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 701 (08/08/2018) - Cost £1

283 Deaths Following Police Contact 2017/18

During this period, black people have been significantly overrepresented in deaths following the use of force by the police. In the financial year 2017/18, the IOPC recorded a total of 283 deaths following police contact. Of these deaths there were 23 in or following police custody, four police shootings (three of which were terrorism related), 29 relating to road traffic incidents, 57 apparent suicides following custody and 170 'other' deaths following police contact.

The IOPC report includes the following data: • There were 23 deaths in or following police custody, the highest figure recorded in the past 14 years, and an increase of nine since last year. • Four people who died in or following police custody were detained under the Mental Health Act. • Seventeen of the people who died in or following police custody or other contact were restrained or had force used against them by the police or others before their deaths. Of these 17 people, nine were White and eight were Black. • 11 of the 23 people who died in police custody had some use of force used against them by officers or by members of the public. • 12 of the 23 people who died in or following police custody had mental health concerns, and 18 had links to drugs and/or alcohol.

Deborah Coles, Director of INQUEST said: "These figures, the highest for over a decade, are an indictment of the failing systems of investigation, learning and accountability which follow police related deaths. Too many highly vulnerable people with mental ill health and addictions are ending up in the criminal justice system. The solution does not lie within policing. Many of these preventable deaths illustrate the impact of austerity and the historic underfunding of health and community services. The disproportionality in the use of force against black people adds to the irrefutable evidence of structural racism embedded in policing practices. Following the Angiolini review, this has been a year of widespread promises of change and learning lessons. Clearly real systemic change remains to be seen."

Restraint Related Deaths Of Black People - During this reporting period 2017/2018, INQUEST are aware of six restraint related deaths of black men: • 21 June 2017 - Edson Da Costa, 25, died in Newham, East London following restraint by police six days earlier. • 19 July 2017 - Darren Cumberbatch, 32, died in Nuneaton, Warwickshire following restraint by police. • 15 July 2017 - Shane Bryant, 29, died in Leicestershire following restraint by members of public and police two days earlier. • 22 July 2017 - Rashan Charles, 20, died in Hackney, East London following restraint by police. • 24 November 2017 - Nuno Cardoso, 25, died in Oxford following restraint by police. • 9 March 2018 – Kevin Clarke, 35, died in Lewisham, South London following restraint by police. On 9 April 2017 – A black woman in her 50's (who has not yet been named publicly) died in Cheshire several days after being arrested and restrained with leg shackles. The inquest into the death of Rashan Charles concluded last month. The inquest into the death of Rashan Charles concluded last month. The other investigations are ongoing and pending inquests.

Mental Health And Restraint • 'Seni's Law', the Mental Health (Use of Force) Bill, which was prompted by the 2010 death following police restraint of Seni Lewis, passed through the third reading in Parliament on 6 July. It strengthens the monitoring and protection of people in mental health settings from potentially dangerous restraint and use of force.

• The inquest into the restraint related death of Terry Smith, who died in 2014, concluded on 5 July, finding neglect and multiple failures by Surrey Police contributed to his death. • A report by the Independent Police Complaints Commission (IPCC) in 2017 examined how a different approach to policing people with mental health needs could have prevented the death of James Herbert.

Accountability: There have also been a number of conclusions in police misconduct hearings and trials that have led bereaved families to question the state of learning and accountability processes. There has never been a successful prosecution of a police officer for a death in custody.

Background Information: In October 2017 the landmark Independent review of deaths and serious incidents in police custody by Dame Elish Angiolini QC was published. Commissioned by Theresa May when she was home secretary, the reviews recommendations included tackling discrimination, through recognition of the disproportionate number of deaths of people from Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic groups following restraint and the role of institutional racism, both within IPCC (now IOPC) investigations and police training.

In January 2018, the Independent Office for Police Conduct replaced the Independent Police Complaints Commission. Dame Anne Owers, the outgoing IPCC chair, urged for the relationship between ethnicity and use of force to be looked at closely.

In March 2018, the death of Kevin Clarke was the first significant restraint case referred to the newly established Independent Office for Police Conduct. In May, the IOPC announced nine police officers are under investigation for gross misconduct.

In April 2018, The United Nations commented on 'structural racism' being rooted at the heart of British society. The group of human rights experts cited police data showing a disproportionate number of people from ethnic minorities died as a result of excessive force.

Source: INQUEST, https://www.inquest.org.uk/iopc-stats-2018

Latest Safety in Prison Custody Statistics, England and Wales

There were 310 deaths in prison custody in the 12 months to June 2018, down 2% from the previous year. Of these, 5 were homicides, up from 2 incidents in the previous year. There were 77 self-inflicted deaths, down from 99 in the previous year, 3 of which occurred in the female estate, compared to 6 incidents in the previous 12 months.

In the 12 months to March 2018, there were 46,859 incidents of self-harm, up 16% from the previous year. The number of self-harming individuals increased by 8% to 11,854. Quarterly self-harm incidents rose by 2% to 12,045 incidents.

There were 31,025 assault incidents in the 12 months to March 2018, up 16% from the previous year. In the 12 months to March 2018, there were 3,926 serious assaults, up 9% from the previous year. Both of these figures are the highest in the time series. In the most recent quarter, assaults increased by 6% to 8,243 incidents.

There were 22,374 prisoner-on-prisoner assaults in the 12 months to March 2018, up 16% from the previous year. Of these, 3,081 (14%) were serious assaults, an increase of 9% in the number of serious incidents from the previous year. Both figures are record highs. Prisoner-on-prisoner assaults saw an increase of 6% in the latest quarter, with 5,901 incidents.

There were 9,003 assaults on staff in the 12 months to March 2018, up 26% from the previous year. There has been a change in how these incidents are recorded since April 2017 which may have contributed to the increase. See the guide for more information. Of these, 892 were serious assaults on staff, up 11 % from the previous year. In the latest quarter the number of assaults on staff increased by 4% to a new record high of 2,427 incidents.

Immigration Detainees Held in Prisons – Do not have Equal Rights With Other Prisoners

The Public Law team at Duncan Lewis have issued Judicial Review proceedings on behalf of the Claimant who was held under immigration powers in prison. This case raises a point of wide importance: potentially vulnerable immigration detainees detained in the prison estate are not afforded the same safeguards that would lead to their identification and release as are made available to those detained in Immigration Removal Centres 'IRCs'. There is a lacuna in the scheme governing the detention of vulnerable persons (inter alia victims of torture or those suffering from mental ill-health) detained under immigration legislation within the prison estate, as compared to the scheme that governs the detention of those in IRCs.

We submit to the High Court that: • There is inherent unfairness/unreasonableness in the failure to put in place an equivalent mechanism to Rules 34 and 35 of the Detention Centre Rules 2001 in the case of immigration detainees held in prison. • It is unlawful discrimination in breach of article 14 of the European Convention on Human Rights. • It is an unlawful breach of the Equality Act 2010. For immigration detainees held in IRC's, Rules 34 and 35 of the 2001 Rules provide a mechanism intended to identify those who are not suitable for detention (for example victims of torture and those who are mentally unwell) through prompt physical and mental examination. This enables the medical staff to report any persons whose health is likely to be injuriously affected by continued detention to the Secretary of State for the Home Department 'SSHD', who, within two working days, is required to assess whether continued detention remains appropriate.

Critically, the Detention Centre Rules do not apply to immigration detainees held in the prison estate. The detention of those held in the prison estate is instead governed by the Prison Rules 1999, Prison Service Instructions and Prison Service Orders, which provide no equivalent to the safeguards provided for by the Immigration Act 1999, the 2001 Detention Centre Rules, the Detention Service Orders and other published policy guidance.

The significance of this lacuna is highlighted by the terms of the statutory guidance which limits the use of detention in the case of vulnerable detainees. The SSHD's policy document entitled 'Adults at risk in immigration detention' succinctly state that: '[T]he purpose of Rule 35 is to ensure that particularly vulnerable detainees are brought to the attention of those with direct responsibility for authorising, maintaining and reviewing detention'.

Given that those working in the prison estate are accountable to the Secretary of State for Justice 'SSJ' and not the SSHD, there is no obligation on medical staff to report torture or health concerns to the SSHD, who is directly responsible for the individual's detention. The effect of this is that those who would be deemed unsuitable for detention owing to their history of torture and/or deteriorating mental/physical health often languish in detention for excessive periods of time since the SSHD is unaware of their vulnerabilities. This was illustrative in the Claimant's case, as his repeated disclosure of torture to medical staff in prison was not investigated or reported to the SSHD who was authorising and managing his detention.

The potential implications of this challenge are significant given that it affects the current detention of a significant number of people. Home Office statistics show that, at the end of March 2018, 358 immigration detainees were held in the prison estate. It is deeply concerning that despite these numbers and the recommendation made by Stephen Shaw in his 2016 report 'Review into the Welfare in Detention of Vulnerable Persons', the Defendants' have failed to put an equivalent Rule 34/35 process in place for those detained within the prison estate.

Hugh Southey QC of Matrix Chambers and Raza Halim of Garden Court Chambers are instructed by Toufique Hossain, Sulaiha Ali and Philip Armitage of DL's Harrow Public Law team.

CJEU: Derogation From European Arrest Warrant Justified Where Trial Would Be Unfair

The Court of Justice of the European Union has ruled that the Irish High Court was justified in delaying the extradition to Poland of a man suspected of drug trafficking because of concerns about political interference with the Polish judiciary. The court found that domestic courts must avoid executing European arrest warrants if there is a real risk that an individual would not get a fair trial. Authorities in Poland sought Artur Celmer, 31, for various offences dating from 2007.

The High Court's Ms Justice Aileen Donnelly had referred the case to the CJEU which, in its ruling, said derogation from the EAW regime was justified if there was a real risk that the subject of the extradition would have their right to a fair trial violated. It also noted that recent action by the European Commission, which launched an infringement procedure against Poland earlier this month, was "particularly relevant to the case". As a result of the ruling, the High Court can make its own finding on whether to proceed with the extradition.

Mr Celmer's solicitor, Ciarán Mulholland, said: I believe that this case has catalysed the debate on the stability and future of the European Union since the Brexit referendum result in the UK. Consequently, these landmark proceedings have drawn interest throughout Europe and further afield. My sole interest is to ensure the protection of Mr Celmer's basic human rights as enshrined within the EU pursuant to the European Convention on Human Rights. He added: "I am in no doubt that there is a very real risk that my client would suffer a breach of his fundamental right to a fair trial in Poland. This is clearly evident from the shocking comments that have been aired by Government figures against Mr Celmer. These views are clearly in conflict with the concept of the presumption of innocence and the inherent right to a fair and just hearing.

Access to Social Justice for Migrant & Refugee Peoples in the UK

UK to go on Trial for Violations of the Rights of Migrants and Refugees. The judgment of an international Tribunal can be a powerful voice for change, and in preparation for the hearing of the Permanent Peoples' Tribunal on violations of migrants' and refugees' rights, which is taking place in London in November, this message is a call to migrant and refugee groups and to unions, civil society and church groups to support the Tribunal and above all, to submit evidence to it. The focus at that PPT Hearing will be on the violation of rights to livelihood and the facilitation of the exploitation of migrants and refugees as workers, in the UK chain of labour. Permanent Peoples' Tribunal (PPT) – To Sit in London – November 2018

PPT the international public opinion tribunal established in the 1970s to draw attention to human rights violations worldwide, is scheduled to hear evidence from UK migrant and refugee rights organisations, trades unions, civil society support groups and others to lay out clearly the effects of restrictive visa policies, extortionate fees, the ban on work for asylum seekers, employer sanctions, the right to rent, as well as the virtual abolition of legal aid and of appeals, and all the other policies which make it impossible for people to remain without working and simultaneously criminalise work, forcing people into precarious and illegal work. It is also a platform for the celebration of resistance – the migrant-led strikes and the campaigns which have forced a retreat on some Theresa May's 'hostile environment' policies. The London Tribunal will focus on the rights of migrants in the chain of labour, violations and resistance.

In seven charges, the Indictment lays out the responsibility of the British government (in its own right and as a member of the EU) for neglecting the rights of the domestic workforce and for the creation of an underclass of super-exploited, disposable, deportable workers.

1. The Defendant government has abdicated its international law obligations to protect

workers and ensure decent working conditions and fair pay. It has enabled the entrenchment of exploitative labour practices and oppressive labour conditions in both the public and the private sector by repeatedly refusing pay rises to public sector workers while allowing managers to take obscenely high salaries; refusing to adopt a genuine living wage; failing to enforce minimum wage and other labour protection vigorously; encouraging or condoning companies' use of zero-hours contracts, manipulation of 'self-employed' status, agency working, undermining of the right to organise and other actions which deny rights and protections to workers and employees.

2. Within an impoverished and insecure workforce, it has ensured that migrant and refugee workers often remain super-exploited, marginalised and deprived of rights by legal and operational measures including: (i) Failure (in common with virtually the whole of the global North) to sign or ratify the UN Migrant Workers' Convention; (ii) Failure (unlike many other states in the Global North) to ratify the ILO Domestic Workers' Convention, and the removal of rights and security from domestic workers; (iii) Legislation imposing employer sanctions for bosses employing undocumented workers, enforced by violent raids on, in particular, small ethnic minority employers, who can be fined up to £20,000 and even imprisoned for employing an undocumented migrant or refugee worker; (iv) The creation of the criminal offence of illegal working, under the Immigration Act 2016, which allows for the confiscation of workers' wages; (v) The denial and/ or restriction of rights to work for asylum seekers; (vi) Maintenance of a legal framework which excludes undocumented workers from protection against abuses including non-payment of wages, unfair dismissal and race and sex discrimination, which are particularly rife in the hospitality, leisure, service, agriculture and construction sectors; (vii) Failure to provide sufficient resources for the Gangmasters and Labour Abuse Authority (GLAA) to enforce decent conditions of work; (viii) Failure to provide legal aid in employment-related cases, and the removal of public funding for advice and assistance in these cases; (ix) Combining enforcement visits by GLAA with immigration enforcement; (x) Removal of European Economic Area (EAA) nationals who are destitute and who cannot find work; (xi) The exemption of immigration removal centres from minimum wage legislation, enabling multinational security companies to profit both from the detention contracts and from the cheap labour of detainees.

3. Meanwhile, the Defendant's policies with regard to immigration and asylum have fostered racism, Islamophobia and nativism, and have deliberately created a 'hostile environment' for non-citizens which involves (in addition to the criminalisation of work) enforced destitution, denial of rights to housing and essential medical treatment, indefinite detention and deportation. These policies violate international human rights obligations to protect rights to life, to dignity, to physical and psychological integrity, to respect for private and family life, to liberty, and to protection from forced labour and from inhuman and degrading treatment. This has been achieved through: (i) Increasingly restrictive visa policies which limit legal rights to enter and stay in the UK for work (for non-EEA or third-country nationals) to a small and diminishing number of highly qualified or corporate employees, with extortionate fees for issue and renewal; (ii) Immigration rules and Home Office policy which treat domestic workers as the property of their employers; (iii) The provision of no-choice, often squalid asylum accommodation to asylum seekers, who are required to live on an impossibly small weekly allowance; (iv) Legislation requiring private landlords and agents to check immigration status before renting out accommodation; (v) Legislation and policy that denies most refused asylum seekers, and undocumented migrants, any benefits or support, as well as any except emergency NHS hospital care; (vi) The entrenchment of racialised viewpoints about migrants in the control system to the point that people of colour resident for decades are exposed to the suspicion of having no lawful right to reside, denied essential services, and threatened with enforced removal; (vii) The removal of legal aid for non-asylum immigration cases;

4. The Defendant, by policies which make it impossible to live without working and simultaneously making work illegal, forces vulnerable people to accept conditions of super-exploitation and total insecurity as the price of remaining in the country, and enables private companies to profit from such super-exploitation.

5. Additionally, while EU free movement law recognises the importance of family unity for EEA nationals who move in order to work, the Defendant's family reunion rules for non-EEA nationals (whether they are admitted as workers or as refugees) are extremely restrictive and result in long-term separation of families.

6. These policies also work to the detriment of the rights of children, who are exposed to risks of exploitation and abuse when they attempt to migrate in their own right, or to hardship and destitution as a consequence of policies which deny public funds support to family migrants.

7. At the same time, the Defendant government, in its own right and as an EU member state, facilitates the making of vast profits by security corporations through contracts for the border security regime, the housing of asylum seekers and for the detention and deportation of migrants, while overlooking or condoning brutality, racism and other human rights violations, criminal offences, fraud and negligence, committed by their agents against migrants and refugees, in fact rewarding them through the continuing award of such contracts.

Reputation Arsonists and Court Redress

A long hot British summer – as infrequent as these may be – is quite capable of bringing out the best (and worst) in some people. It is a chance to soak up the rays at the beach or in the local park. It is a chance, after months of cold winds and incessant rain, to enjoy sitting outside in the garden. On the other hand, some plants wilt, the grass turns brown, the tree leaves turn to crisps and, just as predictably, one or more criminally-minded arsonists will deliberately start fires, regardless of the risk to wildlife, property, livestock and, above all, fellow human beings.

As we watch television images of the wildfires consuming thousands of acres of Saddleworth Moor, police are investigating whether arson may have been involved. It is difficult for most of us to imagine the thought processes of the ignorant, reckless few who feel compelled to start these fires.

Some of these morons are innately cruel, while there are others who are believed by psychiatrists to get a form of sexual thrill from watching the world around them go up in smoke and flames (generally from a safe distance, of course). No doubt, if a fire-fighter or an innocent person or animal in the fire's compass is killed or seriously injured, the conscience of the perpetrator won't be much troubled.

Ask the general public their views and I'd be prepared to bet that 99.99% of those polled would condemn these twisted fire starters as coming from the bottom rung of civilised society and that they are deserving of exemplary punishment when (or if) apprehended. In fact, the criminal offence of arson is considered so serious that the maximum penalty is life imprisonment. I'm reliably informed that convicted arsonists are regarded within the prison system as being so dangerous that certain open prisons refuse to accept them owing to the potential risk they pose to life and property.

However, there is an equally serious form of fire starting that seems to be much less open to social condemnation, regardless of the devastation and human misery that it can cause: I believe I've even coined a phrase for it: 'reputation arson'. The 'reputation arsonist' sets out, often with malicious glee, to destroy the good name – and life – of his or her chosen victim (or victims).

In the past this could be achieved only by spreading vicious, untrue gossip in the local neighbourhood. Occasionally, anonymous poison pen letters would have been written and distributed, but the reach was limited. Despite this, terrible damage could still be wrought.

Today, the effects are much worse due to social media platforms – and some elements of the traditional media – which are being misused to inflict far greater, lasting injury on victims. The most obscene, vile lies can be invented and passed on to an audience of thousands, or even millions, at the click of a mouse. Disgusting conspiracy theories can be propagated as 'fact', without a shred of truth or evidence, putting lives at risk. Yet, popular services such as Twitter and Facebook seem unable – or unwilling – to tackle the phenomenon of the 'reputation arsonists'. And unlike the traditional poison pen letter, the most blatant lies can remain visible online forever.

These devious, malicious 'reputation arsonists' light a fake fire under an innocent person and subsequently smear that target by claiming, "There's no smoke without fire." In common with the reckless arsonist who sets fires with matches or lighters, these amoral, cruel individuals who target others with their filthy lies and distortions seem to get some kind of perverted thrill out of the destruction of their targets. They revel in watching that person's life's work and reputation burn to ashes in public, egged on by a ragbag of nasty cheerleaders, who race to join the online assault. In many cases, members of these unholy alliances have never met the intended victim. In the case of celebrities or people in public life, they may have seen them on television or read about them online or in the press, but their personal knowledge of the individual and of his or her family is likely to be zero. Yet the 'reputation arsonists' are more than happy to throw around terms of abuse such as 'nonce', 'paedo', 'pervert', 'rapist' and worse. Their only aim is to cause hurt, personal injury and the maximum reputational damage.

Very few of these twisted characters are ever brought to justice. They rely on the fact that most of their victims will not take civil action for defamation owing to the prohibitive cost of seeking redress in the High Court, which can easily run to hundreds of thousands of pounds. Everyone knows that libel proceedings are a game for only the very wealthy. Yet, why should only the super-rich and famous be able to defend their reputations from vile, unscrupulous liars, greedy fraudsters, sexual fantasists and twisted, obsessive slanderers? Surely everyone, no matter how 'ordinary', is entitled to enjoy his or her good name and reputation, unless proven otherwise in a court of law?

So here is an idea: perhaps we'd benefit from the equivalent of the Small Claims Court to deal with defamers: the burden of proof would be on those publishing or promoting these allegations to prove to a civil standard that what they have published is fact or fair comment. I'm sure the prospect of having to stand up in public and explain to a judge on what basis they have published such vile accusations would concentrate their (usually limited) minds wonderfully. "And what evidence do you have that this could be true?" the judge might enquire.

Repeating some libellous drivel they've picked up from some online forum or twitter exchange or lies they've read on some anonymous conspiracy-loon website really won't convince a civil court that there is a scintilla of truth in the smears they have been peddling. Like most untutored bullies, they will doubtless crack under the slightest pressure to prove that what they have written is actually true (pay attention the vile troll, who's never met me, but who posted the charming assertion: 'What the fuck? He's fucking guilty!' shortly after a unanimous jury had acquitted me in a matter of minutes at the conclusion of my farcical trial in 2014).

Damages could be capped at a maximum of £10,000 (as in the existing Small Claims Court). This would be sufficient in most cases to discourage social media trolls & reputation destroyers from posting any old vile rubbish they can think up. It would be vital to keep any

legal costs to a minimum, so the multitude of non-celebrities who are targeted can seek justice. And if judgement is given against the defamer and an appropriate award made by a judge, then let the High Court bailiffs loose with warrants to execute. The prospect of having a pair of burly, unsmiling court officers turning up on the doorstep with a hefty bill and the legal power to seize goods, and even property, might serve as a genuine deterrent to any twisted 'reputation arsonist' who is tempted to spread smears and lies. The message needs to go out that online targeting of innocent individuals and the spreading of malicious allegations and lies is never a 'victimless' crime.

Social media mobbing and twisted 'reputation arsonists' wreck human lives and I know from first-hand experience can even lead to suicide. Whole families, including young children, can have their lives devastated by these vicious libel peddlers. We often hear politicians and campaigners talking in the national media about cleaning up the internet, cracking down on bullies and generally making it a safer place. If we really are serious, then notorious libellers and persistent 'reputation arsonists' need to be made accountable for their crimes. Let's make them think twice before they light the next fire under an innocent victim.

Rashan Charles: Why Ex-Met Officer Great-Uncle Rejects Inquest Verdict

Sarah Marsh and Diane Taylor: Rod Charles understands the issue of police constraint more than most. He is a retired chief inspector, having served for 30 years. He is also the great-uncle of Rashan Charles, 20, who died in an incident involving restraint by a police officer last July. He describes the revelation that 23 people died during or after a period in police custody in England and Wales 2017 – the highest number for a decade – as "sad but not shocking. I know that there will be circumstances when police officers and other law enforcement must use the highest levels of force and sometimes it will culminate in death ... but there have been too many cases where people died and none of them merited the highest levels of force. There was Sean Rigg, Roger Sylvester, Edson Da Costa, Rashan Charles ... I could go on," he says.

He also raises doubts over the impartiality of the Independent Office for Police Conduct (IOPC), which compiled the report. "I am not sceptical about the figures but I am worried as to the manner [in which] those cases were investigated ... It's not yet been proven whether the IOPC can function as a separate independent investigative body." More than anything, Charles fears that without drastic change such deaths will continue to happen. "Deaths in custody are going to rise. I am not being melodramatic, I don't want to be proven right, but know I am going to be," he says. The reason for this, he believes, is that officers are not being held to account for gross mistakes. "It's as simple as that ... what must take place is to scrutinise the actions of law enforcement officers and hold them to account."

The former chief inspector agreed with the assessment of the IOPC that the crisis in mental health care provision had made the problem worse, though he stressed that it failed to account for the circumstances of many of the deaths. He said: "The responsibility for care and management of people suffering poor mental health should sit with health care specialists. However, for decades this has been shifted on to police, who do not have the depth or breath of specialist training needed for this caring role. These risks have been obvious for several years now. It is not fair on those that are unwell who require support for mental health, neither is it fair to foist this responsibility on to the police service. However, austerity and a crisis in mental health do not explain many other cases where otherwise sound and fit people are reported as becoming 'unwell' following police contact, and a short time later, life is pronounced extinct."

Last month an inquest determined Rashan Charles's death was an accident. It also identified mistakes by the police officer, referred to as BX47, but concluded they were not significant and Rashan's life was not salvageable in any event. His great-uncle does not accept the verdict and findings. "Before the inquest sat, before the coroner and jury were sworn in, I went on the record to make clear that this case is going to be a farce and the outcome was already predetermined," he says. The reason I made those statements was that I was patently aware that in the 10 to 11 months preceding it there were significant flaws with the standard of investigation identified and raised with the lead investigator in the IPCC/IOPC," he says, in reference to the Independent Police Complaints Commission, the IOPC's predecessor. Rod Charles believes deaths involving restraint such as that of his great-nephew will only rise

Public Left in the Dark About Financial Crime Prosecutions

Rahul Rose, 'The Justice Gap': Earlier this year a crown court dismissed fraud charges against Barclays, dealing a potentially fatal blow to the only UK prosecution of a bank for financial crisis-era wrongdoing. Due to restrictions on media reporting, the reasons for the dismissal are unknown, meaning the public has been left in the dark about why the UK's most significant financial crime prosecution of the past decade has collapsed.

Unfortunately, such secrecy is commonplace in major economic crime cases where linked trials are the norm and judges are fearful of jury prejudice. Indeed, a recent report by my organisation Corruption Watch found that reporting restrictions are far more common in economic crime cases than in other types of criminal proceedings. The majority of foreign bribery trials that have come to court in the past two years have been covered by orders limiting press coverage. The Serious Fraud Office, which is often widely criticised when its cases fail to yield results, is also unable to publicise two major corporate convictions due to blanket reporting restrictions.

In July 2018, Alison Levitt QC, who is being tipped by some to be the next director of public prosecutions, said at an event at the Bingham Centre in London that the judiciary seems to be 'much more sensitive' about juries being prejudiced in economic crime cases compared to other types of criminal proceeding. Levitt noted that the Court of Appeal has repeatedly held that juries can be expected to follow judicial directions not to read media reports, including in highly publicised cases involving preacher Abu Hamza and the murderers of Stephen Lawrence. However, she said that in comparison, judges in less high-profile economic crime cases often diverge from the line of the Court of Appeal, opting for a stricter approach and imposing reporting restrictions that curb freedom of expression. The over-use of such restrictions is just the tip of the iceberg. Inadequate court lists, which are designed to inform the public when and where cases are being heard, are also seriously undermining transparency in economic crime cases.

Last year a major corruption trial of a World Bank consultant received no contemporaneous coverage in the national media despite revealing details of flagrant and large-scale wrongdoing. During the trial, the jury heard that the consultant took over 60 separate bribes to steer numerous multi-million dollar contracts in some of the world's poorest countries. Court lists contain so little information that the national media simply did not know that a trial of significant public interest was taking place. In the past year alone, two major corruption trials as well as an internationally significant judicial review have not been covered contemporaneously by the press due to poor court lists.

Even when the press are aware of and able to report on a court case, it is likely that they will find it difficult to do so owing to the inaccessibility of even the most basic court documents. Despite the Court of Appeal stating that documents should by default be accessible by

the public, they cannot generally be obtained in criminal cases without instructing counsel. In civil cases, 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 court documents from any US federal court, which are available online, than from the Royal Courts of Justice in London.

Urgent reform is needed to bring greater openness to economic crime cases as well as the wider court system. At the very least, the government should introduce an online platform for public access to court documents, as well as provide more detailed court lists and ensure that the media is being given sufficient advance notification of reporting restriction applications. It's worth noting that in many cases, court documents are already available online for lawyers instructed in proceedings. The ongoing £1 billion transformation of the court system represents a once in a generation opportunity for implementing these open justice reforms.

However, at present the government is only taking tentative steps towards greater transparency. Civil servants have been instructed to focus largely on maintaining current levels of open justice during the £1 billion reform, and only if possible to introduce improvements. A recent Ministry of Justice consultation on the future of the court system also made no mention of the term 'open justice'. It seems that the type of full-bodied reform needed to bring proper transparency to the courts is not a priority for this government. This is puzzling as the benefits of open justice are widely noted and uncontroversial, whether it be fuller confidence in the rule of law, better quality investigative journalism or a sharpening of the deterrent effect of court sanctions in economic crime cases. In the words of Lord Shaw the principle of open justice is a 'sound and very sacred part of the constitution of the country'. The government should not lose sight of this.

Legal Challenge Over Police Facial Recognition Technology

Duncan Lewis: Automatic facial recognition (AFR) technology uses CCTV and other video surveillance to determine the assumed identity of an offender. Whilst this appears to be in the public interest, many are being wrongly targeted and asked to prove their identity as a result of its use. Civil liberties group Big Brother Watch's legal representatives have argued that the very use of AFR is in breach of Article 8 and 10 of the Human Rights Act 1998, in that it intrudes on freedom of expression and a person's right to a private life. Big Brother Watch are bringing the challenge after receiving £5000 in crowd funding alongside Baroness Jenny Jones who was targeted by AFR herself. She was routinely monitored going about her daily business because she claims that her photograph is on file in police database for 'domestic extremism'. She has this to say: "The idea that citizens should all become walking ID cards is really the antithesis to democratic freedom. Facial recognition surveillance is likely to impact on my political work..."

At present, AFR is still in its pilot stage, with the Met, Humberside, Leicestershire and South Wales police forces implementing it as part of the trial. It works by taking the 'real time' shots recorded by video surveillance and comparing them with photographs held in the police database. Where a match is identified, that individual will be pursued and asked to prove their identity. So far, the technology has failed to provide satisfactory results, with only two recorded matches out of more than 100 alerts according to Met records. Even when a match is proved to be false, the police are in the practice of storing biometric photos for up to a year without the individual's consent. This means that many individuals who have had their mug shot taken in police custody are made targets for investigation, potentially risking them being put forward as a

suspect. Ultimately, this could result in injustice, not only intruding on innocent parties' private lives, but wasting police time in the process. As part of the trial, Met police officers targeted some 31 individuals, asking them to prove their identity. It was concluded that they had been wrongly identified in connection to the crimes. Big Brother Watch warn that this is exactly what is to come nationwide, should the technology be distributed across the UK after the trial period ends. There is a worry that should it pass the pilot, it will be considered on the same level as other methods of identification in criminal cases, including finger prints and DNA evidence.

Dr Suzanne Shale, chair of the London Policing Ethics Panel, assures that there are still many hurdles to get past before it will be widely used by forces across the UK, reminding of the importance to keep AFR "the subject of ethical scrutiny." It has been used at a number of popular locations so far, including Notting Hill Carnival and Remembrance Sunday in 2017, and it was recently implemented in Westfield shopping centre.

The legal challenge being brought is intended to halt the use of the technology until it can be properly considered by parliament, the police and Home Office, to properly assess whether it is suitable to be used as part of criminal investigations. Crime Director and Solicitor, Rubin Italia predicted that such a trial would be subject to legal challenge; "The findings of the trial should be examined in detail. If the technology is inconsistent, then it should be shelved until such time as it's improved. If anyone is stopped on the basis of flawed technology it risks undermining confidence in the police and the criminal justice system as a whole." In the extreme scenario that a person is identified as an offender through a false positive match and arrested for a crime they did not commit, instructing an expert criminal defence solicitor at the earliest opportunity is imperative.

IOPC Omits 3 Contentious Deaths From Record-Breaking Count Of Deaths In Custody

Open Democracy: Three young black men who died during or after police restraint are not included in the latest official count of "deaths in or following police custody". The three are Rashan Charles, Shane Bryant and Edson Da Costa. But none of the them are among the 23 recorded "deaths in or following police custody", the IOPC confirmed today. Responding to questions from Shine A Light, an IOPC spokesman explained: "Because Rashan Charles was never actually arrested and read his rights, he will not be one of the 23. It's because of the way we define 'in custody'." Asked to specify why Shane Bryant and Edson Da Costa were not included in the headline figure, the IOPC said that their deaths also did not meet the IOPC's definition. Instead, the deaths of Rashan Charles, Shane Bryant and Edson Da Costa are listed among the 170 "other deaths. . . following contact with the police in a wide range of circumstances". That category of deaths rose from 132 in the previous year, a 29 per cent rise. The IOPC said that the steep rise reflected its increased capacity to carry out investigations.

Man Found Not Guilty by Reason of Insanity of Assaulting Judge

Scottish Legal News: A severely autistic Dublin man has been found not guilty by reason of insanity of assaulting a judge after a court hearing. Sean Winters, 34, with an address on Grange Road, Baldoyle, had pleaded not guilty to assaulting Judge Miriam Walsh causing her harm at a court in Dublin on December 11, 2015. Giving evidence during the two-day trial, Dr Anthony Kearns told the court that in his opinion Mr Winters was unable to refrain from the assault because of his mental disorder. Dr Kearns, a consultant forensic psychiatrist, said Mr Winters would have "found the formality of court proceedings extremely stressful". Consultant forensic psychiatrist Dr Ronan Mullaney told Paul Carroll SC, defending, that Mr Winters

was "emotionally dysregulated" at the time and "triggered into an act of unpremeditated and serious physical aggression". Dr Mullaney said it was his opinion that a special verdict of not guilty by reason of insanity should be entered. The jury of nine men and three women returned this verdict unanimously at Dublin Circuit Criminal Court. Judge Walsh told Maurice Coffey BL, prosecuting, that Mr Winters approached her bench after a court hearing and "reigned punches" on her back, shoulder, chest and stomach. She said he "continued kicking relentlessly" as she was in a foetal position on the floor. The judge told the court she was in a complete state of shock after Mr Winters was pulled off her. She said she went to hospital afraid her ribs were broken as she could hardly breathe. X-ray results showed no bones were broken and Judge Walsh was sent home with painkilling medication.

Dr Kearns told Mr Coffey that Mr Winters had a deficiency in social understanding and poor understanding of other people's viewpoints because of his Autism Spectrum Disorder. He said the man, though fit to stand trial, was unable to refrain from carrying out the assault at the time. Dr Mullaney told the court he agreed with Dr Kearns that Winters needed specialist support for his own quality of life and his and others' safety. He said although Mr Winters was intelligent, he s unable to manage independent living. Judge Cormac Quinn made an order committing Mr Winters to the Central Mental Hospital in Dundrum, Dublin , pending an updated psychiatric report.

Idaho Inmates Hack Prison System and Steal $225,000 In Credits

Hundreds of Idaho prison inmates have hacked jail software to "artificially" boost the amount of money in their own accounts, officials say. The Idaho Department of Corrections said 364 inmates were "intentionally exploiting a vulnerability" to take nearly $225,000 (£171,000). Fifty prisoners credited their accounts with more than $1,000 each while another inmate transferred $9,990.

A prisons spokesman said the "improper conduct involved no taxpayer dollars". In a statement to BBC News, Idaho Department of Correction spokesman Jeff Ray said the inmates had hacked the JPay system. JPay is a private firm that allows US prisoners access to portable devices which can transfer money, download music and games, and exchange communications with family members. Mr Ray said the inmates had manipulated the JPay system so it would increase the amount of money credited to them. No funds from any individual or institution were transferred into the prisoners' accounts.

"This conduct was intentional, not accidental," said Mr Ray. "It required a knowledge of the JPay system and multiple actions by every inmate who exploited the system's vulnerability to improperly credit their account." Prisoners from four state institutions and one private prison were discovered to have taken part in the scheme earlier this month. In a statement to the Associated Press (AP), JPay spokeswoman Jade Trombetta said the company "is proud to provide services that allow incarcerated individuals to communicate with friends and family, access educational programming, and enjoy positive entertainment options that help prevent behavioural issues". "While the vast majority of individuals use our secure technology appropriately, we are continually working to improve our products to prevent any attempts at misuse."

Mark Molzen, a spokesman for internet provider CenturyLink, which supports JPay, said the vulnerability in the software had been fixed but declined to explain how the transfers occurred. JPay has so far recovered more than $65,000 worth of credits from the prisoners. They have been suspended from downloading music and games until they pay the company for its losses, but they are still able to send and receive emails. The Idaho Department of Corrections has also issued disciplinary reports to the inmates that were involved, meaning that they would lose certain privileges and be reclassified to a higher security risk level.

Goodyear Hearing: the Legal Deal Which Prevents A Full Trial

A Goodyear Hearing allows the defence to request an indication of the likely maximum sentence should the defendants plead guilty. The principle was established in a 2005 corruption case against sub-contractor Karl Goodyear at Doncaster Crown Court. Goodyear's co-defendant in the case had already pleaded guilty and his barrister told the court that Goodyear was "eager" for his own case not to go to trial. He asked for an indication of the sentence he would receive and this was granted. Goodyear hearings can only take place if requested by the defence. And the basis of the plea should be accepted by the prosecution and the defence before the judge gives his indication. It can take place at any stage of criminal proceedings including, convictions, at trial. The judge can refuse the application. However, if the he decides to give an indication of the maximum sentence at a Goodyear hearing he is then confined to sticking to that sentence if a guilty plea is offered at that stage in the proceedings. He cannot pass a longer sentence.

Newton Hearing

A Newton hearing or inquiry is a comparatively modern legal procedure in English law, used where the two sides offer such conflicting evidence that a judge sitting alone (that is, without a jury) tries to ascertain which party is telling the truth. They are generally used when a defendant pleads guilty to an offence (as in R v Newton itself), but there are factual issues (relating, for example, to the appropriate sentence) that need to be resolved between the prosecution and defence. The name stems from a 1983 case, R v Newton, in which the defendant admitted buggery but claimed his wife had given her consent. The Court of Appeal ruled that in such cases there were three ways of resolving the issue. It may be possible to obtain the answer from a Jury by directing them to consider whether there is the necessary intent for a specific offence or whether a lesser offence which does not require intent is made out. If that is not possible then either. 1.Evidence could be heard from both sides and a conclusion reached on the matter which was the root of the problem, or 2. No evidence heard but submissions analysed and, where a substantial doubt still persisted, benefit be given to the defendant. The Newton Hearing itself operates like a "mini trial", with a judge deciding the disputed points based upon testimony and submissions, rather than a jury. The burden of proof is on the prosecution, who must prove their case beyond reasonable doubt.

For a defendant, there is a balance of risk and benefit to consider. As the Newton hearing takes court time, resources, and perhaps witness testimony, if unsuccessful it will reduce any sentencing credit that might otherwise have been obtained. This aspect has been criticized, on the basis that no such risk exists for the prosecutors, and therefore the Newton Hearing could "allow unrealistic, bullying or foolhardy prosecutors to force defendants to choose between having a Newton hearing and playing it safe". In this sense a Newton hearing may be seen as stacked heavily against a defendant, who must prove the entirety of their concern in order not to suffer from it: "The practice operates as a disincentive to opt for a Newton hearing. Many defence advocates avoid Newton hearings because, unless they are resolved entirely in the defendant's favour, some credit is likely to be lost and it may be that any gains made by the Newton hearing are swallowed up (or worse, outweighed) by the reduction in credit... There is no "remission" for being successful in part, save that the credit for pleading was not reduced further. In the situation where D has required the prosecution to prove its assertions to the criminal standard and the result has been a success and a defeat on each side, why should D be punished, and the prosecution not? Is it not D's right to require such assertions to be proved? The situation appears to be stacked against the defence, to induce acquiescence where arguments may legitimately be taken against the prosecution".

When Murder Investigations Go Wrong – A Defence Lawyer's perspective – part 1

The unprecedented number of murders in London have led to much comment about the cause of such violence on our street. However, we should also consider the strain and pressure that this spree will place on the criminal justice system. Having defended in a number of murders in the capital and beyond, Raj Chada, in a series of articles looks at the issues that arise in murder investigations, how it can go wrong and the need for an active defence with forensic scrutiny. In the first article, Raj looks at DNA evidence….

The mere presence of DNA does not prove a crime happened or that there was a particular participant to that crime. The DNA does not tell you how or when the material got to its discovered location. Contrary to Hollywood crime show (and at times UK Prosecutors) oversimplifications, DNA is not a synonym for "guilty." Make no mistake though, in straightforward cases, DNA evidence is regarded as the "gold standard" in forensics work. This is because forensics can compare the DNA of a suspect with the DNA recovered at the scene and produce a statistical analysis of whether the samples "match". However things are much more complicated when DNA comes from a small amount of material (low trace DNA) or where there is DNA of multiple individuals.

Despite Court of Appeal decisions that say that these forensic reports are admissible, there are still many issues that Defence lawyers have to grapple with. Firstly, there is an issue of whether DNA could have been "transferred" to the scene. This has been particularly highlighted by scientists such as Professor Jamieson as a risk in low trace DNA cases. This issue has also been explored extensively by Greg Hampkian in the US. Hampkian is a researcher at Boise State University and head of the Idaho Innocence Project. He produced reports for the defence in the notorious Amanda Knox case in Italy that eventually led to her conviction being overturned. In one reported study, Hampkian conducted an interesting experiment with his students. They collected five soda cans from the University Dean's Office. They put the cans in individual evidence bags. Then, without changing gloves, they put five newly bought knives into separate evidence bags. They found DNA from a member of the Dean's staff on one of the blades – yet that person had not touched nor even been in the same room with the knives. The risk of DNA transfer or contamination in low trace DNA cases would appear to be real.

DNA analysis can become even trickier when a mix of DNA from various individuals are found in a single crime scene, With a simple sample, analysts look at two sets of peaks at a given locus; one for the victim and one for the perpetrator. With mixtures, they are looking at a mix of peaks, with no indications of which pairs go together, or which source they come from – aside from those known victim. At that point, the analysis becomes highly subjective. Another US expert, Michael Coble, National Institute of Standards and Technology in Gaithersburg, in Maryland, US set up a hypothetical scenario in which a mix of DNA from several people had been found on a ski mask left at a crime scene after a series of robberies. Coble asked 108 labs across the US to determine whether a separate DNA sample, which he posed had come from a suspect in the robberies was also part of the mix. 73 labs got it wrong, saying that the suspect's DNA was part of the mix, when, in fact it was not.

There is a risk in murder investigation that DNA is regarded as the problem solver and that no further investigation is required. Indeed it risks lazy prosecution and demands active defence. Human error, contamination and transfer all must be explored. A thorough analysis of the prosecution's forensic report is also required. It should be noted that the in the cases already cited such as R v Dlugosz, the Court of Appeal accepted that DNA could be admissible – even where due to a "mixed sample", the expert could not say, in statistical analysis exercise that the

DNA was attributable to an individual. Instead, due to the mixed sample, an expert could only provide a subjective opinion based on his/her experience. This is a far cry from the "gold standard" that DNA analysis began with.

Again, the US is perhaps already further ahead of us in recognising the dangers. The President's Council of Advisors on Science and Technology (PCAST) is an advisory group of leading scientists and engineers, appointed by the President of the US. In September 2016 PCAST released a critique of several methods used in forensic science – including in mixed DNA samples. The PCAST report said that "expert witnesses have often overstated the probative value of their evidence, going far beyond what the relevant science can justify". Further that "subjective methods require particularly careful scrutiny because their heavy reliance on human judgement means that they are especially vulnerable to human error, inconsistency across examiners and cognitive bias". There is a specific concern raised about the interpretation of mixed samples DNA, even where software programs are used to assist. As with much else in murder cases, DNA analysis require careful and forensic scrutiny – it should never be accepted as a given.

Black Teenage Boys More Likely to Get Maximum Jail Terms Than White Children

May Bulman, Independent: The justice system is disproportionately handing out harsher sentences to black children convicted of homicide compared with their white peers, an investigation by The Independent has revealed. Analysis of figures for 2009-17 shows one in four black teenage boys guilty of manslaughter were given maximum jail terms, while white children found guilty of the same crime were sentenced to no more than 10 years, with the majority getting less than four. The findings have prompted anger from MPs and campaigners who argue "cumulative" racial discrimination within policing and the judiciary means black young offenders are subjected to harsher punishments and therefore have worse life chances.

It will fuel concerns over racial bias in the justice system after a major review by David Lammy last year found that black people were four times more likely to be in prison in England and Wales than their proportion of the population would suggest. The new analysis shows that black teenagers guilty of homicide – of which there were 73 between 2009 and 2017 – were considerably more likely than their white counterparts to be convicted of murder, which always led to a life sentence. The majority (52 per cent) of white teenagers in this cohort – of which there were 102 – were convicted of manslaughter, which usually led to a shorter jail term, while this applied to just 30 per cent of black children. There were further discrepancies among the children convicted of manslaughter, with 23 per cent of those who were black sentenced to more than 10 years or life, while no white teenager was sentenced to more than a decade.

Five per cent of black children got less than four years, compared with more than half (51 per cent) of their white peers. Responding to the findings, Labour MP David Lammy told The Independent: "Clearly when someone commits a crime, they need to be punished. However, we cannot have one rule for one group of people and a different rule for another group of people," he said. "As I found in my 2017 review of the criminal justice system, some of the difference in sentencing is the result of a 'trust deficit'. Many BAME defendants simply still do not believe that the justice system will deliver less punitive treatment if they plead guilty. "It's vital that all parts of the criminal justice system work hard to address these discrepancies, so that the same crime leads to the same sentence, regardless of ethnicity."

Zubaida Haque, deputy director at the Runnymede Trust, said the reason for these discrepancies were complex, but that black teenagers were facing "cumulative" discrimination within policing and the judiciary, with "harrowing" consequences. "Black teenagers are facing discrimination the moment they have contact with the police, and it continues when they're in front of judges and juries. The gang affiliations, the assumptions – black boys are more likely to be considered suspects," she said. "It's difficult to say where there is most discrimination, but we can say that small decisions have big impacts. It is cumulative. We know there are real racial inequalities in stop and search, and young black people are nine times more likely to be locked up."

The Lammy Review revealed a lack of ethnic diversity in the justice system, with 7 per cent of the judiciary from BAME background and just 6 per cent police and prison service, compared with 14 per cent of the general population. Ms Haque added: "When it comes to the court system, the Lammy Review showed black people were more likely to plead not guilty. And we know from court evidence that people who plead not guilty are more likely to get harsher sentences.

"What we don't know is why black people don't plead guilty. We suspect it's because they don't trust the criminal justice system – and why would they if they've been stopped more by the police? There are so many things that send a message to black people that they shouldn't trust authority." Ms Haque said the impact of sending any teenager to jail for more than 10 years or life was "harrowing", adding: "Until we address this head on, it's not going to change."

A Ministry of Justice spokesperson said: "Sentencing is a matter for our independent judges, who take into account the full facts of each case. "We remain absolutely committed to tackling racial disparity wherever it exists in our justice system.

Feeling Sheepish

A man took his pet sheep, 'Chops', into a Lidl in an attempt to persuade people not to buy lamb refused to leave, choosing instead to punch a store detective and strike him with a metal pole, a court heard. Andrew Meneice, 33, appeared at the store in County Antrim, Northern Ireland, last July. He pleaded guilty to resisting a police officer but contested charges relating to assaults on the store detective and being disorderly. At Coleraine Magistrates Court he was found guilty of one assault and of being disorderly. He was sentenced to four months' imprisonment but has appealed and was released on £500 bail. District Judge Liam McNally said: "You paraded around with a sheep, you were making comments about not buying Lidl lamb. You had no right to be in there with the sheep." Lidly store detective David Bennett told the court he saw a "male with a sheep on a lead" enter the supermarket and in the ensuing scuffle tackled him to the ground, prompting Meneice to threaten he would "kill" him. The judge noted that the sheep had begun nibbling at food as Meneice made "pedantic" comments about Lidl's animal policy. Judge McNally banned Meneice from taking Chops into Lidl and warned him that this didn't mean he could take the sheep to Tesco or Sainsbury's. The ban was extended to include any retail business except a "sheep mart".

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.