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 759 (18/09/2019) - Cost £1

Epic Jail: Inside Uk's Optimised 'Super-Prison' Warehouses

Oliver Wainwright, Guardian: Inmate deaths are up by 20% in the UK, the most incarcerated nation in western Europe. Can prisons designed using virtual reality modelling undo the harm? A huge image of a snowcapped mountain covers the wall at the end of a long corridor of cells in Her Majesty's Prison Berwyn, providing a glimmer of relief from the sterile landscape of indestructible concrete walls and wipe-clean floors, flooded with harsh white light. What the polished PR images of the model £220m "super-prison" in Wrexham, north Wales, don't convey is the constant echo of banging doors and shouting; the lack of ventilation, or the fact that the cell ceilings are so low you can press your hand flat against them. Nor do they show that Berwyn has some of the country's highest rates of violence, weapon finds and "use of force" incidents by staff. Nor that the workshops still remain unfinished two years after the prison opened.

Originally planned to be one of the cheapest Category C jails to run in England and Wales, housing 2,100 men at £14,000 per year per place, HMP Berwyn is currently one of the most expensive, standing 40% empty and costing £36,000 per prisoner each year. It has been dubbed a "catastrophic failure", yet it embodies the latest in prison thinking in the UK – which holds the title of the most incarcerated nation in western Europe. Recent analysis found the rate of imprisonment in England and Wales is about twice as high as Germany and roughly three times that of Italy and Spain. And it's only set to rise.

Boris Johnson's recent announcement of 10,000 extra prison places comes at a time when our penal system is on its knees, with services slashed to the bone after years of cuts. Jails are beset by chronic overcrowding, drug use, mental illness and self-harm. Deaths have risen by 20% in less than a year. Recent inspections report filthy cells, stinking unscreened toilets, broken windows, exposed wiring and heaps of rubbish infested with vermin. In a damning indictment of the levels of squalor, a Dutch court recently refused to extradite a prisoner to England on the grounds that the conditions awaiting him would be "inhumane and degrading".

It is against this bleak backdrop that the Ministry of Justice has allowed architects Bryden Wood to promote their plans for HMP Wellingborough, a £253m 1,600-capacity prison currently under construction in Northamptonshire. Claiming to be the product of "the largest research project of its kind", the designs have done away with Victorian-style gallery cell blocks, removed the bars from windows, and arranged the cells in smaller groups around landscaped courtyards. The visitor centre promises to be an airy timber-lined hall more akin to an Ikea cafe.

"The Scandinavian mindset is that if you are in prison, that's our fault as a society. It's our responsibility to rehabilitate you" "We really started from first principles," says Jaimie Johnston, director of Bryden Wood. The practice was commissioned in 2016 to come up with a standardised design that could be rolled out in a £1.2bn programme of super-prisons – a pre-existing plan that the new prime minister has merely re-announced. "The idea was to put loads of time and effort into understanding the optimum design of a house block," he adds. "If you're building 10,000 cells, it's worth spending ages getting the cell absolutely right." It was supposed to be the ultimate flat-pack kit for incarceration by numbers, fine-tuned for efficiency and cost-effectiveness. Using virtual reality modelling, the architects tested countless layouts with prison staff, tweaking corridor widths and lengths, adjusting ceiling heights and modelling acoustics to come up with a layout that struck a balance between prisoner rehabilitation and operational efficiency – the two chief parameters of prison design, usually diametrically opposed, with the latter generally coming out on top.

The most radical changes in the resulting Wellingborough plan include getting rid of the familiar two-storey atrium arrangement with galleried landings – loved by prison officers for the visibility they allow between floors, but which result in hellish echo chambers – and ditching the usual K-shaped formation of the housing blocks. The K-block, instantly recognisable as a prison from the air, has lingered for generations as a hangover from the panopticon ideal, developed by 18th-century reformer Jeremy Bentham. In theory, a single prison officer placed in the centre of the radial arms of corridors could "survey of the whole establishment in the twinkling of an eye", while imparting in the prisoners a crushing sense of constant surveillance. Pentonville prison, which opened in London in 1842, set the standard with radial wings, galleried landings and all-pervasive grimness. Even contemporary commentators described it as "unnecessarily cruel" and posited that "madness will seize those whom death has spared". Yet, over the following six years, 54 prisons were built to exactly the same template, from Preston to Leeds and Manchester, and the same basic principles have remained unchanged in modern super-prisons.

Bryden Wood's housing blocks attempt to be a little more humane. Their staggered cross-shaped form breaks up the corridors into smaller, more social zones, where prison staff might be able to develop better relationships with prisoners through more direct contact and conversation, rather than the usual physical separation and anonymity of miles of corridors. The perpendicular wings create usable outdoor space for sports and gardening, rather than awkward triangles left over in the armpits of a K-block, while a central hub will provide education, vocational training and social facilities in one place, "like a high street", says Johnston – rather than scattering the facilities across the sprawling campus. These details aside, however, it looks very much like business as usual: endless warehouse-like sheds punctuated by tiny square windows, forming an institutional assembly line for inmates to be processed like Amazon parcels. The design of the cells remains confidential, while a source close to the project says there has been significant "value engineering", including the removal of the acoustic treatment. (An MoJ spokeswoman said: "We have worked closely with [contractor] Kier over the design at HMP Wellingborough, making improvements to each area of the prison at a price that is affordable for the taxpayer.") While the whole scheme was specifically designed for offsite prefabrication and repeatable economies of scale, it is instead being built with conventional construction methods, and will likely remain a one-off.

Architect Roland Karthaus, whose in-depth research on prison design won a RIBA award last year, points to procurement as the biggest obstacle in realising decent, humane prisons. "In the past, a brief has been developed, then sent out to contractors, who appear to value engineer it to death," he says. "There doesn't seem to be any process of actually valuing what the impact of those changes might be." He says the low cell ceilings in HMP Berwyn were a result of cost-cutting, without due concern for the psychological impact of squeezing the prisoners' personal space. Karthaus also found that the layout of furniture in Berwyn's cells meant it was impossible to do press-ups on the floor, while the way the ventilation grilles had been fitted essentially made them redundant.

The failure of the modern prison estate is all the more galling given the extensive wealth of knowledge that exists in academia and practice about how to design environments that are actually conductive to rehabilitation. Johnston says his team constantly showed their client world-leading examples, such as Norway's celebrated Halden prison – where inmates are

trusted with kitchens equipped with knives to cook their dinner, and there's a little house on the campus where prisoners can stay with their families for a night – but that such features would require a fundamental shift in how we think about incarceration in this country.

"The Scandinavian mindset is that if someone is in prison, that's our fault as a society," he says. "We let you fall through the cracks, so it's our responsibility to rehabilitate you." Bryden Wood's design process, by contrast, was haunted by the spectre of the Daily Mail test, forever mindful of "Holiday camps for prisoners!" headlines if their plans were deemed too cushy. Prisons in England must not only punish, but be seen to punish, with politicians constantly citing public opinion to justify draconian measures. So are we stuck with a template that remains basically unchanged since the publication of Hints for the Improvements of Prisons in 1817, which prescribed that the buildings should be "made as gloomy and melancholy as possible"?

According to Yvonne Jewkes, one of the UK's leading prison academics, we shouldn't be surprised that history continues to repeat itself, given the "pervasive cautiousness perpetuated by an intricate network of individuals, companies and capital, and driven primarily by concerns for security, cost and efficiency." She points to the privatisation of both the construction and management of prisons in the 1990s as enshrining short-term cost-saving over long-term benefit. But she sees signs of hope in Scotland's prison programme, where three new prisons built since 2012 – HMP Low Moss, HMP Shotts and HMP Grampian – show a "nod to Scandinavia" in their more open, community-facing designs. Karthaus says the key to Scotland's success is the smaller scale of the operation: all the decision-makers can sit in a room and agree on the design, something that is currently impossible in England's bloated super-prison system.

Just as building more roads brings more traffic, history has shown that if you build more prisons, the prison population will only increase. A recent report by the Prison Reform Trust described an "addiction to imprisonment", and found that the number of people behind bars in England and Wales is nearly 70% higher than three decades ago. If Boris Johnson has any intention of reducing reoffending – which currently costs the taxpayer around £15bn a year – he should focus on reducing the number of prison places, and prioritise rehabilitation over packing as many people as possible into ever more damaging containers.

Settling For Nil Damages Can Still be a Genuine Part 36 Offer

Elliot Kay,Zenith PL: The appellant was arrested on suspicion of harassment but was later released without charge, after police had taken fingerprints and DNA samples. The appellant issued a claim for false imprisonment and assault. In May 2011, the respondent commissioner made a Part 36 offer to settle in the sum of £4,000 and provided a letter of apology. The appellant rejected that offer on the basis that he would have to declare his arrest on entry to certain countries.

In September 2012, the appellant made a Part 36 offer to settle for £5,000 on condition that the commissioner admit liability for the matters alleged in the claim. In May 2013, the appellant made a further Part 36 offer to settle for £5,000 on condition that the commissioner admit unlawful arrest and ensure that all records of his arrest and of the harassment warning be removed from police records. The offer was rejected. On 20 July 2017, the appellant made a further Part 36 offer to settle the matter for nil damages with an admission of liability, plus reasonable costs. That offer was rejected and the respondent invited the appellant to attend a without prejudice discussion. The appellant did not respond to that invitation.At trial, the judge found that the arresting officer's suspicion that the appellant had committed an offence was reasonable. However, she also found that he had voluntarily attended the police station and it had not been reasonable to arrest him. The claim for assault was made out in respect of

the fingerprinting and the taking of a mouth swab for the DNA sample. The appellant was awarded £2,750, but the judge found that it would be unjust to apply the provisions of CPR r.36.17 and made no order as to costs. The appellant appealed on costs alone and submitted that, on the basis that the achievement of a vindication was capable of forming part of the remedy, he had achieved a judgment "at least as advantageous" as the proposals in his Part 36 offer of July 2017 for the purposes of r.36.17(1)(b) and was therefore entitled to his costs. The commissioner submitted that the offer of 20 July 2017 was not a genuine Part 36 offer because it included proposals on costs despite no sums in damages. Mrs Justice McGowan held that the fact that the appellant had given up all claim to a financial remedy was a significant concession indicative of a genuine Part 36 offer. That offer did engage the provisions of r.36.17 and it would be unjust not to follow its provisions in the usual way.

It's Official Your Bum: "Inherently Personal and Private"

A court has ruled by a majority that the rectum is "inherently personal and private" after limiting how police can perform body cavity searches. Guntallwon Brown was arrested in 2015 after he sold an undercover officer crack cocaine then hid a bag of the substance in his backside. He refused to remove the drugs and was ultimately sedated as a bag containing 2.9 grams of cocaine was removed from his rectum. He was convicted and sentenced to three years' probation as well as 90 days' home detention. But the Minnesota Supreme Court has reversed the decision in a 5-1 ruling and sent it back to the district court. Justice Paul Thissen wrote: "If a coerced invasion of one's anal cavity — an area inherently personal and private — while sedated and in front of strangers is not a serious and substantial intrusion of an individual's dignitary interest in personal privacy and bodily integrity, we cannot fathom what is."

Is Abuse of Process in Historic Sex Abuse Dead?

In this article James Wood QC considers some of the policy reasons which apparently lie behind an increasing willingness in the Court of Appeal to overturn decisions of trial judge's to stay proceedings on grounds of delay and loss of evidence, and their reluctance to find convictions unsafe where trial judges have declined to grant a stay.

In July this year in PR v R [2019] EWCA Crim 1225, a Court led by Lord Justice Fulford (the new Vice-President of the CACD) declined to interfere with a trial judge's decision to allow a case of historic sex abuse to proceed, even though the time periods of delay were significant, and the loss of material substantial. On reading his judgment, many considered that it most likely spelt the end of any realistic hope of the use of the abuse application to achieve a stay of proceedings on grounds of loss of historic material as a realistic or sustainable remedy.

The similar earlier ruling in May of this year in R v SR [2019] EWCA Crim 887, rejecting arguments seeking to overturn the trial judge's discretion to allow a trial to proceed, in what the court described as a "troubling" case of loss of historic investigative material, when coupled with an apparent willingness to overturn a trial judge's discretion to stay proceedings when potentially relevant mobile phone evidence had been lost as one "that was not reasonably open to him" (per Sir Brian Leveson (P) in R v E [2018] EWCA 2426, could all be seen as tantamount to an abolition of the jurisdiction, save in the most exceptional of circumstances.

In the 70's, 80's and 90's such stays on grounds of loss of material were prevalent and common place when complainants in sex abuse cases came forward late. Indeed the claim of the most minor of potential evidential disadvantage to the defence could often lead to a stay on grounds of trial unfairness, even if the consequence was to lead to a denial of justice to vic-

tims. As we moved through the millennium, judicial attitudes started to change. In 2001 Brooke LJ's judgment in R (Ebrahim) v Feltham Magistrates Court [2001] 2 Cr App R 23, was to be a turning point, ruling that circumstances in which a trial would "inevitably be unfair are likely to be few and far between", and that the criminal trial was well able to cope with arguments about loss of evidence. This change of approach coincided with an increase in public understanding of the long term personal damage caused to the victims of child sex abuse, and of the factors of fear, oppression, repression, inhibition and immaturity which can credibly lead complainants to only feel able to address deeply painful and personal memories of abuse in middle age and later life. This, coupled with the obvious deterrent effect on potential abusers of children, of knowing that their child victims will grow to adulthood, and when free from oppression from abusers, will be able to speak, and be allowed to give compelling evidence of childhood abuse after many years, have undoubtedly contributed to a further loosening of the tests of trial fairness formerly applied, and a greater reliance upon protective directions to juries upon the potential disadvantages to the defence of significant delay in the trial process.

Whilst our common law jurisdiction has historically relied on staying proceedings on grounds of abuse of process, in other codified European jurisdictions historic sex cases and aged prosecutions were prevented by perhaps unduly short statutory limitation periods for prosecuting offences. It is of note that our courts are not isolated in responding to changing attitudes and the "Me Too" era of historic allegations, by removing obstacles to prosecution which might prevent victims being heard. EU states have also been changing their laws by lengthening the limitation periods which tended to prevent the trial of historic abuse cases. Germany, for instance has revised it 20 year statutory limitation on sex offences to only apply after the victim has reached the age of 30, in effect meaning victims can complain up to the age of 50. In 2013 the Netherlands removed all limitation periods for serious sexual offences which carry a minimum sentence of 8 years. Similar changes are occurring further east, with Poland recently moving legislation to remove any limitation period for child sex offences.[1] So in this sense, what is occurring in our courts has an international consistency as the "Me Too" disclosures gather force.

It must be said, though, that the protections provided by the abuse jurisdiction in historic cases have not totally evaporated, and the trial process itself can provide some protections if defence advocates take the opportunity to fully deploy the fact of the potential material which has been lost, and its potential impact on the trial, in order to raise doubt. In PR v R [2019] EWCA Crim 1225 1 Fulford LJ reviewed the authorities (at paras 67-70) before citing Treacy LJ in R v RD [2013] EWCA Crim 1592 at para 71. He stated "It is clear that imposing a stay in situations of missing records is not a step that will be taken lightly; it will only occur when the trial process, including the judge's directions, is unable adequately to deal with the prejudice caused to the defence by the absence of the materials that have been lost. The court should not engage in speculation as to what evidence might have become unavailable but instead it should focus on any "missing evidence which represents a significant and demonstrable chance of amounting to decisive or strongly supportive evidence emerging on a specific issue in the case" (per Treacy LJ [67] above)."

It remains difficult, in the current climate, to imagine almost any circumstances where the trial process will not be able to cope with lost material. That being so, it remains unlikely the Court of Appeal will interfere when a trial judge rejects submissions seeking a stay, or where contentions are made that missing material renders historic convictions unsafe. Even if successful at first instance, the Court of Appeal has shown a willingness to allow prosecution appeals where trial judges or justices have concluded that a stay should be granted.

Advocates confronted with historic cases, whilst not abandoning abuse arguments, would be well advised to concentrate on fully and extensively deploying the extent of the lost material in front of the jury, and find ways of illustrating the impact that material might have had on the trial process. If this were done effectively, no doubt using hearsay provisions, then a jury will be more likely to give due weight to the arguments, and if trial judges seek to limit the scope of the exploration during the trial process, it may be the Court of Appeal will be more sympathetic, particularly as the directions of trial judges on delay are now required to invite the jury to consider the unfairness presented to the defence by the loss of material. Such a direction should be tailored so that juries understand that the evidence of what has gone missing, is clearly evidence in the proceedings which can properly be considered by them, in determining whether guilt has been established beyond reasonable doubt.

Prosecution Malfunctioning When Dealing With Brutal Kidnapping Ending in Death of Victim

The case Olewnik-Cieplińska and Olewnik v. Poland (application no. 20147/15) concerned the kidnapping and murder of the applicants' brother and son, Krzysztof Olewnik. He was kidnapped in 2001, detained and ill-treated for over two years, then murdered despite the handover of the ransom demanded by the kidnappers. His body was recovered in 2006.

In Chamber judgment in the case the European Court of Human Rights held, unanimously, that there had been: a violation of Article 2 (right to life) of the European Convention on Human Rights as concerned the State's failure to comply with its duty to protect the life of the applicants' relative, and a violation of Article 2 of the European Convention as concerned the inadequate investigation into his death. The Court found in particular that the domestic authorities had to be considered responsible for a series of serious errors on the part of the police in dealing with Mr Olewnik's kidnapping, which had ultimately resulted in his death.

Furthermore, despite a parliamentary inquiry into the case producing a highly critical report and the prosecuting authorities' efforts to bring proceedings against the police, prosecutors and high-ranking civil servants, the proceedings into Mr Olewnik's murder were still pending 17 years after his kidnapping and the circumstances of the events had not been fully clarified.

The applicants, Danuta Olewnik-Cieplińska and Włodzimierz Olewnik, are Polish nationals who were born in 1974 and 1949, respectively, and live in Drobin (Poland). Their relative, Krzysztof Olewnik, was kidnapped in 2001 when he was 25 years old. He was detained and ill-treated until 2003 when he was murdered, despite his family handing over the ransom demanded by the kidnappers via telephone messages and letters containing threats to his life. His body was eventually recovered in 2006 when one of the kidnappers, named by a witness in 2005, confessed and indicated the burial place. Ten gang members were ultimately convicted by final judgment in 2010. Their convictions were mainly based on confessions. At their trial they described keeping the victim chained to a wall by his neck and leg. He was also drugged, beaten and poorly fed. The alleged gang leader and the two other main kidnappers died in detention before or just after their trial. Although their deaths were classed as suicides, after being investigated, they nevertheless led to the resignation of the Minister of Justice and a wave of dismissals in the prosecution and prison services.

In addition to the proceedings against the gang members, there were several other attempts between 2009 and 2013 to clarify the kidnapping and murder. In particular, the Gdańsk prosecuting authorities brought criminal proceedings against most of those involved in the case, namely the police for abuse of power, the prosecutors for negligence and high¬ranking civil

servants for inaction. Two of the officers were acquitted because the offences had become time-barred while the other investigations were discontinued.

In 2009 the Sejm (the lower house of the Parliament) also set up a Parliamentary Inquiry Committee, which examined not only the actions of the police and the prosecution service, but also of the public administration bodies and the Prison Service. Its final report in 2011 concluded that "visible sluggishness, errors, recklessness, and a lack of professionalism on the part of the investigators resulted in the failure to discover the perpetrators of the kidnapping, and... ultimately, in (Mr Olewnik's) death." It also explored the possibility that the errors by public officials "had been intentional and ... aimed at covering their tracks, destroying evidence ... and, consequently, that some of them had cooperated with the criminal gang which kidnapped and murdered Krzysztof Olewnik". An investigation into kidnapping and murder against other unidentified individuals is still ongoing.

'Irreparable Harm' Inflicted on Children Whose Mothers are in Prison

Maya Oppenheim, Independent: The government needs to take action to end the "irreparable harm" inflicted on children whose mothers are in prison, MPs and peers have warned. Courts often do not have adequate information about whether a defendant has children and how a sentence would impact their lives, the Joint Committee on Human Rights said. The committee said powerful evidence it received from women of their own experiences showed their imprisonment poses a "serious threat" to both their own human rights and those of their babies and very young children.

In a report, it argued a child's right to respect for family life should be a central concern when a judge is thinking about sending a mother to jail – and said that too often this is not the case. An estimated 17,000 children each year are separated from their mothers in this way – and the vast majority of the women are sent to jail for non-violent offences. The report recommends that, excluding exceptional circumstances, if a baby is born during the mother's sentence, they should both be discharged from hospital directly to a Mother and Baby Unit (MBU). It says that when a mother with a baby is jailed, the sentence should not start until a place is secured in an MBU.

Harriet Harman, the Labour MP for Camberwell and Peckham who is the Human Rights Committee chair, said: "The right of a child to family life is only given lip service when their mothers are sent to prison. The harmful effects of a mother going to prison start at sentencing and continue for years, even after the mother is released. "Judges can't respect the human right of a child to family life if they don't know the child exists. At the moment there is no guarantee that they have this information; there must be proper checks before sentencing. Visits of children to their mother in prison should not be part of the Incentives and Earned Privileges Scheme [which incentivises good behaviour in prison]. How can it possibly be right to punish children for their parents' behaviour?"

Children whose mothers are jailed are more likely than their peers to have future problems – which include a higher likelihood of criminal offending, mental health problems and drug and alcohol addiction. Compared with their counterparts, they are also more likely to make less money, stop education at a younger age and die before the age of 65. One child told the report researchers: "I was worried about my mum when she was sent to prison. I did not know that it was going to happen. My dad had been to prison but that was not so bad as he could look after himself. I had seen things about prison and thought my mum may be upset and crying, and people may bully her. I had no way of knowing. When she did phone it was a long time. I worried a lot. I felt angry." He added: "It upset me most at night. I cried in the dark because I could not hear her voice. Just to say she was okay, and say goodnight and she loved me, and I could say I loved her, was all I needed." Another child added: "I was left with all the

responsibilities of going shopping, running a house, everything really, at the age of 15. I was a dropout from college because it was taboo to have a mother in prison and I felt like I could not talk about it. I became very isolated and started to go down a really bad route of drinking, getting into trouble, expressing anger."

The committee called for every step to be taken to make sure children can sustain positive relationships with their mothers. The report demands urgent reform in data collection, sentencing, support for children, and pregnancy and maternity. The committee found a total lack of reliable data on the number of mothers in prison, the number of children whose mothers are in jail and the number of women who are pregnant and give birth behind bars. The report urges the government to act urgently to change this.

Ms Harman added: "It's an indictment of the system that the prison service does not know how many women in the system have children, and that – in 2019 – we don't even know how many children are separated from a mother in prison." Female prisoners are often placed in prisons far away from their local community due to the fact the female prison population is smaller and women's prisons are significantly more geographically dispersed. The vast majority of female offenders are handed short sentences of six months or less for minor crimes, with a quarter imprisoned for under a month. However, the jail sentence can still be profoundly disruptive – causing people to lose their jobs, homes and contact with children.

Factors said to drive women to turn to crime include poverty, drug and alcohol problems, mental health issues and coercive relationships with men. Some 60 per cent of female offenders have experienced domestic abuse, an estimated 24 to 31 per cent have dependent children and those in jail or on probation are more than twice as likely to suffer mental health issues as men. Almost half of all female prisoners in England and Wales say they committed their offence to support the drug use of someone else, according to Ministry of Justice data, while many more are substance abusers themselves.

Michael Naughton: Please Forgive Me, But I Won't Be Holding My Breath

Almost two decades of research on miscarriages of justice and wrongful convictions, and over a decade of direct engagements with the Criminal Cases Review Commission (CCRC) with the Innocence Network UK (INUK) and the University of Bristol Innocence Project, have taught me one thing: the CCRC has finally succeeded in ensuring the virtual disappearance of miscarriages of justice as a serious cause for public or governmental concern.

With each successive CCRC chair there has been a further decrease in referrals to the Court of Appeal. This trend has rendered miscarriages of justice effectively non-existent as an official legal category. Referral rates have fallen from a derisory high point of around 4% to a new norm of less than 1% for the third year in a row: are we really to accept that the criminal justice system is near-perfect and that 99% of around 1,500 applicants per year are wrong or barefaced liars in their claims of miscarriage of justice? The way things are going, it seems like the ultimate sign of success would be a referral rate of zero, which would show that the criminal justice system is flawless, that miscarriages of justice don't occur and that there is no need for the CCRC to exist at all.

Literally set up off the backs of the torture, pain and miseries of the wrongly convicted and incarcerated (notably the cases of the Guildford Four, Birmingham Six and Maguire Seven), the CCRC now stands as a chimera for justice. It offers no realistic hope to the many thousands of applicants who have been turned down over the years that they will ever overturn their convictions, and have their lives and reputations restored. Like a perverse April Fool's joke (it started handling case-

work on 1st April 1997), the CCRC's very existence seeks to assure members of the public that because there is now a publicly funded body charged with looking into alleged miscarriages of justice, there is no need for their concerns. It muddies the waters in public discourse in its claims to be a 'champion of justice'or a '"state-sponsored innocence project', when it is in reality a backstop for the appeals system that wards off challenges against convictions.

The devil is always in the detail, of course. It is the definition of what would constitute a miscarriage of justice in the eyes of the CCRC, which also determines how it reviews applications, that reveals the limits of the assistance that it can give to applicants. This is enshrined in section .13 of the 1995 Criminal Appeal Act, which dictates that it can only refer cases to the appeal courts where there is a 'real possibility' that the conviction will be overturned. This means that the CCRC must look to the criteria of the appeal courts when thinking about whether the real possibility test might have been met. As I have long argued, this shackles the CCRC to the appeal courts and means that its assistance to the innocent is merely incidental: that is, in those very rare cases when the 'real possibility' test is satisfied by chance or good fortune, but, crucially, not when the innocent are failed by their lawyers or when forensic scientists make mistakes or juries get it wrong.

In consequence, CCRC reviews are for the most part mere desktop considerations of whether fresh evidence may now exist that was not or could not be available at the time of the original trial or previous failed appeal. Such an approach overlooks and positively excludes lines of inquiry that may prove an applicant innocent if it is not felt that such investigations would discover material that would meet the 'real possibility' criteria. The upshot is that an organisation that was established to assist innocent individuals to overturn their wrongful convictions is now anything but. Now, it trumpets successes like assisting asylum seekers, remedying erroneously-given parking tickets, and saving dogs given destruction orders that owners want to challenge, which, in fairness, is permitted by the 1995 Act.

At the same time, however, allegedly innocent miscarriages of justice victims languish in prison. This does not happen because they are not innocent but, rather, because they are not deemed to satisfy the 'real possibility' test or because their cases will never be investigated in enough depth to see if their claim of innocence is valid. On this point, it was instructive that the CCRC commissioner as long ago as 2005, John Weedon, conceded that if the Birmingham Six applied to the CCRC then, it was unlikely that their case would be referred back to the Court of Appeal. The evidence of their innocence, he said, might not have been considered to be fresh. This should have caused a public outcry, but it didn't. The result is an understandable apathy from alleged victims of miscarriages of justice. They tell me regularly that they have lost faith in the system. They say that they won't even bother to make an application to the CCRC as there is no point. They complain that the CCRC is only concerned with whether an application fulfils the 'real possibility', which, of course, most don't. I can only speculate, but perhaps this was the reason why the test was created in the first place.

Despite this, rather than assert and demonstrate its supposed independence and be bolder in terms of its reviews and the cases that it refers, the CCRC defends and justifies its governing statute that handcuffs it to the appeal courts. In so doing, it is complicit in shielding a criminal justice system that routinely convicts the innocent. They are left with nowhere to go other than university innocence projects, whose own work is hampered by the need to apply to the CCRC and meet the 'real possibility' test. And yet the critique of the CCRC's structures and the impact in terms of its failure to assist the innocent is not new. Leaving aside the efforts of other academics, lawyers, third-sector organisations and victims of wrongful convictions who are dedicated to the fight against wrongful convictions, I personally have been raising

awarenessof the limits and failings of the CCRC in assisting applicants who may be innocent for at least 15 years. This has included consulting with MPs; meetings with the Home Office, CCRC, Parole Board, and so on; presentations in the House of Commons; and invited submissionson my work and wider activitiesto governmental reviews and inquiries.

On a more practical level, I established the first innocence project in the UK precisely because innocent people can be and are wrongly convicted in this country. The CCRC is not the panacea to the problem. Now in their fifteenth year, other innocence projects that were set up in this jurisdiction have managed to overturn a couple of convictions that the CCRC missed, both by Cardiff Innocence Project. Innocence projects, though, are not merely to be seen as a safety net for the CCRC in an otherwise sound system. It is telling that the Cardiff Innocence Project has had about 20 other applications, which it believes to be credible, turned down by the CCRC. Indeed, it is the focus on claims of innocence that may be or are valid that distinguishes innocence projects from the CCRC. In the cases that are not referred, the ontological clash between the two becomes most apparent. Those unreferred cases include a dossier of some 44 cases that Innocence Network UK (INUK) made public in 2011 as part of its campaign for the reform of the CCRC. The dossier was comprised mainly of prisoners serving life or long-term sentences for serious offences, ranging from gangland murders and armed robbery to rape and other sexual offences. All of them maintained that they were not involved in the offences despite having failed in their appeal and having been refused a referral by the CCRC. They asserted that they were wrongly convicted for reasons including fabricated confessions, eyewitness misidentification, police misconduct, flawed expert evidence, false allegations and false witness testimonies. I said at the time that in every single case there were questions, conflicts and problems in the evidence that led to their conviction. I also said that if they are genuinely innocent, it means that the dangerous criminals who committed these crimes remain at liberty with the potential to commit further serious crimes.

In several of the cases, prisoners were convicted mainly on the testimonies of prosecution witnesses who were either known criminals, or who suffer from serious mental or personality disorders. In other cases, convictions were obtained mainly on the basis of highly conflicting identity parade evidence. Many were also convicted despite evidence suggesting innocence, such as alibi witnesses, outweighing the alleged evidence of guilt. Some of the prisoners in the dossier have served decades in prison. They claim that they are victims of the so-called '"parole deal"', and may have been released on parole by now had they admitted guilt to the crimes that they claim not to have committed. As it is currently constituted, the CCRC is unable to helpsuch cases despite the plausibility of their claims of innocence. On this basis alone, I believe that there is an urgent public interest in investigating the cases contained in the dossier.

Despite this, all of the foregoing submissions, casework and wider activities to raise awareness of the CCRC's shortcomings have fallen on deaf ears. None of the necessary reforms for the CCRC to be better placed to assist applicants have been implemented.

How the present government sees the CCRC doesn't bode well, either. In July, for instance, the parliamentary under-secretary of state for justice, Edward Argar MP, said in response to criticism of the CCRC's handling of the Oliver Campbell case that he 'very much supports the work of the CCRC'. He went on to comment that if Mr Campbell's legal team is unhappy with the CCRC's decision not to refer his case then they can always opt for a judicial review. This response to allegations that a man was wrongly convicted of murder and spent 10 years in prison by a sitting MP fails to take seriously the continuing reality of miscarriages of justice. It shows dis-

dain for Mr Campbell's legal team, Michael Birnbaum QC and Glyn Maddocks, leading legal experts with proven track-records in overturning wrongful convictions. It shows a complete lack of understanding of the CCRC's discretionary power to refer or not to refer. It also shows a staggering contempt for the harms caused to the innocent victims of wrongful convictions and their families who strive tirelessly for justice in the hope that the nightmare may one day be over.

This article is written with another inquiry into the CCRC in mind. This time it's the newly established Westminster Commission, established by the all-party parliamentary group on miscarriages of justice. Its brief is to investigate the CCRC as part of its inquiry into the ability of the criminal justice system to identify and rectify miscarriages of justice. I offer this article to the Westminster Commission for its consideration in good faith. I hope, as I always do, that truth and justice will prevail. However, I have travelled this road for a long time now. I know well from past experience that miscarriages of justice are not something that those in power want to hear about for the damage they can and do cause to public trust and confidence in the criminal justice system. I know, too, that those in power care little for victims of miscarriages of justice who are often wrongly convicted precisely because the criminal justice process fails to protect the vulnerable and the powerless from abuses of state power. So, please forgive me, but I won't be holding my breath.

Case Law Casts Doubt Over Solicitors' Ability To Correct Their Mistakes

The case of Howell Jones LLP 11846-2018 has thrown doubt on the extent to which law firms can act for a client who has suffered from a mistake caused by a solicitor in the firm. Facts of the case. Howell Jones LLP acted for a husband (H) in divorce and financial proceedings. Following legal advice, H settled the financial aspects of the divorce. H subsequently complained about the settlement. The firm obtained counsel's advice, who concluded that the settlement was not as favourable to H.

Taking into account conflict of interest, and having informed its insurers, the firm wrote a frank and open letter to H, admitting and apologising for its mistake. The letter stated that H could sue Howell Jones if he wished and either: take independent legal advice, or continue to instruct Howell Jones on the basis that the firm would seek to overturn the settlement at its own expense. H accepted the apology and the offer to continue as the firm's client. His legal fees totalling £6,238 were refunded. In addition, Howell Jones agreed not to charge H for the attempt to set aside the settlement and indemnified H against any adverse costs, should the attempt to set aside the settlement agreement fail. Unfortunately, the application to set aside the settlement did not succeed. Adverse costs were set at £35,000, which Howell Jones duly paid to H. H then complained to the Legal Ombudsman, who awarded him an additional £50,000, which was also covered by the firm.

The matter came to the attention of the Solicitors Regulation Authority (SRA), who investigated and brought the firm before the Solicitors Disciplinary Tribunal (SDT) on the grounds that it had acted in breach of the Code of Conduct, in circumstances where there was an own-interest conflict. In its judgement, the SDT concluded that Howell Jones had, "not ceased acting when it should have done and this was fairly described as an error of judgement". The firm agreed to pay a £5,000 fine and costs to the SRA of £26,850. The overall cost to the firm and/or its insurers therefore totalled around £150,000. It may be of interest to note that had this been a smaller firm or sole practitioner, the total costs may have made them bankrupt.

Implications - The decision in Howell Jones LLP 11846-2018 has the following potential consequences: Solicitors who attempt to resolve mistakes with pragmatic approaches may no longer feel they can do so and will thus be forced to cease acting. Legal costs will therefore undoubtedly increase for the affected client Solicitors may feel that despite correctly following their professional obligations in being open and honest with clients about mistakes, they are still being penalised. This may increase claims for professional negligence against law firms in situations where firms have honestly and genuinely made a mistake, are open with the client about it and take necessary steps to address the issue.

Commenting on the case, Gregory Treverton-Jones QC raises the inherent worry that law firms could now be forced to send clients to another firm rather than put things right at their own expense when they identify an error. He added that, 'The SRA does not seem to consider that an own-interest conflict can be cured by the sort of pragmatic solution that has been in place for decades. The only winners will be professional negligence lawyers.'

Conclusion: The purpose of the SRA as a regulatory body is to maintain the reputation of the profession and ensure that solicitors work to high standards. Common sense tells us that this often means coming up with pragmatic solutions to problems, to ensure that clients get the best possible service. In this case, the SRA penalised Howell Jones for attempting to put matters right at their own expense, giving the client the option of taking independent legal advice and informing him of his right to sue them. This is contrary to both the client's interest and the reputation of the profession. Looking at the way the SRA handled this case, can one conclude that it is really achieving its purpose?

Northern Ireland : Prisoners' 'Lives at Risk' After Jail Release

BBC News: Forty-six people died in a Northern Ireland prison or within a fortnight of being released from jail in the past five years, BBC News NI has learned. Twenty-three died in custody, and the same number died in the two weeks after leaving jail. Many of those deaths between 2014 and 2019 are linked to substance addiction. The Probation Board for Northern Ireland said it works with offenders to "minimise risk, both to themselves and to others". However, the family of one prisoner, who died in hospital after attempting to take his own life, said he had been "badly let down" by The figures were provided by the prisoner ombudsman's office who said the majority of the deaths were 'self-inflicted' - most of those were drug and alcohol related.

Prisoner Ombudsman Dr Lesley Carroll says she is concerned that post-custody deaths are under-reported. She believes there is "a dip in the system" for some vulnerable prisoners when they leave custody and that more should be done to ensure ex-inmates have access to services such as GPs, addiction support and housing. She said: "In some instance, for example, if it is difficult to get an appointment with a GP it is impossible to access required medications and some may decide to self-medicate with drugs acquired on the streets. "You don't know what the balance of that drug is, if it's the proper dosage, you make take too much and the results can be catastrophic." She added: "We need the right agencies across health and justice talking to each to come up with an inter-agency approach to identify those people not being caught by the system. "An answer should be found because there are people's lives at risk."

'It was like he was possessed' - Joseph Rainey, 20, died in hospital of injuries he had sustained in Hydebank Wood Prison after attempting to take his own life 10 days previously. He died as a result of severe brain damage. His mother, Sarah, recalls: "Those ten days were so tough because Joseph took seizures, it was like he was possessed, he would lift right off the bed. "It was heartbreaking to watch your child going through something like that, it tore me apart." The west Belfast man had been to prison on four occasions for offences including theft and criminal damage. He had been on prescription medication for depression, but his father, Tom, says he also had a wider drug problem

that he struggled to get help for.the authorities. "Joseph was very close with his grandfather and when he died, he went down a slippery slope of drug use and he went from cannabis to tablets. I think that's when things started to go really wrong and he would end up in prison. "When he was in prison it was made very clear that when he was in those four walls we didn't have a say, but when he left with the same problems, there was no help. He went back to drugs and he wasn't given support. "I believe he was badly led down by the probation service." He added: "The day we buried Joseph we were in the kitchen and we got a phone call from the probation service demanding to know where he was, because he hadn't attended a meeting. "I thought to myself: ' If these are the people who are supposed to know where he is and this is what is in place to look after these kids, what chance do they have when they leave prison?'"

A prisoner ombudsman investigation found that before being sent to Hydebank, Mr Rainey had spent 38 hours in police custody where they had recorded he was "suicidal". However, the ombudsman found that this information was "ignored" on his arrival to Hydebank Wood and it was not passed on to his committal officer who was consequently unaware of his suicide risk. Hours later, Mr Rainey attempted to take his own life in his cell.

Approximately 80% of prisoners in Maghaberry Prison, Northern Ireland's largest jail, are on prescription medication. In recent years, a number of critical reports have said that more needs to be done to protect vulnerable prisoners and to prevent deaths in custody in Northern Ireland. A key role of the prisoner ombudsman's office is to investigate prison deaths, but it also has the discretion to investigate deaths that occur 14 days after someone is released from prison. The focus of these investigations is to examine if there was any aspect of the prison care that contributed directly to their death.

Dr Carroll said: "There is no legal obligation to inform my office of deaths that occur just after a prisoner leaves custody, so we're relying on organisations like the prison service, the probation service, a hostel manager, a police officer or a family member knowing about the role we can play. "We're missing an important part of the puzzle if we're not fully informed about post-release deaths." The South Eastern Health and Social Care Trust oversees prison healthcare in Northern Ireland and said it recognises the "increased risk" when people go into or leave jail. A spokeswoman said: "When a person enters custody they remain registered with their community GP practice and communication systems are in place for sharing information between healthcare teams. "The trust continues to work with justice partners and health colleagues across the region to ensure appropriate care pathways are in place to support transitions."

Electronic Signatures are as Valid as a Traditional 'Wet' Signature

Law Gazzete: For a body not normally known for brevity, the Law Commission pulled off a remarkable trick last week. It published a simple eight-paragraph statement of how the law in England and Wales stands on documents executed with electronic signature. The verdict: such signatures, which might range from a squiggle on a courier's pad to an encrypted code generated by a security dongle, are as valid as the traditional 'wet' signature and admissible as evidence in proceedings so long as the usual rules on signatures are met. The commission notes that the common law has always been flexible in recognising diverse types of signature, including signing with an 'X', initials only, a printed name, or even a phrase such as 'Your loving mother'. The courts likewise have accepted electronic forms of signatures including clicking an 'I accept' tick box. This 'accessible statement of the law' will no doubt come as a relief to the government, which commissioned the study. The conciseness and certainty are particularly impressive because the current law emerges from a wide range of authorities, including the common law, Westminster statute (the Electronic Communications Act 2000), Europe (the eIDAS regulation) and case law. While the Law Commission says the government 'may wish to consider codifying the law' to make it more accessible, in general the current portfolio is fit for purpose.

However any hope that with the issue finally settled we can now digitise all legal transactions may be in vain. Despite the overall general green light, the commission's 124-page full report suggests loose ends remain. One important point is that the report excludes two significant categories of document: wills and registered dispositions under the Land Registration Act 2002, which are the subject of separate reform proposals. Another is the grey area over the witnessing of electronic signatures. In its consultation document last year, the commission proposed allowing electronic signatures to be witnessed remotely via video link. The final report is more circumspect, recommending that any requirement for a deed to be signed 'in the presence of a witness' currently implies physical presence. The practical issues of a future remote-witnessing process will need to be considered by an 'industry working group', the establishment of which is one of the commission's core recommendations.

"The removal of physical signatures removes an essential safeguard against abuse of a vulnerable sector of society".The Law Society More fundamentally, the report acknowledges consultees' concerns that the witnessing of electronic signatures is fundamentally impossible. One such sceptic is HM Land Registry, which says there is no way for a human witness to be sure that a data string representing a signature is indeed being applied to a data string representing a document. This is a bit of a bombshell for those trying to digitise the conveyancing process.

Finally, and most welcome, the commission's report fires a shot across the bows of government efforts to set up an online process for applying for lasting powers of attorney. Numerous respondents to the Law Commission's consultation said that allowing LPAs to be executed with an electronic signature would increase the risk of malpractice. The Law Society, for example, said it was strongly opposed to a fully digital process: 'The removal of physical signatures removes an essential safeguard against abuse of a highly vulnerable sector of society'.

The commission agrees. It concludes that the Office of the Public Guardian and MoJ must 'consider what is sufficiently secure and reliable for donors before introducing any system using electronic signatures'. To maintain overall confidence in electronic signatures, the commission recommends that the industry working group consider practical and technical issues and provide best practice guidance for their use in different types of transactions. Among these are the obstacles to video witnessing. 'Following this work, the government should consider legislative reform to allow for this.' It also proposes a future review of the law of deeds, to consider broad issues about the effectiveness of deeds and whether the concept remains fit for purpose . For all its opening statement of confidence, the report implies that wet signatures, where necessary witnessed and attested in person, will be with us for at least another decade into the digital age

Strengthening Prisoners Family Ties Policy Framework

This Policy Framework sets out the rules and guidance for staff in all prisons on how they can support prisoners to maintain and develop their relationships with family, significant others and friends.There is growing evidence that family support, and maintaining family ties is not only important for the well-being of prisoners, but may also aid reintegration into the community following release from prison. Supporting prisoners' relationships outside of prison is considered to help prevent reoffending, reduce intergenerational crime and improve the safety and security of the custodial environment. This Policy Framework sets out duties, rules

and general guidance on the actions that staff in all prisons must deliver as part of their local strategy to support prisoners in maintaining and developing their relationships with family and friends. Additional guidance in support of the Policy Framework is available to all Prison staff through the following guidance documents: Delivering Effective Family Practice: Operation Guidanc Public Protection Manual (PSI 18/2016 & PI 17/2016) The Policy Framework will be reviewed in April 2020. Source: Ministry of Justice, https://is.gd/JVNnNz

HMP Forest Bank- Prisoner on Prisoner Violence Very Serious

HMP Forest Bank – a large men's prison in Salford, Greater Manchester – was found generally to have remained a well-led, competent and confident prison since its previous inspection in 2016. However, Peter Clarke, HM Chief Inspector of Prisons, said it was evident in May 2019 that safety in the prison, holding more than 1,400 prisoners from the age of 18, had deteriorated. Inspectors found that violence, mostly prisoner on prisoner and much of it serious, had doubled in three years. Use of force by staff had also risen, though inspectors found evidence of effective de-escalation of incidents by staff. A third of prisoners said they felt unsafe, Mr Clarke said, "a situation that was even worse among vulnerable prisoners where the finding was 52%. There needed to be greater focus and coordination to address violence, by, for example, incentivising good behaviour and consistently holding to account those who behaved poorly."

Security generally was applied proportionately at Forest Bank and inspectors identified the management and use of intelligence as a strength, with close working relationships with local police and robust staff anti-corruption arrangements. Many prisoners suggested that access to drugs was comparatively easy but the positive mandatory drug test rate was lower than at most similar prisons. Self-harm had increased significantly since 2016. Some improvements had been made to case management support (ACCT) processes, although a good scheme to invite families to case management reviews was only used intermittently. Relationships between staff and prisoners were respectful and polite, although inspectors were concerned that staff, many very inexperienced, did not assert sufficient authority when supervising prisoners. Most prisoners were positive about most aspects of daily life at Forest Bank – including the food and good access to the shop – and accommodation was generally clean and bright. However, some 60% of single cells were doubled up and therefore overcrowded, and much furniture and cell equipment was damaged or missing.

Diversity and equality were promoted reasonably well through a comprehensive action plan and helpful consultation, including innovative one-to-one surgeries for prisoners with protected characteristics. Time out of cell was better than inspectors often see and the daily routine, including access to evening association, was reliable, although nearly half the population was locked up during the working day. There were sufficient places in work and education for all and attendance, if not punctuality, were good. Ofsted inspectors judged the overall effectiveness of education, skills and work as 'good' – a "not insignificant achievement in a local prison", Mr Clarke said. Rehabilitation and release planning continued to be a real strength of the prison. Assessments of prisoners and sentence management were reasonably good, and public protection arrangements were robust, with the prison's whole approach to resettlement supported by strong community links. Support for family ties and engagement was similarly very positive.

Overall, Mr Clarke said: "Forest Bank continued to be a reasonably well ordered and settled prison delivering generally good outcomes. Prisoners could, for example, access a better regime than we normally see for this type of prison. Rehabilitation and resettlement work was consistently a strength. Overall this is an encouraging report, although we do identify more work to do in safety and in providing support to staff."

Drunk Mum, Marina Tilby Who Fell Asleep on Baby Freed From Jail

A mother jailed over the death of her four-week-old baby after she fell asleep on top of him has been freed by Court of Appeal judges. Marina Tilby was so intoxicated after a drinking binge it took over an hour for her to be woken up. Her son Darrian was rushed to hospital in an effort to save his life, but he was later pronounced dead. The 26-year-old, of Llwyncelyn in Aberaeron, was jailed for two years and four months in June. Tilby previously admitted child cruelty through wilful neglect at Swansea Crown Court. She was freed from prison on Tuesday 10th September, after judges at the Court of Appeal reduced her sentence to 16 months and suspended it. Mr Justice Fraser, sitting with Lord Justice Singh and Mrs Justice Thornton, told the court Tilby took Darrian with her when she went out drinking with her sister on 29 March 2017. The pair drank Guinness in a pub before heading to the club house at Quay West caravan park in New Quay,Ceredigion at about 20:30. CCTV footage showed Tilby holding her son above her head and throwing him in the air before catching him. The sisters met three men who were staying at the caravan park and went back to their caravan at the end of the evening. Tilby fed Darrian before putting him down on a double bed and then going to sleep next to him When her sister came to look for her a short while later she found Tilby lying on top of Darrian, who was unresponsive with blood on his nose Despite efforts to wake her, Tilby was unable to be woken up from her sleep for an hour and a quarter, while the baby was taken to hospital. Medical evidence was unable to rule out the possibility Darrian's death was caused by sudden infant death syndrome before Tilby had rolled onto him. Mr Justice Fraser said psychological reports made it clear that Darrian's death had a "significant impact" on Tilby's mental health. Sentencing Tilby in June, Judge Paul Thomas told her she had shown "deliberate disregard" for her son's welfare. But her barrister, Dyfed Thomas, argued at the appeal court her sentence was too long. He said: "This young woman made a terrible, terrible mistake of becoming so drunk she couldn't respond to her child's needs." Allowing her appeal, Mr Justice Fraser said the original sentence was "manifestly excessive" in light of her genuine remorse. The court ordered Tilby to undergo supervision by the Probation Service for one year.

Ireland: Prisoners Waiting up uo Two Years to be Admitted to Central Mental Hospital

Records released to The Irish Times under Freedom of Information legislation show that 16 men and three women were transferred from prison to the Central Mental Hospital in 2018. The figures show that one man admitted in June 2018 had been on a waiting list for 13 months, while others admitted in the same month had been waiting since November and December 2017.One man who was assessed as needing to be transferred to the Central Mental Hospital in August 2015 was not admitted until September 2017.Women were generally admitted faster than men, but some still had to wait for weeks.

Serving Prisoners Supported by MOJUK: 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, Warren Slaney, Melvyn 'Adie' McLellan, Lyndon Coles, Robert Bradley, 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 William Kenealy, Glyn Razzell, Willie Gage, Kate Keaveney, Michael Stone, Michael Attwooll, John Roden, Nick Tucker, Karl Watson, Terry Allen, Richard Southern, Jake Mawhinney, Peter Hannigan.