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 714 (07/11/2018) - Cost £1

Justice for the Birmingham Four - Khobaib, Naweed, Mohibur and Tahir

[Question: Would the West Midlands Police force 'Fit' a person/persons up for a crime they did not commit? Answer: Emphatically yes, the West Mids Police have a long history of fitting people up.]

Khobaib Hussain, Naweed Ali, Mohibur Rahman, and Tahir Aziz to Appeal Convictions

They maintained their innocence throughout their trial, claiming the incriminating evidence was planted by an undercover police officer known as Vincent, the boss of a fake firm called Hero Couriers. They are now seeking to overturn their convictions at the Court of Appeal, arguing their four-month trial was "unfair" because it was allowed to continue amid four separate UK terror attacks.

Lawyers for the four argued on Thursday 18/10/2018 that the trial should have been postponed following major incidents in Westminster, London Bridge, Manchester and Finsbury Park. Stephen Kamlish QC, for Ali, told senior judges the trial jury was likely to have found it impossible to consider the case properly in the circumstances. He said: "We say that resulted in them being unable to follow their oath - not because they were avoiding it, but because they just couldn't risk letting them [the defendants] go. All we asked for was an adjournment, we submit we should have got it." The lawyers also said it was "at least arguable" that the trial jury was "tainted" after one juror - who was discharged - asked if a detective involved in the case was single on behalf of another juror. Joel Bennathan QC, for Rahman, told the court it was clear one juror had "an affection at some level" for Detective Sergeant Ryan Chambers, which was "repeatedly pursued", and that the other jurors said nothing to court staff. He said: "It is beyond doubt this takes away any idea that they are a conscientious jury, properly equipped to deal with the seriousness of the task." The men's legal teams further argued that they should have been given more information about Vincent, and said Mr Justice Globe's summing up of the case was "biased" in relation to the undercover officer.

Lawyers for the Crown Prosecution Service opposed the appeals and argued there was no unfairness during the trial which was capable of rendering the convictions unsafe.

For full background read 'Inside Out' No 662' Letters of Solidarity/Support to:

Mohibur Rahman: A3480AZ, HMP Full Sutton, Stamford Bridge, YO4 1PS

Naweed Ali: A0531CJ, HMP Frankland, Brasside, DH1 5YD

Khobaib Hussain: A0537CJ, HMP Long Lartin, South Littleton, Evesham, WR11 8TZ

Tahir Aziz: A8301DV, HMP Whitemoor, Long Hill Road, March, PE15 0PR b

CCRC Refers Murder Conviction of Gordon Park to Court of Appeal

Gordon Park was convicted in January 2005 at Manchester Crown Court for the murder of his wife, Carol Park, 29 years after she went missing in the summer of 1976. He was sentenced to life imprisonment. Carol Park's body was found by amateur divers in Coniston Water, Cumbria, in 1997 and the case became known as the Lady in the Lake murder. (See below for a detailed chronology of the case). Mr Park appealed against his conviction but the appeal was dismissed in November 2008. Little over a year later, on 25 January 2010, he committed suicide in his cell at HMP Garth in Lancashire. In November 2010 members of Mr Park's family applied on his behalf to the CCRC.

Following an exhaustive investigation, the CCRC has decided to refer Mr Park's murder conviction for a fresh hearing at the Court of Appeal. The Commission is referring the case because it considers there is a real possibility that the Court will quash the conviction in light of new evidence. In the Commission's view that real possibility arises from the cumulative effect of a number of matters including: • the non-disclosure of expert opinion undermining the consistent implication by the prosecution that Gordon Park's climbing axe, Exhibit 1 at trial, could be the murder weapon. • the non-disclosure of information undermining the reliability of a prosecution witness who gave evidence of a prison confession. • new scientific evidence showing that Gordon Park was not a contributor to DNA preserved within knots of the rope used to bind Carol Park's body. • renewed relevance of expert evidence, presented for the appellant at the first appeal, that a rock found in the lake near Mrs Park's remains could not specifically be linked to rocks at Bluestones (the Parks' home).

The Commission's painstaking and detailed review has considered numerous issues and lines of enquiry and involved several visits to Cumbria, interviews with multiple witnesses old and new, the use of cutting edge DNA testing and the investigation of multiple potential alternative suspects. During the review we have used our section 17[1] powers dozens of times to obtain material from the Forensic Archive, seven individual police forces, the courts, the Crown Prosecution Service, prison authorities, the Probation Service, and a number of other government agencies and public bodies.

Chronology of the case: Carol Park went missing in the summer of 1976 having been last seen in mid-July. In August 1997 human remains were found by amateur scuba divers in Coniston Water, Cumbria. The remains were found at a depth of 24 metres, about 200 metres from eastern shore of the lake; they were tightly wrapped in bags and bound with knotted ropes. The body was later confirmed as that of Carol Park. Gordon Park was arrested following the discovery of the body and was charged with Carol Park's murder. The prosecution was discontinued in January 1998 on the basis that there was no realistic prospect of a conviction on the evidence then available.

New evidence came to light following the broadcast in September 2000 of a TV documentary called 'A Very British Murder[2]. Mr Park was arrested on 13 January 2004 and again charged with murdering Carol Park "on or about" Saturday 17 July 1976. Media coverage of his arrest generated new information which was used in the case against Mr Park. His trial at Manchester Crown Court began on 25 November 2004 and the jury heard evidence over 27 days. At 3.45pm on Friday 28 January 2005, after deliberating for nine hours and twenty-seven minutes, the jury, by a unanimous verdict, found Gordon Park 'guilty' of Carol Park's murder. He was sentenced to life imprisonment with a recommended minimum prison term of 15 years. Gordon Park's appeal against conviction was dismissed at the Court of Appeal in November 2008. On 25 January 2010, on his sixty-sixth birthday, Gordon Park took his own life in his cell at HMP Garth in Lancashire.

Members of Mr Park's family, aided by his legal representatives, applied to the Commission for a posthumous review of his conviction on November 2010. Mr Park's family were represented in their application to the CCRC by Mr Maslen Merchant of Hadgkiss, Hughes & Beale Solicitors.

Judge 'Staggered' by Prison's Decision to Deprive Elderly Accused Man of Wheelchair

Scottish Legal News: A judge has condemned a prison authority's decision to deprive an elderly accused man of a wheelchair. Seventy-seven-year-old Edward Cairney, who, along with Avril Jones, 58, is accused of murdering Margaret Fleming, was due to appear in court to apply for bail after their trial collapsed. The two deny murder. However, Mr Cairney was forced to remain in the G4S van in the car park of the High Court in Glasgow after HMP Greenock took his wheelchair. The prosecution argued that Ms Fleming was killed at the age of 19, between 18 December 1999 and 5

January 2000. Ms Jones was at the court, though she did not apply for bail. Lord Matthews said: "I'm staggered that the Scottish Prison Service think it appropriate to remove the wheelchair Mr Cairney has been using all this time. I want an explanation."

Thomas Ross QC said: "I would like to explain why Mr Cairney is not in the dock. Since he was fully committed he became the responsibility of the Scottish Prison Service. He is in the vicinity of this court in a van in the car park. When he was leaving Greenock Prison this morning the prison withdrew his wheelchair from him. The reason given was that it was expected that he would be granted bail and they were presumably concerned they wouldn't get their wheelchair back. They somehow managed to get him into the van at the prison, but G4S can't get him out this side."

The court was told there are no wheelchair facilities at the High Court. Conservative justice spokesman Liam Kerr MSP commented: "No matter the nature of the allegations, an accused has to be in court during proceedings against them. Everyone involved in a trial should only be focused on establishing the truth and not appropriate seating. It is highly impractical to delay a significant trial over the loan of a wheelchair, at cost to the public purse." Iain McSporran QC, prosecuting, said the Crown would not oppose bail for Ms Jones if she changes her mind. He added: "The Crown does intend to re-indict this case. A trial might take place in April next year. That is the current intention."

Deaths in Prison and Shortly After Release - Short Term Fixes Are Not Working

The Ministry of Justice has (25 October 2018) released the latest statistics on deaths and self-harm in prison custody and deaths of people ('offenders') in the community shortly after release from prison. Both sets of data show a rise in deaths, as numbers remain at historically high levels.

INQUEST casework and monitoring identifies repeated and systemic failings around communication, emergency responses, drugs and wider issues of mental ill-health and healthcare provision in prison. Less is known about the issues surrounding deaths of people on probation, which receive significantly less scrutiny.

The key findings on deaths in prison include: An 8% rise in deaths in custody, with 328 total deaths in the 12 months to September 2018. Overall deaths are at historically high levels, as detailed in INQUEST's rolling statistics. 87 of these deaths were self-inflicted, 4 of which were women. There were 68 deaths recorded as 'other', which await classification. This is more than double the 30 deaths recorded as 'other' in the 12 months to September 2017, and 33 'other' deaths the year before.

Additionally, self-harm in prison continues to rise, with a 20% rise in incidents from the previous year. Assaults and serious assaults have reached record levels, both on prisoners and staff. The data on 'Deaths of Offenders in the Community' looks at deaths of people supervised by the probation service both on post-release supervision and serving court orders. It shows there were 955 deaths of people on probation in the community in 2017-18. The comparable figure in 2010 was 110. The majority of deaths (659) were of people supervised by Community Rehabilitation Companies, a rise of 24%. 30% of the latest deaths of people under supervision were self-inflicted, 31% defined as natural causes and 26% remain unclassified. Rebecca Roberts, Head of Policy at INQUEST has wrote a recent analysis of deaths in the community, considering what the issues surrounding these deaths are.

Deborah Coles, Director of INQUEST said: "Self-inflicted deaths, homicides, self-harm, drugs and assaults are endemic in the prison system. This reflects a system in crisis, failing in its duty of care to staff and prisoners. At a time when scrutiny on prisons has never been higher, the prison system is failing. Short term fixes are not working. Ministerial focus on violence ignores the shocking death toll in our prisons, and the need for a radical overhaul. We need to tackle sentencing policy, reduce the prison population and redirect resources to community services. INQUEST is increasingly concerned about unclassified deaths, which have more than doubled this year. We urgently need to understand why. Deaths of people following release from prison and being supervised by CRCs are also rising. There is a resounding silence surrounding these deaths, which need and deserve proper scrutiny and investigation."

Sally Challen Appeal Hearing 28th November 2018

On 28th November, Sally Challen will appeal her conviction for the murder of her abusive husband Richard, relying on fresh evidence of 'coercive control'. This form of psychological abuse which can involve manipulation, isolation, degradation and gas-lighting (mind games causing the victim to doubt their own sanity) was dramatised to critical acclaim in Helen Archer's storyline in 2016, in Radio 4's The Archers, gaining widespread media coverage and raising public awareness. However, it is still largely misunderstood not only in wider society but also within the criminal justice system itself. Introduced to English Law in 2015, there have so far been very few convictions of the perpetrators of this form of abuse and female survivors such as those represented by Justice for Women are still persecuted in Court.

Arshole Born Again!

A man who allegedly dipped his rear end in a holy water fountain while high on meth has been arrested. Zachary Burdick, 21, is said to have disgraced himself in the Spirit of Life Church in Mandan, North Dakota during Mass on a Tuesday morning. Witnesses said he pulled off his clothes, began masturbating and then started to "splash around" in a holy water fountain. The church now faces a $500 bill to drain, clean and sanitise the foundation, KFYR-TV reports. Meanwhile, Burdick has been charged with criminal mischief, indecent exposure and ingestion of a controlled substance.

Three Police Officers Sacked For Lying In Julian Cole Case

Jon Robins, 'The Justice Gap': Three police officers involved in arresting a man left paralysed and brain-damaged have been sacked after being found guilty of gross misconduct. A police misconduct panel on Monday reached a verdict that four officers of the Berkshire Police Service – PC Hannah Ross, PC Nicholas Oates, PC Sanjeev Kalyan and PS Andrew Withey – lied about the circumstances around the arrest and detention of Julian Cole.

The incident happened in the early hours of the morning on May 6, 2013, when the 19 year old sports science student left Elements Nightclub, Bedford with friends. They were asked to leave the club but Cole, seemingly intent on requesting a refund, ran back to the club. Julian Cole was tackled to the ground twice, the first time by the club's security and on a second occasion by police officers. There is CCTV footage showing the young man apparently unconscious dragged across the road by the police officers towards the police van and he was then taken to a police station rather than to hospital for emergency treatment. The young man suffered a broken neck and a severe spinal cord injury which led to a cardiac arrest, serious brain injury and he was left paralysed. He has spent the last five years in a vegetative state.

The three officers were accused of breaching their code of conduct for honesty and integrity in their accounts of what happened. They were found to have lied about his condition in statements in their pocket notebooks and in interviews. The misconduct panel decided that the three officers' conduct amounted to gross misconduct and they were dismissed without

notice. Assistant Chief Constable Jackie Sebire called the case 'an absolute tragedy, which has had a devastating effect on a young man and his loved ones'. 'This hearing in essence reviewed a seven minute encounter which took place more than five years ago, and I agree with the panel that the length of time the Independent Office for Police Conduct (IOPC) and CPS enquiries have taken to get to this stage is simply unacceptable to Mr Cole, his family, the officers concerned and the force. On far too many occasions investigations such as these take years to come to a resolution and this cannot be right.'

Julian Cole's mother Claudia Cole said welcomed the tribunal decision. 'When we first saw Julian in a coma and on life support five and a half years ago; and the police officer told us that he had been "chatty" in the police van, we suspected a cover up.' The family's solicitor Rachel Harger of the law firm Bindmans, noting that hearing was not about who caused his injuries, said the outcome has 'confirmed the family's belief that police officers gave deliberately dishonest accounts in order to avoid criticisms of wrongdoing and their behaviour demonstrated a callous disregard for his wellbeing'. 'Fresh evidence has come out during the course of the hearing which will assist the family as they seek answers as to who caused the injuries Julian suffered and we shall now be calling on the IOPC to re-open their investigation,' she said.

Justice as Important as Health or Education - Public

Monidipa Fouzder, Law Gazette: A survey commissioned by the profession's major representative bodies to understand what the public thinks about justice, shows that an overwhelming majority think it is as important as health or education. However, the survey also highlights a widespread belief that the justice system is tilted in favour of the wealthy. The findings of the survey were released ahead of the first Justice Week, a national series of events organised by the Law Society, Bar Council and Chartered Institute for Legal Executives, which begins on Monday.

According to the survey of 2,086 people, more than three-quarters agreed that justice is as important as health of education. A similar figure agreed that people on low incomes should be able to get free legal advice. Nearly two-thirds of respondents would feel uncomfortable dealing with the law and legal processes themselves if they were accused of a crime which could result in a custodial sentence. Only 13% think the state should not have to pay for people's legal expenses if they are accused of an offence that could land them in prison.

For all types of legal issues listed in the survey, at least half of respondents said they would feel uncomfortable dealing with them without a lawyer. Six in 10 believe people on low incomes are more likely than wealthy people to be convicted of crimes.

Law Society president Christina Blacklaws said: 'Cuts to legal aid spending over the past five years have denied justice to the most vulnerable in society, placed a further burden on the taxpayer and damaged the foundation of our justice system. Since April 2013, hundreds of thousands of people have become ineligible for legal aid as a result of freezes to means tests as well as cuts to the scope of legal aid, including victims of domestic abuse and people under threat of eviction.'

Andrew Walker QC, chair of the bar, said there was 'now a gulf between what people expect from our justice system, and what they are getting. We do not leave the ill to treat themselves without expert medical help, so nor should we expect people to deal with legal problems and disputes without expert legal help if they cannot afford it'.

CILEx president Philip Sherwood said the perception that the system is tilted in favour of the wealthy may not be surprising 'but it is extremely dangerous and undermines the rule of law'. The representative bodies united to create Justice Week as a way of placing justice and the rule of law at the centre stage of public and political discussion.

Publication of Revised Code for Crown Prosecutors (CPS)

- Considering disclosable evidence pre-charge is included for the first time
- More stringent conditions on how the Threshold Test is applied
- A greater focus on CPS role in recovering proceeds of crime.

Revisions to the Code for Crown Prosecutors have been unveiled today by Director of Public Prosecutions Alison Saunders. "The Code for Crown Prosecutors stands at the heart of every case we deal with, so it is essential it evolves to reflect the changing issues prosecutors must consider. The explosion in digital evidence seen in recent years has brought real challenges for prosecutors. While it can strongly support the case for prosecution, there must also be rigorous examination of any evidence that assists the defence. "By revising the Code, we are taking a practical step to support prosecutors with their duty to charge the right person with the right offence in every case. It is vital that defendants and complainants have trust in the criminal justice system and the public has confidence in the outcome of court cases." The Code governs all CPS prosecutions. It sets out the general principles which must be applied when making decisions about whether or not a person should be charged with a criminal offence.

The Code, cam into force on Friday October 26 2018. It gives guidance to prosecutors on the general principles to be applied when making decisions about prosecutions. Significant changes include:
• Under the revised guidelines on disclosure, prosecutors must consider whether there is any material held by the police or material that may be available which could affect the decision to charge a suspect with any crime. This is the latest measure by the CPS to improve the way disclosure of evidence is handled. In January a joint plan was introduced with the police which set out a comprehensive range of actions to drive lasting improvements in disclosure management.

• For the first time, prosecutors must take into account the degree to which a suspect benefitted financially from an alleged offence when deciding whether to charge them. . This change is aimed at assisting the court in recovering any assets such as homes, luxury cars, designer clothes, jewellery or money.

Last year the CPS helped recover £80.1 million from defendants who benefitted from illegal activity and returned the funds to the public purse. • Guidance on how to apply the Threshold Test has been simplified and updated, to make sure it is only being used where completely necessary and to avoid cases being charged prematurely. The Threshold Test allows a suspect who presents a substantial bail risk such as a serious risk of harm to the public, to be charged and therefore held in custody in the expectation that further evidence will be produced by the police. It must only be applied in limited circumstances after a rigorous examination of all the conditions.

Mafia Boss Subjected to Restrictive Regime Violation of Article 3

Bernardo Provenzano, now deceased, was an Italian national, born in 1933. Mr Provenzano was arrested in 2006. He was subsequently convicted of numerous extremely serious offences, and sentenced to several life sentences. After his arrest, he was imprisoned under the section '41 bis regime', a restrictive regime in Italy to prevent those convicted of mafia-related crimes from maintaining contact with members of the criminal organisation within or outside prison. It includes restrictions on visits by family, a ban on using the telephone and the monitoring of correspondence. The regime was extended every year until 2010, then every two years until 2016. He was detained in prisons in Parma and Milan. He became progressively seriously ill in prison and, notably, his cognitive functioning declined. At the end of 2013 he became permanently bedridden and had artificial nutrition via a feeding tube. He was eventually hospitalised in 2014 in the correctional wing of the San Paolo civil hos-

pital in Milan, where he remained until his death in 2016. Between 2013 and 2016 he brought court proceedings requesting that his sentence be suspended for health reasons and applying to lift the special prison regime, all without success. The courts, relying on medical evidence and a report by court-appointed experts, found that he was receiving appropriate medical treatment, both as concerned his detention in Parma and in the Milan hospital. They also found that the special regime was still justified in the interests of public order and safety. Relying on Article 3 (prohibition of inhuman or degrading treatment) of the Convention, Mr Provenzano complained of inadequate medical care in prison and about the continuation of the special prison regime until his death, despite his ill health. Violation of Article 3 - on account of the renewed application of the special prison regime on 23 March 2016 Just satisfaction: The Court held that the finding of a violation constituted in itself sufficient just satisfaction for the non-pecuniary damage sustained by Mr Provenzano.

Hostile Environment Creeps Into Criminal Courts

Audrey Cherryl Mogan, 'The Justice Gap': Defendants now required to state nationality: Anyone who has witnessed criminal proceedings will be familiar with seeing the defendant asked to stand and confirm their identity: name, date of birth and address. It's clear why this is necessary – the court needs to identify them and verify that the person in the dock is the person who should be in the dock. However, last year an additional question – which had not been necessary in hundreds of years of criminal justice – was asked.

By virtue of section 162 of the Policing and Crime Act 2017, as amended by The Criminal Procedure (Amendment No. 4) Rules 2017, defendants in England and Wales are now required to provide the court with their nationality. Failure to provide this information, or providing incomplete or inaccurate information, without a 'reasonable excuse' is punishable with up to 51 weeks imprisonment, a fine or both.

At first blush this seems an innocuous additional way in which to identify the defendant. However, the government's stated purpose for a nationality requirement policy is to 'remove as many Foreign National Offenders as quickly as possible' (see here). As there is currently little political objectivity on foreign alleged criminals, this policy passed through Parliament without much scrutiny or criticism. Recent scandals such as the treatment of Windrush migrants have begun shedding light on the encroachment of immigration enforcement into various areas of public services, causing wider concern of how the system is operating. Recent legislation has required employers, landlords, doctors and teachers to conduct immigration checks, and the new requirement continues this expansive reach of immigration control outside of immigration arenas by requiring magistrates' and judges to take on the task of border guards.

Nationality information must be provided to any court, during any stage of the proceedings, regardless of whether immigration status has a bearing on the substantive offence or issues of bail. The disclosure of this information is required under threat of imprisonment for non-compliance, despite whether the individual is ever convicted of a criminal offence, and despite whether the substantive offence results in a term of imprisonment or even carries with it a term of imprisonment. It is also retained regardless of whether the defendant is acquitted, or the proceedings are discontinued and becomes publicly available as a consequence of having been said in open court.

Defendants' nationality and immigration status is routinely used by prosecutors opposing bail and by tribunals and judges in making decisions on bail and sentencing. It has been well documented that non-British nationals are disproportionately refused bail, and disproportionately receive custodial sentences. As the Lammy Review and Amnesty International's report on police gang matrices, as well as the Ministry of Justice's own statistics have demonstrated, racial bias is a significant problem in the criminal justice system.

The requirement to identify nationality only worsens this discrimination to the further detriment of minorities' trust in the criminal justice system. For argument's sake, even if the new provisions did not make the proceedings unfair, how will it impact on perceptions of fairness? Imagine being a defendant, now required by law to confirm your nationality to a judge or tribunal, in open court. It is inevitable that you will wonder whether this information will impact how they treat you.

It is also striking to note that this mass gathering of nationality data, linked to other sensitive personal data, applies not only to adult defendants but to all children that appear before the youth courts. In 2016/17 there were 28,400 children and young people (aged 10 – 17) cautioned or convicted (see here). Although these numbers have decreased in the last 10 years, the proportion of BAME youths has been increasing, accounting for 45% of the custodial population in the latest year. Many of these young people will not receive a criminal conviction (for example, they may be acquitted, or their case may be discontinued), and even fewer will receive a custodial sentence. Yet the criminal courts are required to collect their nationality data and share it with the Home Office under the guise of deporting foreign national offenders. How can that be justified as a proportionate response?

As lawyers we must advise defendants that they are required by law to provide this information. Defendants understandably more focused on the criminal matters at hand casually provide their nationality, and the provisions remain unchallenged. There is very limited information on how this policy has been put into practice, and no information on its current impact. It is also unclear exactly how the information is being stored and whether it is shared with other government departments.

I've often had clients misunderstand the question and provide details of their ethnicity, as opposed to nationality – this could be even more detrimental to the perception that justice is colour blind in our courts. Little is known about whether incorrect information is then retained and shared, and how the Courts expect those from stateless backgrounds to comply with the requirement.

For these reasons I'm working with Commons, the not-for-profit criminal law firm, to investigate how the requirement is being implemented and it's potential outcomes. With the support of the Strategic Legal Fund, we've set up a call for evidence to gather views from practitioners and to conduct pre-litigation research into this controversial measure which we believe may impact on the perception of fairness in the criminal justice system. The nationality requirement poses alarming questions of whether your nationality determines the standards of justice you receive. So, if you practice law in the criminal courts, please take a moment to share your experiences and views here.

Bloody Sunday: £900,000 in Damages for Victims

BBC News: Damages worth more than £900,000 are to be paid out in compensation for claims brought over the Bloody Sunday shootings in Londonderry. The families of nine of those killed by British soldiers in the city in January 1972 are to be paid £75,000 each. Another five people wounded are to receive £50,000. Thirteen people died after members of the Army's Parachute Regiment opened fire on civil rights demonstrators. A fourteenth person died later.

The resolutions were confirmed at the High Court on Thursday 25th September 2018, as part of a series of lawsuits against the Ministry of Defence (MOD). Claims were brought by victims and their families after a major tribunal established the innocence of all those shot. The Saville Inquiry's findings in 2010 prompted the then Prime Minister, David Cameron, to publicly apologise for the actions of the soldiers. He described the killings as "unjustified and unjustifiable". With liability accepted, the cases centred on the level of damages to be paid out.

Last month a judge awarded Michael Quinn £193,000 for injuries inflicted when he was shot in the face as a schoolboy on Bloody Sunday. That led to settlements being announced in another two test cases. The widow of Gerry McKinney, a father-of-eight, received £625,000 compensation for his death. A pay-out of £75,000 was also agreed for the family of Michael McDaid, 20, over his killing.

Lawyers returned to court on Thursday morning to announce resolutions in similar actions featuring unmarried victims with no dependants at the time. The 14 cases involved a combined total of £925,000 in damages, plus costs. A judge was also told that further discussions are to take place in the remaining lawsuits. Listing those cases for a review in December, Mr Justice McAlinden said: "I congratulate the parties' representatives for the work they are doing in resolving these very sensitive and difficult matters."

Outside court, solicitor Fearghal Shiels, who acted for some of the families, said they welcomed the settlements and hoped to "achieve satisfactory outcomes in the remaining actions as soon as possible".

A Ministry of Defence spokesperson said: "Our thoughts remain with those who were affected by these tragic events. As settlement related cases are ongoing it would be inappropriate to comment further."

CPS/Police Failing to Investigate Thousands of Cases Efficiently

Nosheen Iqbal, 'The Observer': Britain's criminal justice system is "creaking" and unable to cope with the huge amounts of data being generated by technology, the head of the Crown Prosecution Service has warned in her final interview before stepping down. Speaking exclusively to the Observer, Alison Saunders said the CPS and police were failing to investigate thousands of cases efficiently – from rape to fraud to modern slavery – and were critically short of the skills and resources required to combat crime. Her comments corroborate a home affairs select committee report last week which warned that police were struggling with outdated technology and at risk of becoming "irrelevant" as reported crime continues to surge, rising by 32% in three years. Saunders said: "The number of cases coming through [to the CPS] are going down, [yet] there are all sorts of things we need to work out as a system. It needs an investment of resources nationally, in capacity of forces and in future-proofing it. Who is making the plans for what is going to happen in five years' time?"

While fraud has become the most commonly reported crime in England and Wales, with 1.7 million offences a year, only one in 200 victims ever sees the perpetrator brought to justice. Saunders admitted that many cases were simply being ignored "because it takes time and a skilled investigator". The capability and capacity of the police should be an urgent concern for the Home Office, she said. In their report, MPs warned of "dire consequences for public safety and criminal justice" if police funding was not prioritised. In an emotional interview, Saunders admitted feeling bruised by her five-year tenure as director of public prosecutions, with critics branding the service "toxic" and "disastrous". "I don't think you'd be human if it didn't affect you," she said, between tears, but she felt she had "done a good job". Saunders had to lose a third of her workforce as a result of funding cuts of more than 25%, but was proud that "morale in the service is demonstrably better" than when she arrived in 2013. "As the DPP, I accept responsibility for what happens in the service," she said, over the crisis in disclosure of evidence in rape cases that led to several collapsing and hundreds more being dropped earlier this year. "I could have stood there and blamed the police and say it all starts with them, but I don't think it helps. We have a disclosure manual which means we are talking to the police early on about what are reasonable lines of inquiry. We give them advice that helps them." Saunders admitted that those initial conversations between the CPS, the police and the defence about what evidence would be used in court was "what's been missing – that system-wide, early-doors approach to it".

Poor Healthcare in Jails Is Killing Inmates, Says NHS Watchdog

Denis Campbell, Observer: Almost half of England's jails are providing inadequate medical care to inmates, whose health is being damaged by widespread failings, the NHSwatchdog has told MPs in a scathing briefing leaked to the Observer. Healthcare behind bars is so poor in some prisons that offenders die because staff do not respond properly to medical emergencies, the Care Quality Commission (CQC) says.

Mental health services for the 40% of inmates who have psychological or psychiatric problems are particularly weak, which contributes to self-harming and suicides among prisoners, according to the care regulator's confidential briefing to the Commons health and social care select committee. It blames chronic understaffing, problems getting to medical appointments and guards knowing too little about ill health to recognise problems.

The mixture of NHS and private companies that provide healthcare in England's 113 adult jails and young offender institutions "frequently struggle to deliver safe and effective services", the commission tells MPs. However, it adds, this is often "due to issues outside of their control" such as shortages of prison and healthcare staff and the environment of jails not offering suitable space for consultations. It adds: "In 2017-18 we completed 41 joint prison inspections [with the prisons inspectorate]. We found breaches of [CQC] regulations in 47% (19) of these inspections and took corresponding regulatory action, in some cases against more than one registered provider." The CQC ordered providers to take remedial action because the care offered to inmates was unacceptable in its quality or safety and breached the watchdog's five fundamental standards that require providers to ensure services are safe, caring, effective, responsive and well led.

The document details a litany of problems including: • Mental health nurses are unable to assess, care for and treat prisoners because they are too busy responding to inmates having breakdowns or being given drugs. • Shortages of prison guards to escort them means prisoners are missing out on NHS appointments outside the jail. • Inspectors frequently find "inadequate mental health awareness among prison staff and their inability to recognise mental health issues and seek appropriate support for prisoners". • Incarceration can worsen prisoners' existing conditions or lead to them developing new problems as a result of "limited exercise and exposure to sunlight (causing vitamin D deficiency), poor diet, illicit drug availability, assault/injury, exposure to communicable diseases, psychological deterioration, self-harm and suicidal ideation". • Follow-up inspections frequently reveal "poor progress in achieving the intended improvements".

The charity Inquest said it was concerned about "repeated failings [by prison healthcare providers] around communication, emergency responses, drugs and wider issues of mental ill health and healthcare provision resulting in death. "Evidence from our casework, supporting families whose relatives have died in custody, indicates that prisons are unhealthy and unsafe environments. A patient in prison has very little autonomy, control and access to medication and appointments. Prisons, at their core, are environments of toxic, high health risk," said Rebecca Roberts, its head of policy.

In oral evidence to the committee in July Peter Clarke, England's chief inspector of prisons, painted a bleak picture of inmates' health and healthcare provision behind bars. Prisoners' mental health was suffering because overcrowding means that many thousands do not have a cell to themselves, and cells must serve as living room, dining room, kitchen and toilet.

The illicit drugs trade in jails has led to a toxic mix of violence, fear, debt and bullying for many prisoners, Clarke added. As a result "they self-segregate and self-isolate, and instances of self-harm and suicide tragically flow from that". Inmates' inability to get to medical appointments, due to staff shortages, has produced "an inevitable knock-on effect on their health

and wellbeing". Paul Williams, a Labour member of the select committee, which will publish a report into prisoners' health next week, said: "In too many prisons a profoundly unhealthy environment and woefully inadequate staffing results in prisoners' health getting much worse because of their time inside. Missed appointments lead to missed cancers, and severely mentally ill people are kept in cells instead of hospital wards."

Professor Steve Field, the CQC's chief inspector of primary medical services and integrated care, added: "During our programme of inspection in partnership with Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Prisons, we have found some poor care and I have serious concerns that the issues we have found are affecting the health of some the most vulnerable people in society. "I'm anxious that the issues highlighted in our evidence around mental health provision, staff training, particularly nurse and doctor training and inadequate pharmacist oversight of prescribing are dealt with as a matter of urgency." A government spokesperson said: "We are investing tens of millions of pounds extra in prison safety and decency. We are spending an extra £40m to improve safety and tackle the drugs which we know are fuelling violence and healthcare problems, including X-ray scanners and drug-detection dogs. Over 3,500 new prison officers have been recruited in the last two years which will help improve access to healthcare services."

Joe Doocey & Wayne Nash, Wrongly Jailed For Contempt Reach Settlement For Damages

Scottish Legal News: Two men who were wrongly jailed for contempt of court have reached a settlement for damages, the Irish Examiner reports. Joe Doocey and Wayne Nash spent 48 hours in jail in June 2016 after being found in contempt at Athlone District Court. Judge Seamus Hughes had ordered them to spend seven days in jail because he overheard the pair insulting him outside the court. They were released after just two days when the High Court found that they had been unlawfully detained. The pair brought proceedings against the Minister for Public Expenditure and Reform for €75,000 in damages each before Judge Kathryn Hutton in Dublin Circuit Civil Court under the Irish Human Rights and Equality Commission Act 2014. Counsel for the Minister later told the court that the proceedings had been settled for an undisclosed sum and legal costs.

O.R. and L.R. v. the Republic of Moldova

The applicants, Ms O.R. and Ms L.R., are two Moldovan nationals who were born in 1979 and 1987 respectively. The case concerned the investigation into their allegation that they had been forced to strip naked and do sit-ups by the police when arrested in the context of wide-scale unrest in Moldova in 2009. The applicants were arrested on 7 April 2009 following protests by hundreds of young people in Moldova against the general elections. They alleged that they had been taken to Chisinau police headquarters and, along with others, had been ordered to face the wall. Those who looked to the side were hit. They heard the sounds of people being beaten in an adjacent room. After signing their arrest record under threat, an officer escorted them to another room. Two officers ordered them to undress and do sit-ups. They were eventually released on 13 April 2009.

Soon after there were reports in the press about the incident, and there was an internal investigation during which the applicants were interviewed. Nine months later the prosecuting authorities launched a criminal investigation into three police officers. In 2013 two of the officers, who had ordered them to undress, were convicted of psychologically ill-treating the applicants and given a five-year suspended sentence. In the meantime, the prosecutor had discontinued the criminal investigation against the escorting officer, finding that his actions could not qualify as torture.

Furthermore, the officer had clearly exceeded his powers but this was an administrative offence which was already time-barred. The applicants' appeals against these decisions were all unsuccessful. Throughout the proceedings none of the three officers were suspended from their duties.

Relying on Article 3 (prohibition of torture and of inhuman or degrading treatment), the applicants alleged that the investigation into their ill-treatment had been ineffective and that the police officers involved had been able to act with impunity. Violation of Article 3 (investigation) Just satisfaction: 7,500 euros (EUR) each to O.R. and L.R. in respect of non-pecuniary damage, and EUR 1,500 jointly to O.R. and L.R. in respect of costs and expenses

Post-Conviction Disclosure Regime 'Not Fit For Purpose'

Miscarriages of justice were going 'unidentified and uncorrected' as a result of a lack of transparency around forensic science in our courts, criminal appeal lawyers argued. In its submission to the House of Lords' Science and Technology Committee's inquiry into forensic science, the Centre for Criminal Appeals argued that testing the accuracy of forensic evidence was 'too often impossible' which prevented the review of questionable convictions.

The group argued that defendants should have a right to access transcripts of expert evidence given at their trial free of charge and to 'controlled access' to police and CPS documents including correspondence with experts, forensic examiners' bench notes, unused material and crime scene documentation unless there was an 'overwhelmingly compelling reason' why they should not be.

Submissions published last week highlighted problems with post-conviction disclosure which, according to Inside Justice, the charity headed up the journalist Louise Shorter, was 'an opaque, unaudited landscape which is not fit for purpose'. Following a 2014 Supreme Court case in the Kevin Nunn case (which the Justice Gap reported on here), those seeking disclosure of such materials can find themselves in a 'Catch-22' – i.e., to make a successful request for evidence, they need to argue that such evidence is likely to demonstrate innocence however, the only way to establish such knowledge is by accessing the evidence in the first place.

Inside Justice argued that the way that forces treated exhibits post-conviction represented a 'woeful picture'. The guidelines recommend storage for 30 years, seven years and three years in cases of major crime, serious crime and volume crime respectively. According to Freedom of Information requests sent to all 43 police forces of England and Wales by Inside Justice revealed only two forces citing the correct guidelines. One former senior police officer told Inside Justice: 'I doubt that there's ever been a case where exhibits are kept properly.' A scientist specialising in cold-case reviews who worked with many forces said: 'I get the impression that, if cases were identified, even homicides, the exhibits aren't kept… in sex offences, not a chance. I get the impression that they [police forces] are all doing something slightly different.'

The group argued that it should be an automatic right for interested parties to view forensic files post-conviction. It argued that then Nunn judgment was 'often mis-interpreted' by police forces resulting in unnecessary legal challenges applications. The CCA noted that the Nunn judgment relied on the Criminal Cases Review Commission (CCRC) as the 'safety net' to secure post-conviction disclosure. The CCRC used its investigative powers 'very conservatively', it reckoned; citing 'the tragic case of Victor Nealon', who spent an extra decade wrongly imprisoned because the watchdog refused to conduct DNA testing despite repeated requests.

Alastair Logan OBE, a retired solicitor who represented the Guildford Four and Maguire Seven, highlighted concerns about the closure of the Forensic Science Service (FSS) in 2010. 'England and Wales are now the only countries in the world in which forensic science

entirely in the hands of either the police or private forensics science providers whose principal customer is the police,' he argued. Logan identified concerns that forensic tests carried out by police forces might not be as rigorous as those conducted by the FSS and, even if the tests were carried out, they needed to be interpreted properly which required 'just the kind of expertise that has been lost' through its closure. Some eight out of 10 of the 1,600 scientists employed by the the service failed to find another job, he pointed out. The ensuing fragmentation of the market now meant that there was 'real potential for evidence to be lost'.

He quoted Ann Priston, president of the Forensic Science Society. 'I've not heard a single person say that closing the FSS was a good decision,' she said. 'On the whole, the closure of the only state-funded forensic provision was, I think, an ill-conceived, ill-thought out and hasty decision.'

Death of Prince Fosu in Harmondsworty IRC– CPS 'Cop Out' on Prosecution of GEO & Nestor

On the 6th anniversary of the death of Prince Kwabena Fosu in Harmondsworth Immigration Removal Centre (IRC), the Crown Prosecution Service (CPS) have announced they will be reversing a decision to bring criminal charges against the private companies responsible for his care. Prince Kwabena Fosu, a 31 year old Ghanaian national, died in Harmondsworth Immigration Removal Centre on the morning of 30 October 2012. An inquest into the circumstances of Prince's death was postponed until after the conclusion of any criminal investigation or prosecution.

On 14 April 2017 the CPS authorised criminal charges against GEO Group UK Ltd, which then ran Harmondsworth, and Nestor Primecare Services Ltd, which provided healthcare services at the IRC. The charges were for a breach to section 3 of the Health and Safety at Work Act 1974. The CPS declined to bring corporate manslaughter charges. Evidence suggests that Prince was extremely distressed and suffering from mental ill health. He was held in cellular confinement for six days in unsanitary conditions, without any clothing or bedding or a mattress. It is thought that Prince went into sickle cell crisis and died on the floor of his cell. It initially took the CPS almost three years from receiving the police file to confirm that criminal charges would be brought, and the reversal of that decision 18 months later is unfathomable to the family, who still do not know the full truth about what happened to Prince. Last year saw the highest ever number of deaths of immigration detainees in IRC's, prison, and shortly after release, with a total of eleven deaths in 2017. This year there have been at least two further deaths of detainees.

Prince's father said: "For a bereaved family, it is difficult to understand why there is such delay in the criminal decision making process, we are just told that it is normal. How can I now explain to the wider family on the anniversary of Prince's death, that we have got nowhere in six years? How can I explain why the prosecution decision has been reversed? How can it be acceptable to treat a bereaved family this way? This is not justice."

Deborah Coles, Director of INQUEST said: "We had hoped this trial would shine a spotlight on the inhumane treatment of Prince, who died naked on the concrete floor of his cell. On the 6th anniversary of Prince's death, this is a reprehensible step backwards by the CPS. Recent months have seen the highest number of deaths of immigration detainees on record. The culture of impunity for private companies and the Home Office, in the face of well documented ill treatment of detainees, is shameful."

Kate Maynard, solicitor for the family said: "The CPS is clearly a failing and arrogant institution if they think that the management of this case has been acceptable. This case illustrates the systemic delay for decision making in death in custody cases. To take four years to review a case, announcing that there will be a prosecution and then reversing that decision 18 months later, is dysfunctional. A culture change is required within the CPS to fix the way it operates so that bereaved families receive a decent, efficient and humane service."

Sex Offender Wins Appeal Against Extended Sentence

Scottish Legal News: A man convicted of unlawful sexual activity with a 14-year-old girl has successfully challenged a sheriff's decision to impose an extended sentence. The Appeal Court of the High Court of Justiciary quashed the extension period after ruling that the sheriff failed to explain why she considered that the test imposing an extended sentence had been met. Lord Menzies and Lord Turnbull heard that the appellant Adam Tonkin, 26, pled guilty to an indictment which narrated that he engaged in unlawful sexual activity with a girl between February and March 2016, which included sexual intercourse on two occasions.

Having obtained a criminal justice social work report the sentencing sheriff imposed an extended sentence with a custodial part of 12 months imprisonment, reduced from 18 months for the first offender's early plea, and an extension period of 12 months. But the appellant appealed against the imposition of an extended sentence. On the appellant's behalf, criticisms were advanced concerning the sentencing sheriff's reasons for deciding to impose an extended sentence. Attention was drawn to what was said in the sheriff's report, where the sheriff stated that she wished the appellant to be subject to "post-release supervision".It was argued that, on its own, this would "not be sufficient" to entitle the imposition of an extended sentence. It was also observed that in any event the appellant would be subject to a period of post-release supervision in light of the provisions of section 1AA of the Prisoners and Criminal Proceedings (Scotland) Act 1993, which was not acknowledged in the sheriff's report.

Statutory test: Section 210A of the Criminal Procedure (Scotland) Act 1995 provides that an extended sentence may only be imposed if the court considers that the period for which the offender would otherwise be subject to licence would not be adequate for the purpose of protecting the public from serious harm from the offender. But it was submitted that at no stage in the sheriff's report did she address this test or explain why she concluded that the period for which the appellant would otherwise be subject to licence would be inadequate. Further, no account appeared to have been taken in the assessment of risk posed by the appellant of the fact that the offending conduct occurred two years before the imposition of sentence and that the appellant had "kept out of trouble" in that period.

A number of criticisms were also advanced in the written case and argument concerning the criminal justice social work report. It appeared from the content of that report that the authors had not been provided with a summary of the evidence or a copy of the Crown narrative, as the two authors of the report appeared to proceed upon the basis that the appellant had pled guilty to "sexual assault". The authors observed that the sexual assault which he perpetrated was illegal also in terms of the complainer's age, when in fact the child's age reflected the sole element of criminality. It was therefore argued that the authors had misunderstood the nature of the criminality which the appellant had displayed, which "undermined" the value which the sentencing sheriff could place on the risk assessment and the other views expressed by the authors of the report.

'Important misunderstanding' The judges pointed out that the sheriff made plain in her report to the appeal court that she appreciated that the appellant had not pled guilty to an offence of sexual assault and she appreciated that the terminology in the social work report was inappropriate. Nevertheless, the sentencing sheriff did take account of certain parts of the report and the judges said it was correct to observe that the authors appeared to have "laboured under an important misunderstanding" as to the nature of the offending to which the appellant pled guilty. The court agreed that the value of the report was "diminished" and ruled that there was also "merit" in the criticisms of the sentencing sheriff's overall approach.

Delivering the opinion of the court, Lord Turnbull said: "She does not explain that she took account of the fact that the appellant would be released on licence in any event, she does not at any stage of her report refer to the test provided for by section 210A of the 1995 Act and she does not explain why the period for which the appellant would be subject to licence would not be adequate. "Furthermore, the sheriff does not explain why she concluded that the public required the ongoing form of protection she identified, despite the lengthy passage of time between the commission of the offence and the date of the sentencing. "In all of these circumstances we are persuaded that the appeal ought to be granted and we shall quash the extended sentence imposed. In its place we shall impose a sentence of 12 months imprisonment reduced from the period of 18 months to reflect the guilty plea and sentence will date from the same date selected by the sheriff."

Mental Health Units (Use of Force) Act AKA 'Seni's Law' Now In Force

Lewis Family Celebrate Lasting Legacy as Mental Health Units (Use of Force) Act is now in force. Eight years after the death of Seni Lewis for whom it is intended as a lasting legacy. Known as Seni's Law, the Act will increase protections and oversight on use of force in mental health settings. The Private Members Bill brought by Steve Reed MP is named after Olaseni 'Seni' Lewis, a 23-year-old IT graduate who died as a result of prolonged restraint by police officers whilst a voluntary inpatient at Bethlem Royal Hospital, Croydon in 2010. Steve Reed MP has worked closely with the family of Seni Lewis, who are constituents of Croydon North. He worked on this Bill with the family's lawyer Raju Bhatt, INQUEST, and a coalition of NGOs including Agenda, Article 39, Mind, Rethink and YoungMinds. Throughout its passage in Parliament and the Lords the Bill has received cross party support. It also led the Minister Jackie Doyle Price to make commitments to consider the issue of the lack of independent investigations into deaths in mental health settings.

In 2017 an inquest jury unanimously condemned the actions of police and healthcare staff who watched on as Seni was restrained by 11 police officers. The inquest found the force used was excessive, disproportionate, and contributed to Seni's death. His family have welcomed the Bill as an opportunity to prevent further deaths. On 30 October 1998, David 'Rocky' Bennett died following excessive restraint in a mental health unit. A public inquiry into his death recommended formal recording of the use of restraint, consideration of racial and gender discrimination, and improved training and oversight. At long last, the Royal Assent of this Bill will create a statutory duty to ensure many of the recommendations of the inquiry into this death 20 years ago are belatedly enacted.

Aji Lewis, mother of Seni Lewis said: "When Seni became ill, we took him to hospital which we thought was the best place for him. We shall always bear the cross of knowing that, instead of the help and care he needed, Seni met with his death. It took us years of struggle to find out what happened to Seni: the failures at multiple levels amongst the management and staff at Bethlem Royal Hospital where, instead of looking after him, they called the police to deal with him; and the brute force with which the police held Seni in a prolonged restraint which they knew to be dangerous, a restraint that was maintained until Seni was dead for all intents and purposes. We don't want anyone else to go through what our son went through. That is why we have supported this initiative by Steve Reed MP which has culminated today in Seni's Law. We welcome it in his memory, in the hope that it proves to be a lasting legacy in his name, so that no other family has to suffer as we have suffered."

Deborah Coles, Director of INQUEST said: "Seni Lewis failed by the very people that were meant to keep him safe and died a violent death after excessive restraint. The Lewis family have fought tirelessly for eight years to ensure that no one else dies in such horrific circumstances. They have been the driving force behind this bill. High levels of restraint are routinely used behind the closed walls of secure settings inflicting physical and psychological harms and the ever-present risk of death. Disproportionately restraint is used against people from black and minority ethnic groups, women and children, young people, and people with learning disabilities and autism. We hope the protections of this bill and greater scrutiny and oversight will drive the cultural change and practice needed, end the abusive use of force and ensure those in crisis are treated with dignity and respect. This important step is not the end but the beginning. INQUEST, alongside bereaved families, will continue to work to ensure the guidance and changes arising from Seni's Law leave the best possible legacy. There is more work to be done, but this is a momentous move in the right direction."

Steve Reed MP, who tabled the Bill, said: "This new law will save lives and gives mental health patients in the UK some of the best protection in the world from abusive restraint. INQUEST's support and advice has been critical in getting this change."

Ireland: Hunger Strike Prisoner Awarded €5,000 Payout

The World News: A prisoner who went on hunger strike in protest at his jail conditions has been awarded €5,000 by the High Court over the failure of prison authorities to take his protest seriously. The man, who cannot be named, was convicted of a serious assault offence and is serving a 12-year sentence at a prison which also cannot be identified by order of the court. Ms Justice Marie Baker stressed, in deciding on the sum of €5,000, that she intended to do no more than mark damages in relation to the failure of the prison authorities to deal reasonably and expeditiously with his complaints about his conditions. He started the hunger strike in February 2015 but gave it up after Ms Justice Baker, in a separate ruling the following month, said he was entitled not to be force fed even if he fell into a coma. He then indicated that he would bring this case for damages and declarations in relation to his rights. Making the award, Ms Justice Baker said the inaction of the prison authorities "led to the circumstances becoming far more grave and dangerous than those even the plaintiff himself intended in the early days of the hunger strike". While that failure was negligent, it did not cause the him to go on hunger strike but made his protest much more hard than a "fleeting and transient one", she said. There was therefore a breach of the obligations to properly manage his grievances and difficulties with the prison regime. Given his very difficult personal and psychological makeup, it became impossible or, at least, very difficult for him to turn back, and this was a reasonably foreseeable consequence of the failure to deal with the man's written complaints, she said.

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.