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 715 (14/11/2018) - Cost £1

Appeal Court Rubber-Stamps Entrapment of Naweed, Khobaib, Mohibur, & Tahir

Entrapment: Wherein, the police/CID with malice aforethought, incite a person or persons to plot/commit a crime and whence the person/persons have committed to carrying out the crime. Arrest and charge the person/persons with conspiracy to break the law.

Naweed, Khobaib, Mohibur, & Tahir. On 3rd August 2017 were all sentenced to life imprisonment, they appealed against their convictions on the 18th October 2018, the judges at that date reserved their judgement and handed it down on the 2nd November 2018. They said: 'Standing back from the grounds of appeal, we have considered whether anything put before us casts doubt on the safety of the convictions. We are satisfied that there is nothing which does so.'

A secret police unit, combined with the Security Service (MI5), decided to run an undercover operation in an attempt to obtain evidence of terrorism, to this extent. In the summer of 2016, officers of the West Midlands Police established a fake business in Birmingham called Hero Couriers. They did so as part of an undercover operation intended to observe and engage with Khohaib and Naweed, who were suspected of involvement in terrorism-related activity. A number of undercover police officers played the roles of members of staff at Hero Couriers. In particular, an undercover officer known as Vincent posed as the manager. Another undercover officer, whose evidence featured prominently at trial, was known as Andy. Mohibur & Tahir were dragged into this for their association with Khohaib and Naweed. On 3rd August 2017, they were all sentenced to life imprisonment.

The Disturbing Key Features in Their Case 1. The shocking realisation that in 2017, despite every development in the UK criminal justice system, defendants who were not guilty of the charges brought against them can nevertheless be convicted by a jury. 2. The even more shocking appreciation that the jury that convicted the four after a five-month trial, heard key police witnesses clearly lying about the primary evidence on which they had to decide guilt or innocence. 3. Not only did the jury, furthermore, hear patently false evidence given on oath by police witnesses, but got to see more than a thousand deleted messages from the personal phones of police witnesses as they communicated with each other during the course of the month in which the wrongful arrests and prosecutions of the men were clearly being planned and achieved – messages that extended into the period of the trial itself as the police witnesses tried to contact each other and match the evidence they gave to the jury to other evidence appearing more and more dramatically (that contradicted what they said) as the case proceeded.

What was particularly outrageous, was the continuation of the judges to give anonymity to Vincent and Andy both undercover policemen, who were the principal witnesses on behalf of the prosecution. Therefore, preventing the fours legal teams' legal team from assessing/establishing the credibility of both police officers, the defence team argued, to quote from the judgement: 'anonymity which had at an early stage been granted to the witnesses Vincent and Andy should be lifted. On behalf of the applicants Ali and Hussain in particular, it was submitted that the effect of the anonymity had been that the defence had been precluded from investigating and testing issues relevant to the credibility of the evidence of those witnesses. In particular, it was submitted, there had been no opportunity to investigate or test any previous allegations made against either Vincent or Andy of planting evidence; to know whether or not the fingerprints and/or DNA of either Vincent or Andy were on the JD Sports bag or any of its contents; or to investigate whether Vincent might have possessed, purchased or been able to purchase any of the items found in the bag. It was further submitted that there had been an improper failure by the police to investigate those matters, and a failure by the prosecution to ensure that there was a proper investigation of them.

No need to tell you that the judges didn't give an inch on this or on anything else for that matter!

Mariam Hussain, sister of Khobaib said, all four men were under 24/7 surveillance for months prior to the arrest and there is no evidence linking them to the JD sports bag which was planted. The four will fight on for as long as it takes to overturn their convictions!

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

Has a Crime Writer Now Proved the Innocence of 'Wang Yam'?

Vanessa Thorpe, Guardinn: Wang jailed for murder amid claims of a cover-up to will have evidence reheard as a result of award-winning book.The brutal murder of an elderly writer in his dilapidated Regency home in north London posed one of the grimmest riddles of 2006. Allan Chappelow was found bludgeoned underneath the manuscript pages of his latest book, and his death remains at the centre of a wider, unsolved mystery. It involves MI6, the playwright George Bernard Shaw, allegations of a serious miscarriage of justice – and an extraordinary British legal oddity: a murder trial that the media was not allowed to attend, let alone report on, during many of its sessions. Now, with the success of a new book about the case, the man eventually convicted of the killing, a Chinese dissident called Wang Yam, has renewed hope of freedom after serving nine years in English prisons. Arguments for his innocence are due to be heard by the European court of human rights in the new year, and the leading British QC Dinah Rose is taking up his cause. "Wang Yam's entire defence case was held behind closed doors," said the Guardian's former security editor, Richard Norton-Taylor, who reported on the original murder trial in 2009. "It was unprecedented in modern times for the media and the public to be prevented from hearing a defendant's case in a murder trial."

Last month Blood on the Page, Thomas Harding's gripping study of the murder and the police investigation that followed, won a top literary prize, the Crime Writers' Association's Golden Dagger; it is out in paperback this weekend. Harding, best known for his books The House by the Lake and Hanns and Rudolf, was drawn to tell the story because he had grown up in Hampstead as a neighbour of Chappelow. Sometimes he passed the eccentric character in the street, often noting the deteriorating state of the once-grand home where he lived alone. Ten days ago, when Harding accepted his prize at a ceremony in London, he said he had found Blood on the Page harder to write than anything else, partly due to legal pressure to drop the project. Chappelow, 86 at the time of his death, was a published expert on Shaw, the literary hero he had met and visited in his youth. Police discovered his body after being alerted to suspicious activity in his bank accounts. They turned their attention to Wang, who lived nearby, when Chappelow's stolen credit cards were traced. Wang, son of a Red Army general whose grandfather had been Mao Zedong's third in command, claims to have left China for London after his involvement in the Tiananmen Square demonstrations. He had worked in the Chinese nuclear weapons research institute and was granted refugee status

in Britain in 1992. It is now believed that he became an MI6 informant.

Charged with burglary, murder and receiving stolen goods, Wang was convicted of the theft and fraud offences at a first trial in 2008. But the jury, who were all required to have security clearance, could not agree on a murder verdict. After a second Old Bailey trial a year later, Wang was convicted of murder and jailed for life, with a recommendation he serve at least 20 years. The court proceedings were covered for the Guardian by Norton-Taylor, as well as by his colleague, crime reporter Duncan Campbell, despite government efforts to close down the story. Media organisations, including the Guardian, vainly joined in a challenge to an unprecedented request – that witnesses at a modern murder trial should be heard in secret for reasons of national security.

Campbell said Wang did not have a fair trial. "Evidence from a near neighbour of the murdered man that he, too, had been the subject of a burglary and threats of murder when Wang Yam was already in custody, plus evidence of Chappelow's excursions to [a location known as] the 'spanking bench' on Hampstead Heath, would almost certainly have led to his acquittal," said Campbell. "Geoffrey Robertson, who was Wang Yam's QC in his first trial, says as much in his recently published memoir, Rather His Own Man."

A key passage in Robertson's book argues that Wang was "wrongfully convicted, I believe, in the sense that his guilt could not be proved beyond reasonable doubt". But last year Wang's conviction was upheld by the court of appeal, despite the evidence against him being, in the words of the court, "entirely circumstantial". During this period Wang wrote to the Guardian, saying: "I was convicted for murder without even police have evidence that I know the deceased or ever met each other. There is no evidence to link me with the deceased, even police burnt the crime scene by accident and there are unknown DNA fingerprint [and] footprint, all not belong to me." Harding remains in contact with Wang, who sees fresh hope for his release. But reporting the story is still difficult, as Norton-Taylor explains. "While we can say Wang Yam was an informant for MI6, we cannot even speculate how he helped MI6, though it is obvious from his background that he would have had his uses … We do not know in the Wang Yam case what lay behind the gagging orders obtained by a home secretary and a foreign secretary – whether it was genuine concern about national security or merely determination to prevent embarrassment."

Wang Yam, HMP Lowdham Grange, Old Epperstone Road, Lowdham, NG14 7DA

Inquest Opens into Suicide of IPP Prisoner Tommy Nicol at HMP The Mount

Thomas James Nicol, known as Tommy, died on 25 September 2015, four days after he was found hanging at HMP The Mount. Tommy was 37. He was in prison on an 'Imprisonment for Public Protection' sentence (IPP); indeterminate sentences which have since been abolished. The inquest into his death opened today (Monday 5 November) at Hertfordshire Coroner's court. The minimum tariff on Tommy's sentence was four years, starting from November 2009. He died after almost six years in prison. Tommy was transferred to HMP The Mount after spending time at HMP Erlestoke after a Parole Board review of his sentence in June 2015. The review concluded that Tommy should do further 'motivational and psychological' work before release. Tommy expressed frustration about this decision, and not being able to do the required programmes ahead of the review. The next Parole Board review was not due until February 2017, over two years later. Tommy had not been diagnosed with mental ill health, but following the review spent long periods in segregation cells at HMP Erlestoke. On 15 September 2015 he was transferred to HMP The Mount straight from segregation, and three days later seriously self-harmed and expressed extreme distress and frustration at not having been moved to an open prison. The prison began monitoring procedures for self-harm and suicide known as ACCT. Following this, Tommy's self-harm and troubled behaviour escalated. He remained in segregation and was considered high risk by staff. On 21 September he was found hanging in a segregation cell. On 25 September doctors withdrew life support and Tommy died. The family were later informed of Tommy's self-harm and subsequent death. Despite being abolished in December 2012, on 20 July 2018 the Parole Board reported that around 2,800 people remain in prison on an IPP sentence. Throughout the use of the sentence, serious concerns were raised over difficulties in accessing 'offender behaviour' courses, required to qualify for release.

Ireland: Hunger Strike Prisoner Awarded €5,000 Pay-Out

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 graver and more 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 harder 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.

Felipe Valiati & Fernanda Santos - v – Director Of Public Prosecutions

1. These appeals by way of case stated both involve consideration of the use which the court may make of information provided by advocates acting for the defendant as part of case management in the Preparation for Effective Trial ('PET') form. In both cases, it is argued that critical information was taken from the PET form and treated as evidence either to fill a gap in the prosecution evidence or to support a conclusion reached.

2. The underlying principle for criminal litigation in the 21st century is identified in R v Gleeson [2004] 1 Cr App R 406 by Auld LJ (who was responsible for the Review of the Criminal Courts of England and Wales, October 2001) at [36]: "A criminal trial is not a game under which the guilty defendant should be provided with a sporting chance. It is a search for truth in accordance with the twin principles that the prosecution must prove its case and that a defendant is not obliged to inculpate himself, the object being to convict the guilty and acquit the innocent. Requiring a defendant to indicate in advance what he disputes about the prosecution case offends neither of those principles." Observations to like effect have been repeated over the years: see, for example, R (on the application of the DPP) v Chorley

Magistrates' Court [2006] EWHC 1795 per Thomas LJ from [22] and R (on the application of Hassani) v West London Magistrates' Court [2017] EWHC 1270 per Irwin LJ at [9], [11]-[13].

3. The starting point is the Criminal Procedure Rules made pursuant to s. 69 of the Courts Act 2003 and, in particular, the duty of the court, as set out in CrimPR 3.2(1), to further the overriding objective by actively managing the case which includes the early identification of the real issues: see Crim PR 3.2(2)(a). In that regard there is a corresponding duty on the parties actively to assist the court in fulfilling its duty under 3.2 which includes communication between the parties (and the court) as to what is agreed and what is likely to be disputed: see CrimPR 3.3(1), (2)(a), (b), (c)(ii) and (d). Under the heading 'Conduct of a trial or an appeal' and in order to manage the trial, the court "must establish, with the active assistance of the parties, what are the disputed issues": see Crim PR 3.11(a). The PET form (prepared by the Criminal Procedure Rule Committee) contains a series of questions, a number of which are tick boxes, all designed to assist the process: so that there is no confusion, it should be completed as drafted without amendment to the questions posed.

4. Moving from pre-trial case management into a trial in the magistrates' court, it is first important to underline that CrimPR 24.13(2) requires that unless the court otherwise directs, it must be provided with: a copy of the record of information supplied by each party for the purposes of case management, including any revision of information previously supplied; pre-trial directions for case management, or relating to admission or giving of evidence; and, any admissions. Further, CPR 24.3(3) identifies the sequence to be adopted at the commencement of a trial in these terms: "(3) In the following sequence – (a) the prosecutor may summarise the prosecution case, concisely identifying the relevant law, outlining the facts and indicating the matters likely to be in dispute; (b) to help the members of the court to understand the case and resolve any issue in it, the court may invite the defendant concisely to identify what is in issue"

5. In R (Firth) v Epping Magistrates' Court [2011] EWHC 388 (Admin), [2011] 1 WLR 1818, [2011] 1 Cr App R 32, the issue arose as to the admissibility in evidence, for the purposes of proceedings for committal for trial, of case management information supplied by her advocate. Initially charged with a summary offence, the case progression form then used in magistrates' courts identified the issues as "assault on [defendant] by complainant and "only contact made was in self-defence". When assault occasioning actual bodily harm was substituted and a committal held, the defence challenged the adequacy of the evidence of presence at the scene. The prosecutor relied on the inference to be drawn from the issues identified in the case progression form and successfully argued that it was admissible pursuant to s. 118(6)(a) of the Criminal Justice Act 2003 ("the 2003 Act") as an admission made by an agent of the defendant.

6. Before the Divisional Court, it was conceded that the information given constituted an admission of presence at the scene but it was argued that it was inadmissible on the basis that indications given for the purposes of case management should not be used as evidence against the provider of that information. Toulson LJ (as he then was) rejected (at [23]) the broad proposition that any requirement that a defendant should disclose his or her hand before trial was inherently repugnant. He went on to observe that any unfairness at the trial could be prevented by the court's power to exclude evidence under s. 78 of the Police and Criminal Evidence Act 1984 ("PACE").

7. Toulson LJ also dealt with the position of a trial in the magistrates' court. He said: "[29] Suppose that in the present case the matter had proceeded to a summary trial in the way that the parties originally expected. Because of the way that the issues were identified in the case progression form, the prosecution would not have thought it necessary to adduce identification evidence. If then, after the prosecution had called its evidence dealing with the nature of the events, Miss Firth had submitted that there was no case to answer because there was no proof of identification, Mr Grout recognises that there would be a problem. To put it colloquially, the prosecution would have been led up the garden path. He submits that it would not be possible in those circumstances for the prosecution to introduce the case progression form. Rather the appropriate course would be for the prosecution to seek an adjournment. As a matter of practical reality, the case would then have to go off to a future date, probably before a different bench of magistrates, and the prosecution would have to set about seeing whether they could obtain further identification evidence, involving identification parades, by now a considerable time after the incident. [30] If one asks rhetorically whether that approach is consistent with the object of the Criminal Procedure Rules 2010, i.e. whether it would further the interests of justice, do fairness and encourage expedition, the answers are obvious. I see no unfairness, in such a case, in the prosecution being able to put in evidence the case progression form."

8. Concern was expressed that this decision had the effect of modifying the fundamental right of a defendant to put the prosecution to proof of its case and to might encourage claims to privilege against self-incrimination in connection with case management (see, for example, (2011) Crim LR 547). The Court of Appeal (Criminal Division) sought to deal with them in R v Newell [2012] EWCA Crim 650, [2012] 1 WLR 3142.J.

9. The case concerned the use sought to be made by the prosecution of the comment "no possession" on a case management form in connection with a trial for possession of a controlled drug with intent to supply. A later defence statement (served on the first day of the trial) admitted possession but denied any intent to supply. Prosecution counsel was permitted to adduce the form into evidence and to cross examine the defendant on the inconsistency between "no possession" and the defence case statement. Sir John Thomas P (as he then was) said (at [33]): "Given that statutory regime in the Crown Court embedded primarily in the CPIA and the Criminal Procedure Rules, and the obligation to put "cards on the table" through the attendance of the trial advocate at the PCMH, the requirements of a PCMH form in the Crown Court should be seen primarily as a means for the provision of information to enable a judge actively to manage the case up to and throughout the trial, and the parties to know the issues that have to be addressed and the witnesses who are to come. The nature of the defence should appear from the defence statement with the statutory consequences provided for in the event of a breach of requirements. The Crown is also generally protected by the principles in the Chorley Magistrates' Court case and R v Penner, if in breach of the obligation to identify the issues an ambush is attempted by the defence."

10. He explained (at [35]) that the Trial Preparation form (now the PET) provides for admissions or acknowledgment that matters are not in issue, that admissions will be admissible but that other statements should be made without the risk that they would be used at trial as statements of the defendant admissible in evidence "provided the advocate follows the letter and spirit of the Criminal Procedure Rules". Allowing the appeal on the basis that the use of the form for cross examination should not have been allowed, he went on (at [36]): "Applying what we have set out, therefore, the position should be, provided the case is conducted in accordance with the letter and spirit of the Criminal Procedure Rules, that information or a statement written on a PCMH Form should in the exercise of the court's discretion under s.78 not be admitted in evidence as a statement that can be used against the defendant. The information is provided to assist the court. Experience has shown that, unless the position is clear, the proper administration of justice is hampered. There may of course be cases where it would be right not to exercise the discretion but to admit such statements. Those circumstances are fact specific, but an example is a case where there was no defence statement, despite the judge asking for one to be provided, and an ambush attempted inconsistent with what was stated on the PCMH Form. In such a

case it would not be appropriate to exercise the discretion to refuse to admit what was stated on the form, if an adjournment to enable the Crown to deal with the issue could be avoided. However, we think, provided the parties adhere to the letter and the spirit of the Criminal Procedure Rules and follow the practices we have outlined, such cases should be very, very rare."

11. What is clear is that the court was not saying that the information was inadmissible as a matter of law (otherwise there could never be a situation, however rare, in which it could be admitted). Indeed, subject to s. 78 of PACE, the statements may be admissible as hearsay under the sixth rule preserved by s. 118(1) of the Criminal Justice Act 2003 ("the 2003 Act"). In order for that to happen, however, an application must formally be made to the court and that, along with any application under s. 78 then have to be determined. That is not to suggest that the requirements of notice as set out in CrimPR Part 20 can or should be required: it is this sort of circumstance that is envisaged by Crim PR 20.5(1)(c).

12. Against the background of the Rules and these decisions, I turn to the Criminal Practice Directions. It is important to underline that the directions pass through the Criminal Procedure Rule Committee and are issued by the Lord Chief Justice pursuant to s. 74 of the Courts Act 2003 and Schedule 2 (Part 1) of the Constitutional Reform Act 2005. They represent the current practice and bind the courts to which they are directed. In that regard, they are identical to the practice directions for civil proceedings (s. 74 of the 2003 Act being in substantially the same terms as s. 5 of the Civil Procedure Act 1997) in respect of which Waller and Dyson LJJ said in Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government v Bovale Ltd [2009] EWCA Civ 171 at [28]: "The issue of a practice direction is the exercise of an inherent power, … and it cannot be open to another judge of the court to which the practice direction is intended to apply to ignore that practice direction or to suggest in a judgment that a practice direction should no longer be followed in that court." The value of the Criminal Procedure Rules and the Practice Directions is that they provide a code which govern the practice of all criminal litigation and go a long way to ensuring that justice is administered consistently throughout the country.

13. In relation to trials in the magistrates' courts, the relevant Practice Direction in relation to the role of the Legal Adviser is CPDVI Trial 24A.11 and is in these terms: "Immediately prior to the commencement of a trial, the legal adviser must summarise for the court the agreed and disputed issues, together with the way in which the parties propose to present their cases. If this is done by way of pre-court briefing, it should be confirmed in court or agreed with the parties." I emphasise the mandatory nature of the requirement.

14. More significantly, under the heading "Identification for the Court of the Issues in the Case", the Directions provide: "24B.3 The parties should keep in mind that, in most cases, the members of the court already will be aware of what has been declared to be in issue. The court will have access to any written admissions and to information supplied for the purposes of case management: CrimPR 24.13(2). The court's legal adviser will have drawn the court's attention to what is alleged and to what is understood to be in dispute: CrimPR 24.15(2). If a party has nothing of substance to add to that, then he or she should say so. The requirement to be concise will be enforced and the exchange with the court properly may be confined to enquiry and confirmation that the court's understanding of those allegations and issues is correct. Nevertheless, for the defendant to be offered an opportunity to identify issues at this stage may assist even if all he or she wishes to announce, or confirm, is that the prosecution is being put to proof. 24B.4 The identification of issues at the case management stage will have been made without the risk that they would be used at trial as statements of the defendant admissible in evidence against the defendant, provided the advocate follows the letter and the spirit of the Criminal Procedure Rules. The court may take the view that a party is not acting in the spirit of the Criminal

Procedure Rules in seeking to ambush the other party or raising late and technical legal arguments that were not previously raised as issues. No party that seeks to ambush the other at trial should derive an advantage from such a course of action. The court may also take the view that a defendant is not acting in the spirit of the Criminal Procedure Rules if he or she refuses to identify the issues and puts the prosecutor to proof at the case management stage. In both such circumstances the court may limit the proceedings on the day of trial in accordance with CrimPR 3.11(d). In addition any significant divergence from the issues identified at case management at this late stage may well result in the exercise of the court's powers under CrimPR 3.5(6), the powers to impose sanctions."

15. The Directions are intended to codify the approach identified by the case law dealing with the tension between case management on the one hand and the rights of the parties (in particular the defendant) on the other. This underlying principle reflects the approach to the administration of criminal justice in which both sides rather than the prosecution alone are required to disclose the issues well before trial. More significantly, if these directions are followed, there will be clarity between the court, the prosecution and the defence as to the nature of those issues and appropriate admissions can be formulated in relation to what is not in issue so that any trial can be conducted efficiently and expeditiously.

16. I repeat the observations of Auld LJ that requiring a defendant to identify the issues does not offend the twin principles that the prosecution must prove its case and that a defendant is not obliged to inculpate himself. In that regard, if the defence is to put the prosecution to proof, that is what must be indicated: this does not involve the presentation of a positive case. Where such a case is thereafter sought to be presented, such an attempt could demonstrate that the defendant is not acting in the spirit of the CrimPR and applications by the prosecution can be considered accordingly. If there is a failure to comply and what then appears to the court to be the creation of a trap for the prosecution, in addition to the possible approaches described by CPD 24B.4, it could be open to the prosecution to seek to rely s. 118 of the 2003 Act and, subject to s. 78 of PACE, the admission of hearsay. It is against that background, that the two appeals by way of case stated fall to be decided.

17. On 23 November 2017, Felipe Valiati appeared before Highbury Corner Magistrates' Court charged with common assault upon his partner, Fernanda Santos. He pleaded not guilty and a PET form was completed which included answers by way of tick box to the following questions set out in para. 8.1: "The defendant [carried out][took part] in the conduct alleged: - No. The defendant was present at the scene of the offence alleged: -Yes. The defendant was correctly identified: - Yes The defendant was arrested lawfully: - Yes. Defendant's interview [summary][record] is accurate: - Yes – No comment."

18. The PET form went on to pose the question, "What are the DISPUTED issues of fact or law for trial, in addition to any identified in paragraph 8.1". The response was: "I do not remember any of these incidents. I put the prosecution to proof."

19. Paragraph 9 of the form deals with admissions and asks whether any facts which are not in dispute can be reduced into a written admission pursuant to CrimPR 24.6 and s. 10 of the Criminal Justice Act 1967. The response was in the affirmative but the only admission offered related to the interview (which contained no comment).

20. The Case Stated identifies what happened thereafter. Although summoned to attend court for the trial on 19 January 2018, the complainant did not appear. An independent witness, Mr Lowe, however, gave detailed evidence of seeing a man assaulting a woman at a bus stop which caused him such concern that he turned his car around and witnessed a further assault,

eventually stopping to assist the woman whom he provided with his contact details. Having received a call from her, he spoke to the police but was never asked to take part in identification procedures. Mr Valiati did not give evidence and submissions were made on his behalf about identification, the absence of an identification parade and the possibility of error.

21. The justices recorded their findings in the Case Stated in these terms: "We found the evidence of Mr Lowe, a fully independent witness, to be reliable and consistent. We found that Ms Santos was assaulted by being forcefully and violently pushed, resulting in her falling over a low wall and that the assailant ran after her and repeatedly kicked out at her. We noted the appellant's no comment interview and the acceptance on the PET form of presence at the scene. We drew an adverse inference from his failure to give evidence in court. We were satisfied so that we were sure that Mr Valiati was the perpetrator of the attack on Ms Santos and found him guilty of assault by beating."

22. The questions posed for the High Court were as follows: "(i) When reaching our verdict were we entitled to consider the following questions on the PET form that were answered in the affirmative part 3 paragraph 8.1 The defendant was present at the scene of the offence alleged; The defendant was correctly identified; The defendant was lawfully arrested; even though they were not contained within part three, paragraph 9 PET form that is entitled 'Admissions'? (ii) Were we entitled to find that the perpetrator of the assault was the defendant, in the absence of specific identification evidence being presented by the Crown?"

23. It is not suggested that a formal application was made by the prosecution to admit the information on the PET form or that the defence were alerted to the evidential use to which the PET form would be put so that representations could be made about it. Neither does it appear that there was any evidence that proved the relationship between Ms Santos and Mr Valiati.

24. Not being contained in formal admissions made pursuant to s. 10 of the 1967 Act, or the subject of the discussion envisaged by the Practice Direction at the start of the trial, the inconsistency between the case management information that presence and identification was not in dispute and the observation that Mr Valiati did not remember any of the incidents and put the prosecution to proof was not explored. What is clear, however, is that no attempt was made to utilise s. 118 of the 2003 Act by admitting what was said on the PET form as hearsay and what the justices (albeit understandably) did was to confuse the provision of case management information with evidence without the same being formally adduced. If the relevant Practice Directions had been followed, this problem would not have occurred.

25. In the event, the answer to this Case Stated is clear. The answers to both questions posed must be in the negative and the appeal allowed accordingly.

26. Soon after an incident on 8 September 2017, KM (15 years old at the time) was arrested and, after interview the following day, charged with common assault on two other girls and theft of the mobile telephone of one of them. On 11 October 2017, she appeared at the Stratford Youth Court and entered not guilty pleas and a PET form was completed, signed by prosecution, defence and the court.

27. Part 2 was completed by the prosecution. It stated that some CCTV evidence was outstanding and would be served. It also indicates that the prosecution would rely on a summary of KM's interview.

28. Part 3 of the form was completed by the defence. In paragraph 8, dealing with case management information, the tick boxes read as follows: "The defendant [carried out][took part] in the conduct alleged: - This was left blank but this and the following question were bracketed and marked "See below". The defendant was present at the scene of the offence alleged: -Yes. The defendant was correctly identified: - No. … Defendant's interview [summary][record] is accurate. If not agreed, explain what is in dispute: No. The form is annotated "Require interview recording".

29. At the bottom of the form the following was annotated in manuscript: "1. Did not provoke incident and not aggressor 2. Any violence used in reasonable self-defence. 3. Did not take part in joint enterprise attack on either complainant. 4. Accepts picked up mobile but at the time did not realise belonged to complainant. deny comments alleged by [one of the complainants]. 5. Admissibility of Q & A with PC Ramchandan (Breach of PACE - Interview without caution or appropriate adult)."

30. Part 4 of the PET was completed by both parties and the court. It deals with the required attendance of prosecution witnesses. Both complainants and the two police officers were fully bound. The defence set out why they needed the witnesses namely that their account was disputed. The court appears to have filled in the time estimate for the evidence of each of the witnesses and included time for legal argument based on s. 78 of PACE.

31. An order was made for the service of the tape of the interview (which was not complied with). Further, on the date fixed for trial (13 December 2017) although both complainants attended, neither of the police officers did and the full interview was not, even then, available. In the circumstances, there was no evidence of arrest and the interview summary was not admitted into evidence. There was no application to adduce any hearsay evidence and formal admissions were not sought by either party.

32. The complainants gave evidence about the incident in which they described their attacker and the person who took the mobile phone, in general terms, as being a black girl with red hair. That description could have matched the defendant at the time of trial although neither witness had been asked to take part in any form of identification procedure. The phone taken had been restored a little while later by one of the police officers: that was proved as one of the complainants demonstrated it was hers by entering the passcode accurately. There was, however, no evidence from the police officers (and thus no evidence as to the identity of the person from whom they recovered the phone) and the interview was not adduced.

33. The defence made a submission of no case on the basis that the identification evidence was insufficient. The magistrates found as fact that KM was arrested a short distance from the incident and that, when searched, she was found to be in possession of the mobile phone which the complainant unlocked whereupon KM was taken to the police station and admitted being present at the scene, raising self-defence or defence of another; she admitted picking up the phone saying that she shouted to ask who it belonged to and received no reply. The court went on to hold that there was a case to answer on the following grounds: 1. There was a case to answer. The two prosecution witnesses had given credible evidence that they were assaulted by a girl of particularly distinctive appearance. 2. The mobile phone had been recovered by police from the Appellant, who had been apprehended in an area close to where the assaults took place. The police had got the description of this person from the complainants and this same person as being the girl who carried out the assaults, and who had taken [the complainant's] mobile phone. [She] was able to identify the phone as being definitely her phone, which had been taken by the girl "with red hair". This was by opening the phone with the security pin. 3. We were satisfied that the "girl with the red hair" was, indeed, the Appellant who appeared before us, and that there was a case to answer."

34. The Case Stated goes on to explain that, having retired to consider their verdict, they asked (without objection from either party) for the PET form containing the information set out above. They gave the following reasons for their decision: "Notwithstanding the comments made in the PET form, we were of the opinion that the evidence of the two complainants was sufficient to place the appellant at the scene of the incident for the reasons we have already mentioned

[regarding the rejection of the submission of no case to answer]. The issue of mistaken identity was not raised as a trial issue. We felt that the witnesses' evidence alone (and not in conjunction with what was stated in the PET form) was sufficient to satisfy us, to the criminal standard, that the appellant was guilty of the offences with which she has been charged."

35. The questions for the opinion of the High Court are: 1. Were we entitled to rely upon the information contained within section 8 of the preparation for effective trial form to confirm our decision when that form was not before the Court in evidence? 2. Notwithstanding the answer to [(1)] above, were we permitted, in the light of the decision in R v Newell [2012] 2 Cr. App. R. 10, to note from the PET form that the appellant's presence at the scene of where the alleged offences took place was not an issue in dispute? 3. Was it open to the court find a case to answer?

36. Before dealing with the questions posed, by way of preliminary observation, it does not seem that there was sufficient evidence of identification from the general description provided by the witnesses of a black girl with red hair unless there was something else to link KM to the offence. Evidence that she had the mobile phone could have been sufficient but there was no basis for the magistrates to find as a fact that the police seized the mobile phone from KM or where they did so. Neither was there any evidence of the interview to justify the findings of fact to that effect.

37. Although there might have been no objection to the request for the PET form, again, the Practice Direction was not followed. Had that happened, it might be that sufficient formal admissions would have been agreed or, in default, urgent arrangements made for the arresting officer to attend. Given that the prosecution had been ordered to provide the interview and both police witnesses had been required to attend (but without apparent explanation did not do so), it is difficult to see on what basis it would have been appropriate to admit the identification of issues contained within the form to close the gaps left by the complainants. The PET form cannot be used as a mechanism for avoiding complying with court orders or, absent agreement or specific court order, not bringing witnesses to court whose attendance has been required.

38. Neither this court nor (as far as I can tell) the magistrates' court was not told why the interview had not been served or why police witnesses whose attendance was required were not available. On the face of it, these failures are lamentable and the Crown Prosecution Service owes an apology to the complainants. At the end of the day, however, the court must proceed on the basis of evidence called or properly placed before the court.

39. In this case, the magistrates explain that they did not rely on the PET form to reach a conclusion in the case (although the question posed may lead to the inference that they used it to 'confirm' their decision). Assuming that the questions are not, therefore, moot and the issues had not formally been limited as envisaged by the Practice Direction, the answer to the first two questions is that in the absence of the PET form being admitted in evidence, they were not entitled to rely on it and that, in the context of this case, there was no basis to admit it. Based on the evidence adduced at the trial, the answer to the third question is also in the negative. This appeal, therefore is also allowed.

40. None of the foregoing is intended to minimise the importance of the PET form in the magistrates' court, or the PTPH form in the Crown Court. Neither is it to discourage the identification of issues, leading to appropriate admissions thereby reducing the time which a trial necessarily takes up. Effective case management requires nothing less. Similarly, it does not imply that what is contained in information provided to the court by way of case management cannot be used to prevent "game-playing" (in the language of Irwin LJ in R (on the application of Hassani) v West London Magistrates' Court [2017] EWHC 1270 (Admin) at [10]).

41. If circumstances arise in which it is sought to argue that the information provided on a PET form should have evidential significance, an appropriate application must be made and the hurdles both in relation to hearsay and s. 78 of PACE satisfied. In these cases, however, no such application was ever made and, to such extent as it might have been, it was wrong to take it into account. These appeals are, therefore, allowed.

Women, Scrap Sentences of Less Than 12 Months 'Save Lives And Cut Crime'

Jon Robins, 'The Justice Gap':Prison sentences of less than 12 months should be scrapped for women, according to a new report from a cross-party group of MPs and peers published yesterday. The All Party Parliamentary Group on Women in the Penal System (APPG) reckoned that evidence of the case against short prison sentences was 'overwhelming for women'. The group is chaired by Baroness Corston and pushes for the implementation of recommendations from her 2007 review of vulnerable women in the criminal justice system. According to the APPG, women prisoners were 'among the most disadvantaged and vulnerable people in society' and almost half report having suffered domestic violence and more than half report emotional, physical or sexual abuse during childhood. The APPG, which is supported by the Howard League for Penal Reform, argued that women did not receive adequate mental health support with 'catastrophic' consequences. Last year there were 8,317 incidents of self-injury by women in prison, 93 women died in prison including 37 who lost their lives through suicide.

Last year just over two thirds of women sentenced to immediate custody were given sentences of less than six months and 246 women were sentenced to prison for less than two weeks. The number of community orders given to women fell by nine per cent in the first quarter of 2018 compared with 2017. The APPG argued that imprisoning women was 'almost never' justifiable in terms of public protection. Only three per cent of the women prisoners was assessed as representing a high risk of harm to others. The APPG noted that the damage done by imprisonment continued post-release and, for example, fewer women than men leaving prison found jobs. Between April and June 2017, one in five women leaving prison were recorded as homeless at the point of release. 'It is well established that imprisonment makes things worse, not better, for women, but our inquiry has found that women are still being sent to prison unnecessarily, and overwhelmingly for short periods,' commented Baroness Corston, co-chair of the group. 'Too often, magistrates view custody as the only option when all the evidence indicates that women's centres provide better support for women and are more effective at reducing offending. Ministers are aware and have spoken publicly about the futility of short prison sentences. Scrapping them for women would save lives and reduce crime.'

Prisons New Frontline in Fighting Crime, Says Gauke

Jamie Grierson, Guardian: Jails have emerged as a new frontline in fighting crime because advances in technology mean prison walls alone are no longer effective in stopping criminals, the justice secretary has told police chiefs. David Gauke said organised gangs and networks were treating prisons as lucrative and captive markets to push drugs, mobile phones and other contraband, creating "a thriving illicit economy".

Addressing the Association of Police and Crime Commissioners (APCC) and National Police Chiefs' Council (NPCC), Gauke said there was a direct link between crime inside and outside prisons. "I believe prisons have emerged as a new frontline in the fight against crime," he said. "The fact is, new technology and sophisticated approaches mean that prison walls alone are no longer

effective in stopping crime – inside or outside of prison. Offenders who commit crime in prison have a disruptive and often devastating impact on the prospects of those who are trying to turn their lives around and who see prison as a pivotal turning point in their lives." Gauke said recent successes in fighting organised crime behind bars included a joint operation by prison intelligence officers and police that broke up an organised crime gang that used drones to smuggle £1.2m worth of drugs, weapons and mobile phones into prisons across the UK. In the last few weeks, Gauke said, 15 members of the same gang received prison sentences of up to 10 years.

The justice secretary last month announced a new financial investigations unit, which will aim to identify and disrupt organised crime gangs in prisons. The government is also spending £70m to improve the safety and stability of prisons, including equipment such as x-ray scanners to stem the influx of the drugs fuelling much of the violence. Earlier at the APCC and NPCC summit, the shadow home secretary, Diane Abbott, said the UK was at risk of becoming a safe haven for organised criminals and terrorists under the government's proposed terms to leave the European Union. Abbott told the summit that Labour would vote down any deal that left the UK's security and policing in a worse situation than before. She warned that being outside Europol (the EU's law enforcement agency), losing the use of the European arrest warrant and not having access to EU criminal databases would damage the UK's ability to fight crime. Abbott said: "Put simply, the government's hard Brexit and its lack of progress on security matters contains a real risk that this country could become a safe haven for the terrorists, the Mafia-type criminals, the smugglers and the paedophiles on the run from the EU27. This is not a prospect either this country or the EU should contemplate."

Serious and Organised Crime

Sajid Javid: My first priority as Home Secretary is to keep the public safe. Today Thursday 1st November, I have published a new, revised and updated, "Serious and Organised Crime Strategy". The strategy has been laid before Parliament as Command Paper (Cm 9718), and copies are available in the Vote Office and on gov.uk. Serious and organised crime affects more UK citizens, more often, than any other national security threat. Its perpetrators ruthlessly target the most vulnerable, ruining lives and blighting communities. Their activities cost us at least £37 billion each year and have a corrosive impact on our public services, communities, reputation and way of life.

Since the previous strategy was published in 2013, we have made significant progress in creating the powers, partnerships and law enforcement structures we need to respond to the threat. The law enforcement community, and the National Crime Agency in particular, has an impressive and sustained track record of pursuing serious and organised criminals and bringing them to justice. But the threat we face has grown increasingly complex over the past five years. Criminals and networks are quick to exploit the rate of technological change and globalisation, whether it is grooming children online, using malware to steal personal data or moving illegal goods, people and money across borders. They have learnt to become more adaptable and resilient. Our response must continue to adapt to new challenges. The revised strategy follows a comprehensive cross-Government review, led by the Home Office. It sets out the Government's new approach to prevent serious and organised crime, build our defences against it, track down the perpetrators, from child sex offenders to corrupt elites, and bring them to justice. We will allow no safe space for these people, their networks or their illicit money in our society.

Our new approach will be to target the highest harm networks and the most dangerous and determined criminals exploiting vulnerable people, using all the powers and levers available to the state to deny them access to money, assets and infrastructure. But we will not

achieve our aim through disruption alone. We will also work with the public, businesses and communities to help stop them from being targeted by criminals and support those who are; and we will intervene early with those at risk of being drawn into criminality.

We will invest at least £48 million in 2019-20 in law enforcement capabilities to strengthen efforts to tackle illicit finance, which will enhance our overall response to serious and organised crime, including additional investment in the multi-agency National Economic Crime Centre. We will pilot new approaches to preventing people from engaging in serious and organised crime and build community resilience against it. We will establish a new national tasking framework for law enforcement. We will improve engagement with the private sector, particularly the information and communications technology industry. We will also expand our overseas capabilities, including establishing a new network of overseas policy specialists.

The new strategy will align our efforts to tackle serious and organised crime as one cohesive system. We will equip the whole of Government, the private sector, communities and individual citizens to play their part in a single collective endeavour.

Solicitors Challenge Lack Of Immigration Advice in the Prison Estate

Duncan Lewis currently represents a number of individuals who are subject to immigration control, but are detained within the prison estate as opposed to within immigration removal centres. We have commenced judicial review proceedings on their behalf, primarily arguing that the Lord Chancellor, the Director of Legal Aid Casework and/or the Secretary of State for the Home Department are squarely discriminating against those held under immigration powers who are detained within prisons when compared to detainees in immigration removal centres. The most significant impact of this discrimination is that individuals detained within the prisons are precluded from accessing justice in the form of effective legal representation. The danger of this is that without professional legal support, immigration detainees in prisons risk losing out on legitimate legal action which could alter the outcome of their case. It could also mean that they are eligible for compensation for unlawful treatment, of which they are not aware, and unable to dispute.

Within immigration removal centres these individuals that are presently held within the prison estate would, at the very least, have access to regular legal advice surgeries carried out by immigration practitioners. As specialists in these matters and with an extensive team of outdoor clerks, Duncan Lewis regularly attend immigration removal centres to provide advice and support to those that need our assistance. If immigration detainees in prisons had access to this regular support, they would be afforded the same opportunities as those currently available to those in immigration removal centres and would have a greater chance of success in their case.

The Lord Chancellor has recognised the need for provision of legal advice in an immigration context to those detained within immigration removal centres. In line with the statutory duty contained within Section 1 of the Legal Aid Sentencing and Punishment of Offenders Act 2012, the claimants in these proceedings argue that on review this duty also extends to those facing the prospect of being subject to immigration control, but detained within the prison estate. For this reason, we argue that they should be given access to the same justice already afforded to those detained in immigration removal centres.

The fact that these provisions are already in place, but are not being made available to immigration detainees held in the prison estate demonstrates neglect on the part of the aforementioned authorities. The judicial review we are bringing aims to identify the party/ies at fault, to ensure that responsibility for correctly implementing access to quality legal support for all immigration detainees – regardless of where they are detained – is accepted and actioned.

Children in Prison Aren't Coping - But Nobody Seems to Care

Mark Johnson, Guardian: Children's jails are places we all wish didn't exist. In this country we lock children up at 10, the minimum legal age for criminal responsibility. In secure children's homes, young offender institutions and secure training centres, children are detained for committing crime but also for their own protection from abuse. This means some are detained having done nothing wrong. They can be locked up for any amount of time, including for the majority of their childhood.

Recently, User Voice, the organisation I founded, gave some of them an opportunity to tell the world about their lives. We spoke to 200 out of the approximately 1,000 children in jails, through focus groups, interviews and surveys. These voices are rarely heard, so this is probably the most in-depth consultation of incarcerated 10- to 17-year-olds in recent history.

What they told us made me angry and fearful for their futures. These vulnerable children are seriously stressed. Eighty-five per cent said they had taken drugs, of whom a large proportion told us this was to cope and to alleviate stress, grief and anger. "Isn't that why all people take drugs, to suppress feelings and escape the world? [It's an] easy way to cope with reality," one child explained. For all the stories of good practice and standout staff, there were many, many more of torturous loneliness. "I have been let down in the care system so many times it's hard to trust," was the all-too-common refrain. "It's OK if you've got small problems," said another boy, seemingly resigned to dealing with his issues on his own. They are far from isolated examples. These children don't believe adults will help them: three-quarters said they didn't trust any professional involved in their so-called care. "Can't go anywhere for help because all they will do is write stuff down and use it against you," one child told us.

Little wonder that so many of these young people reported using drugs to deal with complex mental health issues such as grief, trauma and long-term stress. Some mentioned drinking to cope, and being hospitalised numerous times. Stressed, no one to trust, resorting to drugs to cope. It's a ticking time-bomb. It's not just the trauma of what happened to them before they were locked up. Nearly all the kids I met seemed to be having a stress response to their situation – locked up for weeks, months and years, with limited access to their families, friends and possessions.

But these are vulnerable children and we should all be uncomfortable about incarcerating them. It is also a huge waste of money – it typically costs £200,000 a year to lock up one child. With around half of young offenders ending up in adult jails, this system is failing to rehabilitate children who commit crimes. We keep on doing the same old thing: punish, lock up, but never address the underlying causes that lead to stress, chaos and chemical reliance.

The young people themselves know it is a scandal. They want future generations to have the early intervention that they didn't have, including access to supportive staff who understand, listen, are approachable, who respect them and who they feel they can trust.

But no one seems to care that these vulnerable children are not coping with being locked up, let alone do anything about it. If we don't start jailing fewer children and making life better for those who are incarcerated, we cannot have much hope of ending the negative cycle of disadvantage, abuse, neglect, drug-taking and offending. The government needs to understand the links between trauma and child offending, and provide properly funded support services.

This negative pattern is not restricted to young offender institutions or secure children's homes, it is all too visible in cities across the UK. Knife crime and youth crime are soaring. Why? Well, when you talk to these kids, the answers are there – in fact, they are shouting them out, but we're still not listening.

• Mark Johnson is founder and chief executive of User Voice, a charity that works in prisons.

CCRC Refer Sexual Offences Conviction of Neil Secker to Court of Appeal

The Commission has referred the sexual offences conviction of Neil Secker to the Court of Appeal. Mr Secker appeared at Norfolk Crown Court in September 2016 charged with five counts of sexual assault against the same person. He pleaded not guilty to all. The jury acquitted him of the first two counts but convicted him of the remaining three. He was sentenced to four and a half years' imprisonment. Mr Secker tried to appeal against his conviction but his application for leave to appeal was dismissed in February 2017. In June 2017 he applied to the Criminal Cases Review Commission for a review of his conviction. Having reviewed the case in detail, the Commission has decided to refer Mr Secker's conviction to the Court of Appeal because it considers there is a real possibility that the Court will quash Mr Secker's convictions on the basis of post-trial information which is capable of significantly undermining the credibility and reliability of the complainant.

Rostomashvili v. Georgia Violation of Article 6 § 1

The applicant, Paata Rostomashvili, is a Georgian national who was born in 1973 and lives in the village of Akhaldaba (Georgia). The case concerned the applicant's allegation that he had not had a fair trial when he had been found guilty of murder. Mr Rostomashvili was found guilty of aggravated murder in May 2006. His conviction was based to a great extent on testimony by the victim's father, who said he had witnessed the killing. Mr Rostomashvili appealed, arguing that there was no forensic evidence to connect him to the crime. He also questioned the testimony of the victim's father, pointing to contradictions between his statements and those of two other people, who had said that they themselves had told the father of the murder and that he had not at the time mentioned having witnessed it. The Supreme Court upheld the first-instance verdict in September 2006. It found that the trial court had assessed the factual circumstances fully and objectively. It did not address any of Mr Rostomashvili's arguments, such as his submission that the trial court had failed to consider his statement that none of the evidence had implicated him in the crime and that the victim's father, who had implicated him, may not have been at the crime scene. Relying in particular on Article 6 § 1 (right to a fair trial) of the European Convention on Human Rights, Mr Rostomashvili complained that the domestic courts had failed to give sufficient reasons for their decision to convict him. Violation of Article 6 § 1

Adrian McDonald Tasered by Police and Seriously Bitten by a Police Dog.

An inquest has opended into the death of Adrian McDonald died aged 34 on 22 December 2014, following arrest by Staffordshire Police, during which he was tasered and seriously bitten by a police dog. The inquest will examine the options available to the police officers who dealt with Adrian, given his presentation, and the circumstances which contributed to his death. Almost four years on, Adrian's family believe the length of time the inquest has taken to reach a hearing is disproportionate and upsetting. This delay is due to the time taken by the then Independent Police Complaints Commission to investigate the matter and report.

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.