, when New Labour ditched the double-jeopardy rule.

Ferrari was having none of it. 'But these men are wicked', he said. Even my agreement with him that the men are indeed lowlifes, alongside my argument that 'this isn't about them, it's about what kind of justice system we want to have', didn't wash. 'I disagree with everything

you say', Ferrari told me, and cut me off mid-sentence.

Double jeopardy is the elephant in the room of the Dobson and Norris conviction. Sure, journalists are mentioning it, usually in fluffy factboxes titled 'How this case came to court', but no one wants to discuss it in detail. No one wants to discuss the extraordinary amount of history and progressive tradition that had to be consigned to the dustbin of 'bad ideas' in order to secure one conviction against two nasty blokes.

The double-jeopardy rule had existed in some form or other for centuries. There was a Roman maxim which said 'nemo bis in idem debet vexari' - no man shall be punished twice for the same. It's there in early Christianity, too, in St Jerome's insistence in the fourth century that 'there shall not rise up a double affliction'. It's also in the sixth-century Digest of Justinian, the seed of much of modern jurisprudence, which insisted that, 'The governor should not permit the same person to be accused of a crime of which he has been acquitted'. An academic study of the double jeopardy rule in history points out that it is one of the 'few legal rights recognised by the Christian fathers throughout the Dark and Middle Ages' (1).

In twelfth-century England, a form of double jeopardy was codified in the Constitutions of Clarendon, which, in an attempt to rein in the authoritarian instincts of Henry II, stipulated that no man could be tried for the same offence in both the ecclesiastical courts and the king's courts. It had to be one or the other. From England it spread to the US, where the eighteenth-century revolutionaries and their successors made a bar against double jeopardy a key plank of their new republic's constitutional guarantee of liberty against state power. In each historic period, the purpose of the rule against 'double afflictions' was strikingly similar: to protect individuals from potentially being hounded and interminably retried by governors, crown forces or cops determined to stick them in jail. That's because being permanently at risk of prosecution is itself a kind of life sentence.

Yet where the double-jeopardy rule survived the Dark Ages, it could not survive the New Labour years. Proving they're even more allergic to liberty than those pointy-hatted men who ruled Europe in that bleakest period of cultural and moral deterioration, New Labour suits decided to ditch the double-jeopardy rule in 2003. Taking their cue from the 1999 Macpherson Report into the Stephen Lawrence case, which proposed a new 'power' to override the double-jeopardy rule, New Labour's Criminal Justice Act 2003 made it possible to retry someone for a serious offence of which he had previously been acquitted or convicted.

And so it was that a legal protection that had existed in various forms for two millennia, articulated by everyone from Romans to saints to revolutionaries, was discarded - all in the name of bringing a few rotters from south London back to court to answer for the killing of Stephen Lawrence. Add the ditching of the double jeopardy rule to recent assaults on the right to silence and even on the right to trial by jury in some instances, and you can clearly see that it is not justice that is being boosted here, but rather the power of the state over the once-sovereign individual. The further legal denuding of the individual before the forces of the state is simply too high a price to pay to secure convictions against people we don't like. The immediate losers might be people like Dobson, but the long-term losers are all of us, with our rights and protections, fought for over centuries, further eroded by the state and its compliant media cheerleaders and supposedly liberal supporters.

You don't have to be a friend of Dobson or Norris to recognise that undermining long-standing legal protections for a narrow and fleeting end is never a good thing to do. Isn't there

also an old legal maxim about how 'hard cases make bad law'?

Investigation Launched After Man Dies in Police Custody In Manchester

An investigation has been launched after a man died in police custody following the use of CS spray during his arrest. The man was found to be unresponsive in the back of the police van by the time he arrived at the custody station following a journey of about four miles. He was later pronounced dead in hospital and the Independent Office for Police Conduct (IOPC) is investigating. Greater Manchester police said the man, in his 30s, had been arrested by officers following an alleged domestic disturbance in Oldham at about 11.35pm on Friday. A police spokesman said officers “used CS spray to detain the man” during his arrest on suspicion of breach of the peace. “During the arrest attempts, the officers deployed CS spray before putting him in the back of a van,” said Chief Supt Neil Evan. “On arrival at Ashton police station, the man was found to be unresponsive and he was taken to hospital where he was sadly pronounced dead. “We have since been providing his family with support from specially trained officers at this difficult time. We have made a mandatory referral to the IOPC, who are independently investigating and we will continue to cooperate with them fully.”

HMP Wandsworth – Needing A New Culture To Improve Safety And Living Conditions

HMP Wandsworth in south London was found by inspectors to be one of the most overcrowded jails in England and Wales and filled with many men with drug or mental health problems receiving poor training and education. 43 recommendations (49%) from the last inspection had not been achieved and 17 only partly achieved (19%).

Peter Clarke, HM Chief Inspector of Prisons, said that at the time of the inspection, in February and March 2018, 36% of the 1,428 men in the Victorian-era jail were receiving psychosocial help for substance misuse problems, 40% said it was easy to get illicit drugs, and 450 referrals were made to the mental health team each month. “Meanwhile, 42% of the men were locked in their cells during the working day and this was no doubt, at least in part, because there were only enough full-time activity places for around a third of the population. There were too many prisoners, many with drug-related or mental health issues, and with not enough to do. This is of course an all too familiar story, but it must not be forgotten that more than 100 prisoners every month were being released into the community. How much better could their prospects, and those of the communities into which they were released, have been if their time in prison had been spent in more decent conditions?”

Inspectors found a “long-standing culture of not recording or analysing data to understand what was happening and to drive improvement” and “an obvious gap between the intentions of senior managers and what was actually happening on the wings.” However, Mr Clarke said, it was good that the senior team saw a recent influx of new staff “in an unequivocally positive light” – not as a challenge but as giving a real opportunity to improve, bringing a new and fresh culture into the prison. That cultural change is needed cannot be doubted. Despite six self-inflicted deaths since the last inspection, it was concerning to find that not all staff were carrying anti-ligature knives, that no staff would enter a cell alone – even if a prisoner’s life was in danger – and that the response to cell call bells was totally inadequate. This latter point was not due to a lack of staff,” Mr Clarke said. I personally saw cell call bells going unanswered while groups of prison officers were gathered in wing offices and not responding…Clearly, not every use of a cell bell is properly justified, but the apparent assumption by staff that they were being misused and therefore did not warrant a response is dangerous. At the very least there should be a proper strategy to triage response and deal with regular misuse.”

Many men shared cells designed for one prisoner, with poorly screened lavatories, and were confined in them for far too long each day – though a refurbishment programme was underway "which, while it would not in itself reduce overcrowding, would at least make living conditions a little more acceptable." Mr Clarke said the necessary change of culture also extended "to developing an intolerance on the part of both staff and prisoners to dirt and grime."

Inspectors noted that anti-corruption prevention work had improved and had led to the identification of alleged illegal activities by staff which were now subject to ongoing prosecutions. Searches in the six months prior to the inspection had found 277 mobile phones, 65 weapons and 153 drugs packages. However, inspectors could not get a clear explanation of why an x-ray body scanner – which prisoners preferred to strip-searching – had fallen into disuse.

On a more positive note, inspectors assessed rehabilitation and release work as reasonably good, with generally well-managed public protection procedures and improved use of home detention curfew (HDC) as part of preparing men for release. Inspectors made 61 recommendations. Overall, Mr Clarke said: "It was quite clear that there was a very real determination on the part of many dedicated staff at Wandsworth to make positive progress at this well-known and important prison. The influx of new staff is a real opportunity, and it is vital that the governor should be fully supported both from within the prison and by Her Majesty's Prison and Probation Service (HMPPS) more broadly as she embarks on what she describes as 'the long journey' of improvement at the establishment."

Reporting Restrictions 'Prevent Scrutiny' Of Economic Crimes

Owen Bowcott, Independent: Excessive court reporting restrictions, inadequate listing information and difficulties in obtaining documents are preventing scrutiny of economic crimes and bribery cases, according to a report by Corruption Watch UK. A high proportion of hearings are effectively being heard in private because of tight legal controls, and fraud trials are disproportionately affected by such court orders, the study said. The majority of foreign bribery cases that have come to court in the past two years have been subject to reporting restrictions, according to Corruption Watch. Cases involving unexplained wealth orders – introduced in January as instruments for targeting illicit and corrupt wealth in the UK – are proceeding in secrecy without adequate monitoring of how they are used, the report said. The Serious Fraud Office (SFO) is currently unable to publicise two major corporate guilty pleas because of blanket reporting restrictions, it said.

Court lists add to the problems, the report said, because they lack sufficient detail to highlight the significance of cases, are usually only available the afternoon before hearings at the earliest, and their distribution online has been partially privatised, "undermining open justice". Corruption Watch said it found that despite the court of appeal ruling that court documents should by default be accessible to the public, they could not usually be obtained in criminal cases without instructing counsel. "In civil cases," the report said, "it usually takes weeks to obtain a single document, a process that involves multiple trips to the courthouse and can cost upwards of £50. Transcripts of hearings are also prohibitively expensive, often costing more than £20,000 for a three-week trial. Generally, a UK-based reporter can more easily access documents from any US federal court than London's Royal Courts of Justice."

Rahul Rose, a senior researcher at Corruption Watch, said: "There are countless rulings from senior members of the judiciary highlighting the vital importance of transparency and openness for the justice system. However, for most members of the public, including experienced journalists, the courts feel Kafkaesque and opaque. "The lack of open justice in the court system is having a worrying effect on anti-corruption enforcement with many bribery trials receiving no contemporaneous coverage, and significant hearings routinely proceeding in private."

HMP Dovegate Impressive Institution Working With High-Risk, Violent Men

Dovegate Therapeutic Prison (TP) in Staffordshire, which holds 200 men from across the prison service undergoing intensive programmes to reduce the risk they pose, was found by inspectors to be an impressive institution. The men, most of whom are serving long or indeterminate sentences for serious offences, live in one of five therapeutic communities (TCs), and an induction unit. The TP is linked to the mainstream HMP Dovegate but was inspected separately. Peter Clarke, HM Chief Inspector or Prisons, said: "The underlying ethos of TCs is that both staff and prisoners have a real say in how the communities are run. Men involved must be willing to be open about their offending and related institutional behaviour and to being challenged by their peers and staff. Therapy is embedded into all TC activities, not just in individual and group therapy sessions. It is a structured, externally validated intervention, and for men who go through the whole process, it lasts approximately two and a half years. Most men in the TP were serving very long determinate or indeterminate sentences."

Inspectors found Dovegate TP to be a safe prison. Despite the histories of violent offending by many prisoners, there was very little violence in the TP. Men received good support on arrival, including the small number who felt vulnerable and were at risk of self-harm. There had been no self-inflicted deaths since the last inspection in 2013. Dovegate TP was also a respectful prison, with good staff-prisoner relationships at the core of the therapeutic approach. Physical conditions were excellent, as was the external environment, and men felt well cared for, both by staff and their peers. Consultation arrangements were very strong, and the food provided was good. Time out of cell was also good, though teaching and learning was not consistent. Most men felt they were making progress in the TCs and inspectors were struck by the insights the men had about their past behaviour and offending and about how different and productive their future could be.

Overall, Mr Clarke said: "Dovegate TP was impressive. A national resource, it was part of the offender personality disorder pathway. It worked with men intensively over a period of years to better understand their problematic behaviour, attitudes and thinking patterns and to help them change. Most men who reached the end of the process made progress, and over 80% of respondents in our survey said they felt they had done something at the prison to make it less likely they would reoffend in the future. Learning, skills and work activities needed to better complement the prison's therapeutic aims, and the clinical model underpinning therapy work needed to be implemented in full. However, in nearly all other respects the work the prison was carrying out was excellent."

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, Robert Knapp, 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.