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 765 (30/10/2019) - Cost £1

"Hardship has Tempered me and Turned my Mind to Steel"

The situation with my parole remains bizarrely uncertain, and it has now become obvious that it is not the parole board that is deciding matters but the Justice Ministry itself. Unfortunately my Judicial Review fell at the first hurdle after my initial optimism when the first judge to consider my case decided there did appear to be a breach of proper legal procedure in the way the Justice Ministry refused to refer my case back to the parole board when the board's supposed dissatisfaction with the length of time the probation service had arranged for me to spend in a parole hostel if released was put to rest when the hostel concerned informed the board that they were prepared to accept me for as long as was considered necessary.

The judge then gave the Justice Ministry 21 days to present a defence as to why I remained in prison still when there was clearly no real public protection justification for my continued imprisonment. 21 days later the Justice Ministry presented a "defence" claiming that it wasn't just the issue of a long-term hostel place that had influenced the parole board's decision to deny my release, but also my "aggressive anti-authority authority", which it was unable to give any specific examples of in terms of breaches of discipline reports, etc. This was a blatant moving of the goalposts and unfortunately the different judge this time to consider the case, and who had obviously been "briefed" about my prison history and politicisation, swallowed the re-manufactured bullshit to justify my continued imprisonment and dismissed my action.

However, he was clearly uncomfortable with providing legal legitimacy for the dodgy reason used to keep me imprisoned, evidenced by him awarding the financial cost of the legal action against the Justice Ministry as well as wringing an agreement from them that my next parole hearing would be expedited and brought forward.

A couple of weeks later, the parole hoard requested all the relevant reports from the prison and probation service in preparation for what I assumed and hoped would be an imminent hearing. Then silence descended. Despite repeated inquiries from my lawyer to the parole board and Justice Ministry the silence prevailed, and then last week they finally broke their silence and claimed they were not prepared to set a date for my next parole hearing until the prison system provided them with a transcript of the judge's remarks from a prison protest trial in 1984 and my entire prison disciplinary record from 1980, neither of which the prison apparently has.

So now it seems they are digging deep into the past to try and excavate any reason to deny my release, and as I say, I am convinced it is the Justice Ministry that is behind this. So, I am now preparing for another parole knockback probably and then a return to the prison trenches, and trying to retain sufficient inner-strength to cope with that, which I am sure I will.

"Without the cold and desolation of winter, there could not be the warmth and splendour of spring. Hardship has tempered me and turned my mind to steel." Ho Chi Minh

Take Care, my Friends, and Stay Strong.

In solidarity, John Bowden, A5026DM, HMP Warren Hill, Hollesley, IP12 3BF

Treatment of Mentally Ill by Criminal Justice System 'Outdated' & 'Stigmatising'

Sapan Maini-Thompson, Justice Gap: The approach of the criminal justice system towards those with mental health conditions was 'stigmatising' and 'in need of change', the Director of Public Prosecutions has said. In a lecture to the Howard League for Penal Reform, Max Hill QC outlined various proposals which he argued would ensure the fairer treatment of those with mental impairments and disorders. In March 2019, the Crown Prosecution Service published new guidance for prosecutors on dealing with defendants with mental health issues. That guidance, said the DPP, reflected a shift in thinking about disability from the medical to the social model, which locates an individual's disadvantage in a society's failure to organise its facilities in an accessible manner. That change in attitudes recognises that a mental disability does not in and of itself have to disable someone's access to justice. Nonetheless, legislation is not up to date. There were two main issues in need of reform, argued Hill. First, there was how the courts approach fitness to plead, which relates to the defendant's mental state at the time of trial. Second, there was insanity, which relates to their mental state at the time of the offence.

Fitness to Plead: There should be a coherent, modern definition of what not being able to participate in criminal proceedings means. The starting point for approaching fitness to plead is found in the Pritchard criteria, based on a case from 1836. These criteria were then codified in the Criminal Procedure and Insanity Act 1964. The legislation and case law are geared towards assessing the ability of a defendant to perform particular court functions. In the civil context, by contrast, the Mental Capacity Act 2005 reflects an up-to-date understanding of someone's cognitive capacity to process and communicate information. This difference – noted by the Law Commission in their 2016 report Unfitness to Plead– 'creates the potential for seemingly conflicting assessments of the same individual who, for example, could be found fit to plead in relation to a murder allegation, but lacking in capacity for litigation about the less critical issues of an inheritance dispute'. The DPP argued that disparity was evidence of the criminal law's failure to apply a modern definition of mental fitness. By failing 'to provide for full participation in criminal proceedings for all, or as nearly all as can be", the criminal justice system is failing to achieve the appropriate balance between "the rights of the vulnerable with the interests of those affected by an alleged offence and the need to protect the public'.

Mens Rea (The mental element of a person's intention to commit a crime; or knowledge that one's action or lack of action would cause a crime to be committed. It is a necessary element of many crimes.): In turn, the flawed approach to assessing a suspect's fitness to plead can result in procedural unfairness in how Crown Courts evaluate their mens rea. As a consequence, those unfit to plead may be placed in a worse situation than someone fit to plead. Hill's submission on this point was informed by the findings of the Law Commission, which noted the Pritchard test is 'not consistently understood or applied by clinicians, legal practitioners and the courts'. Hill affirmed their recommendation for 'a modernised test for unfitness to plead, bringing it into line with today's psychiatric and psychological thinking. The new test would look at the defendant's decision-making capacity and ask whether the defendant is able to participate effectively in their trial'.

Insanity: The defence of insanity is characterised by 'outdated' and 'stigmatising' terminology, declared Hill. In particular, the M'Naghten criteria, which refer to a 'defect of reason from a disease of the mind', are not based on modern medical understanding. The practical effect is that very few people are found not guilty by reason of insanity. In a 2013 discussion paper, entitled Insanity and Automatism, the Law Commission found that there are only around 30 successful insanity pleas each year in the Crown Court. In their 2017 report Mental Health

and Fair Trial, the law reform and human rights organisation JUSTICE similarly stated: 'The defence is rarely used in practice, in some respects due to the difficulty posed in meeting its complicated criteria, the stigma attached to the defence and the limited disposals available.' As Hill contended, if the purpose of the criminal law is to punish those who wilfully do wrong, then the current operation of the insanity defence would suggest we are 'punish[ing] rather than compulsorily treat[ing] those who are not wilfully doing wrong'. That said, ensuring public safety remains of principal concern and so the law's distinction between 'internal' and 'external' factors in determining the cause of the accused's lack of control remains of value. It would be a 'significant improvement' said Hill to abolish the common law insanity defence and replace it with a new statutory defence where someone is not criminally responsible by reason of a qualifying recognised medical condition. The new defence would be available in relation to any criminal offence and would result in a new special verdict – 'not criminally responsible by reason of a recognised medical condition'. There would need to be a public policy discussion about which medical conditions should qualify and what outcomes are available upon such a verdict. As Hill concluded, there was 'a long way to go' to ensuring the fair and proportionate treatment of those with mental health conditions in the criminal justice system. The need for remedying some of the current imbalances was urgent, he said.

Kyle Major - Under Heavy Manners

I am writing today to raise awareness about the targeting and treatment I am receiving by South Yorkshire Police. Since my arrest in June 2019 for driving offences, they have done nothing but attempt and try to frame me for crimes I have not committed.

In (2017) a Prison Officer attacked me in (HMP Lindholme) and the Prisons Police Investigations team made a decision without referring it to the (CPS) not to charge or prosecute the Officer which was gross and inappropriate. Shortly after this incident I was assaulted and attacked by 6 Prison Officers leaving me paralysed from the waist down requiring the use of a wheelchair full time as outlined in my online article with (FRFI) which can be looked up as (Kyle Major - FRFI).

While medically assessed as needing a wheelchair by Senior Medical Professionals as well as an Occupational Therapist and social care needs, I was moved to a prison where my life was in danger (HMP Moorlands). I was given a (wheelchair friendly cell) fully adapted for my disabilities. Quite frequently I used to get many people in and out of my cell, on one occasion there was a number of people in my cell, and an incident between prisoners arose which had nothing to do with me, and a prisoner was injured during their altercation, the Police have attempted to say that I was involved in this altercation yet I was in a wheelchair and unable to walk. I was interviewed and then shortly released into the community where I was in a Probation Hostel for (3 months) suitable for disabilities and then went on to have double surgery on my spine. The surgeon involved in my case was quite clear in the fact that the bottom of my spine was crushed trapping the Central Nervous System on my left side predominantly and my lower spine. It was impossible for me to stand.

The altercation between the two prisoners took place in (January 2018), and I was released in (April 2018) after being denied multiple medical appointments by the Prison Service which I needed. Over 12 months later the Police turn up and issue me a Proceeds of Crime Application in an attempt to steal my (jewellery) and accompanied with them is a member of (South Yorkshire Police Prisons Investigations Team) which I thought was strange.

Ten days later at a pre-sentencing hearing, I hear for the first time that I am due up in Court in (November 2019) for an offence of Section 18 Wounding with Intent from (January 2018) at

this time I was genuinely and sincerely unable to stand and walk. This could have been quickly confirmed by my spinal surgeon who did a (double operation) on my (spine), but clearly, the police have failed to do this proving it is a genuine setup! This case will be thrown out without a doubt!

However, what is happening is the police are clearly trying to shine me in a negative light, so the judge that sentences me for the pending matters gives me a harsh sentence, it is unfair and targeted/corrupt treatment by South Yorkshire Police in order to get me extra time in prison. This is not justice! This is criminal and calculated targeting by the police and prison service combined. I am under genuine threat 100%,

I currently have a complaint against South Yorkshire Police for failing to inform me that my life was in danger when they had information this was the case. I was later rammed into a Cul de Sac and had 12 bullets fired at me from a semi-automatic weapon. The police had information my life was at risk and failed to notify me clearly proving South Yorkshire Police were contributing to getting me murdered. My complaint to the 'Independent Office for Police Conduct' (IOPC) has clearly upset them, and I am still having problems with my mobility now and find it hard to walk due to the constant denial of medical treatment by the (NHS) under the influence of (HMPPS). The Police, Prison Service and Probation Service are ganging up to try and set me up and put me in Prison for things I have not done. I need help and support more than ever.

Deep in Struggle and Solidarity, Kyle Major: A13397AJ, HMP Doncaster Marsh Gate, Doncaster, DNS 8UX

Ivor Bell Cleared of Soliciting Jean Mcconville Murder

Belfast Telegraph: Boston tapes interviewer 'out to get Gerry Adams', says judge. Veteran Republican Ivor Bell has been acquitted of any involvement in the IRA's abduction, murder and disappearance of mother-of-ten Jean McConville. Mr Bell was found not guilty of having done two acts of soliciting to murder Mrs McConville in 1972 after a judge ruled the Crown's main evidence was "inadmissible." The trial - which saw former MP Gerry Adams called as a witness - commenced last week but could not be reported on due to a restriction which was only lifted today, Thursday 17th October 2019 .

A jury of eight men and four women were sworn in to preside over the trial and were told their role was to determine whether or not Mr Bell solicited the murder by encouraging others not before the court to murder her, and endeavouring to persuade others to murder her. After hearing evidence from a number of witnesses, the jury was addressed by Mr Justice O'Hara, who said: "As a result of some legal rulings to legal arguments made over the last two days, there is now no evidence which the prosecution can put before you in order to support the case it was making against Mr Bell. "My ruling now is to direct you to return a verdict of not guilty because you simply cannot find him to have done the acts alleged." Mrs McConville (38) was dragged from her Divis home by a masked gang in late 1972 and was murdered and 'disappeared' by the IRA. Mr Bell, an 82-year old former IRA man from Ramoan Gardens, in west Belfast, was excused from attending due to ill health. Before the trial began, he was examined by several doctors and was diagnosed as having vascular dementia.

In a hearing which spanned seven days, the jury was played extracts of audio tapes from the controversial Boston College's Belfast Project. The project was designed to become an oral historical account of the Troubles, and included interviews with former senior paramilitaries about their roles during the conflict. The director of the project was journalist Ed Moloney, while the interviewer was former IRA prisoner Anthony McIntyre, and it was the latter's role that formed

part of the defence application to entirely exclude the Boston Tapes as evidence. Extracts of two interviews, which were conducted with interviewee Z and who trial judge Mr Justice O'Hara ruled was Mr Bell, were played twice to the jury last week. In the tapes, Mr Bell claimed that in late 1972 he and two men he named as Gerry Adams and the now-deceased Pat McClure held a meeting where Mrs McConville's fate was discussed. Mr Bell claimed Mrs McConville was suspected of being an informer, and that he had no problem shooting touts. He also said that when he was told at that meeting that the plan was to bury her, he disagreed as it "defeated the purpose." All the allegations made against Mr Adams were denied when he was called to give evidence earlier this week. From the witness box, he denied being a member of the IRA and of any involvement in the abduction, murder and burial of Mrs McConville.

In his ruling, Mr Justice O'Hara noted that Mr McIntyre - who refused to co-operate with the court proceedings - "had an agenda" against Gerry Adams, the peace process and the Good Friday Agreement. He also felt that after listening to the interview with Mr Bell, the tapes "clearly show Mr McIntyre leading Mr Bell to speak against Gerry Adams." Mr Justice O'Hara also raised the issue of a guarantee the interviewees - including Ivor Bell - were given at the time, namely their tapes would not be released until after their deaths. The Judge said this guarantee may have led to a situation where while Mr Bell felt "liberated to tell the truth ... the difficulty is he may also gave felt free to lie, distortion, exaggerate, blame and mis-lead."

Branding the evidence on the tapes as "tainted", Mr Justice O'Hara said there was "clear bias" on the part of Mr McIntyre who was "out to get Mr Adams", and the information given orally by Mr Bell was "unreliable as a direct result of the way it was induced by Mr McIntyre." The Judge also noted that a witness who was involved in the early stages of the Belfast Project, Professor Kevin O'Neill, branded the project as "deeply flawed because of the lack of proper consent on the part of the interviewees." Prof O'Neill, who gave evidence on Monday via video link from Boston, said he was "frozen out" when he raised concerns about bias within the Project. He also branded it as "highly controversial ... it's now held up as a model of how not to do an oral history." The Judge therefore ruled all the evidence from the Boston Tapes was inadmissible on Wednesday morning. He granted an overnight adjournment to allow the Crown time to consider its options, and this morning Crown QC Ciaran Murphy confirmed there would be no further evidence presented against Mr Bell. Mr Justice O'Hara addressed the jury and after directing them to return 'not guilty' verdicts, he thanks them for their time and released them from jury service.

Application to Exclude the Boston Tapes Evidence

[1] The accused, Ivor Bell, was charged with two offences of soliciting the murder in 1972 of Mrs Jean McConville. On the first charge he was accused of encouraging persons not before the court to murder her contrary to Section 4 of the Offences Against Person Act 1861 and common law. On the second charge he was accused of endeavouring to persuade persons not before the court to murder her, again contrary to Section 4 and common law.

[2] The evidence on which the prosecution case relies is what it asserts is a confession made by Mr Bell to Mr Anthony McIntyre in 2004. It is contended by the defence that the circumstances in which Mr Bell confessed to Mr McIntyre are such that the evidence of that confession should be excluded under Article 74(2) and Article 76 of the Police and Criminal Evidence (Northern Ireland) Order 1989.

[3] It is necessary to set out the background to this case in order to put the application to exclude the evidence in context.

[4] Mr Bell is now 82 years old and suffers from vascular dementia. He is not fit to stand

trial. Accordingly the issue for the jury at the end of this hearing will be whether he did the acts alleged by the Crown, not whether he is guilty of the offences charged. That difference is not something which affects the ruling I have to give. The question of what evidence is admissible is not affected by this being a hearing of the facts.

[5] The evidence before the court is that in or about 2000 Boston College, Massachusetts agreed to develop an oral history project, the Belfast Project. The College entered a contract with a journalist Mr Ed Moloney. Under the terms of that contract it was agreed that he would be the Project Director. As part of this role he was to require interviewers and interviewees to sign a confidentiality agreement forbidding them from disclosing the existence or scope of the project without the permission of the College.

[6] Mr Moloney's agreement with the College also provided that each interviewee was to be given a contract guaranteeing to the extent American law allows the conditions of the interview.

[7] The project employed researchers to interview former members of the IRA and the UVF. One of those researchers, the one who interviewed Mr Bell, was Mr McIntyre.

[8] The interviewees were given contracts to sign called donations agreements. The one signed by Mr Bell, assuming he did in fact sign one, has not been traced but on the evidence available it is clear that it did not comply with the terms of the College's agreement with Mr Moloney. Instead all of the interviewees appear to have agreed to the following: "Access to the tapes and transcripts shall be restricted until after my death except in those cases where I have provided written approval for their use following consultation with the Burns Librarian Boston College. Due to the sensitivity of content the ultimate power of release shall rest with me. After my death the Burns Librarian of Boston College may exercise such power exclusively."

[9] The terms of this agreement are immediately striking because they omit the critical clause that control or confidentiality is protected but only "to the extent American law allows". In other words the interviewees did not control access to the tapes or transcripts to the exclusion of all others: their control could be overridden by the law of the United States.

[10] On the available evidence that fact was not known to any of the interviewees involved in the Belfast Project including Mr Bell.

[11] The existence of the Belfast Project became public knowledge in a number of ways. In particular it was revealed by the publication in 2010 of a book "Voices from the Grave, Two Men's War in Ireland" by Mr Moloney. That book was based on interviews with Mr Brendan Hughes and Mr David Ervine, one a Republican and the other a Loyalist who had both died. The introduction to the book was written by professors from Boston College who were involved in the Project, Robert O'Neill and Thomas Hachey.

[12] In addition news reports emerged in which Ms Dolours Price, an interviewee who was still alive, revealed that she had given interviews for a project identifiable as the Belfast Project and that she had admitted to being involved in the murder and subsequent hiding of the bodies of four victims of the IRA. These were reported to have included Mrs Jean McConville.

[13] These revelations triggered applications to compel the College to release tapes and associated documents from interviews with Mr Hughes, Ms Price and any other interviewee with information about the death or abduction of Mrs McConville.

[14] Mr Moloney and Mr McIntyre were joined in court proceedings involving Boston College in the United States and were unable to persuade the relevant courts that the documents and tapes should be withheld from the Police Service of Northern Ireland.

[15] On receipt of the tapes the PSNI interviewed the defendant Ivor Bell. The jury has

heard relevant extracts from interviews 11 and 42 in which statements were made which amount to a confession to involvement in Mrs McConville's murder, on the Crown's case.

[16] One issue before the jury is whether the tapes are in fact of conversations with Mr Bell. In the documentation the interviewee is anonymised as Z. For the purposes of this ruling I will assume that it is in fact Mr Bell because: (i)An expert witness Mr Hirson has expressed the opinion that it is likely to be Mr Bell speaking. (ii) That evidence is support by multiple additional and strong pointers to Mr Bell including: - Z refers to being divorced from his first wife. Mr Bell was divorced in 1985. - Z refers to being arrested and held in custody on foot of allegations made by Beano Lean which were then retracted - this happened to Mr Bell in 1983. - Z refers to himself and Mr Gerry Adams being in prison - it is agreed that Mr Bell and Mr Adams were in prison together and that they were convicted together in 1975 for Mr Adams escaping from lawful custody with Mr Bell's assistance in 1974. - There is a reference to Z's brother Billy - Mr Bell has a brother christened William. - There is a series of references by Z to himself as "Ivor". In short the evidence that Z is Mr Bell is overwhelming, though if this case goes to the jury that will be a matter for them to decide.

[17] Neither Mr Moloney nor Mr McIntyre assisted with police enquiries nor did they give evidence at this trial. They did not therefore give any explanation for the form of the guarantees provided to the interviewees or any of the other troubling aspects of the Belfast Project.

The Application o Exclude the Tapes and Transcript

[18] On the prosecution case the exchanges between Mr McIntyre and Mr Bell during interviews 11 and 42 amount to a confession by Mr Bell. For the purposes of this ruling it is immaterial what offences Mr Bell admits to, if any - the point is that it is a confession, according to the prosecution, which the prosecution want the jury to consider.

[19] The admissibility of confessions is largely governed by Article 74 of the Police and Criminal Evidence (Northern Ireland) Order 1989. Article 74 paragraph (1) provides:" In any criminal proceedings a confession made by an accused person may be given in evidence against him in so far as it is relevant to any matter in issue in the proceedings and is not excluded by the court in pursuance of this Article."

[20] Article 74(2)(b) then provides: "If, in any criminal proceedings where the prosecution proposes to give in evidence a confession made by an accused person, it is represented to the court that the confession was or may have been obtained— (a)by oppression of the person who made it; or (b) in consequence of anything said or done which was likely, in the circumstances existing at the time, to render unreliable any confession which might be made by him in consequence thereof, the court shall not allow the confession to be given in evidence against him except in so far as the prosecution proves to the court beyond reasonable doubt that the confession (notwithstanding that it may be true) was not obtained as aforesaid."

[21] For Mr Bell, Mr Macdonald QC with Mr Hutton contends that in this case the false promise of confidentiality was so absolute that Mr Bell wrongly understood that nothing would be revealed of what he said until after he died, unless he consented, and that therefore there would be no consequences to him from what he said. To put this within the statutory wording, what was said or done was that he was given the false guarantee following which and in consequence of which he said what he did about Mrs McConville's murder and subsequent disappearance.

[22] Mr Macdonald further contends that the false promise which led Mr Bell to talk was likely in the circumstances existing at the time to render unreliable any confession.

[23] In support of this proposition Mr Macdonald highlighted a number of points including: · On the available evidence Mr McIntyre is hostile to the peace process, to the Good Friday

Agreement and personally to Mr Adams. · Mr Bell shares those views and that hostility. ·This makes it all the more likely that allegations will be made against Mr Adams to damage his reputation. ·The tapes clearly show Mr McIntyre leading Mr Bell to speak against Mr Adams. · The tapes clearly show Mr Bell's hostility to Mr Adams · At some points there is discussion off tape which leads to a version of events being changed on tape to the detriment of Mr Adams. Specifically there is a change of position by Mr Bell on whether Mr Adams approved of or was involved in the decision to "disappear" Mrs McConville after she was murdered. · As conceded by Detective Chief Inspector Montgomery Mr Bell said some things in his interviews which were at least wrong (in relation to the Four Square Laundry) if not wholly untrue (the suggestion that a brigadier's daughter had been killed in a Crumlin Road massage parlour).

[24] In this context Mr Macdonald says Mr Bell could speak dishonestly, unreliably, with exaggeration or just incorrectly because there would only be scrutiny of what he had said after he died.

[25] That being so, it is contended that the prosecution simply cannot prove beyond a reasonable doubt that the confession was not obtained as a direct result of the false promise or guarantee notwithstanding that it may be true. On that analysis the tapes should be ruled inadmissible.

[26] For the prosecution Mr Murphy QC with Mr Russell contends that contrary to the defence submission the guarantee of confidentiality would have liberated Mr Bell to tell the truth as his legacy. He challenged the suggestion that the false promise was likely to lead to lies being told by Mr Bell to blacken Mr Adams name even if in doing so he implicated himself in crimes which he had not actually committed.

[27] Mr Murphy strongly submitted that the issues raised under Article 74(2)(b) were more properly for the jury to consider and that when they came to do so all of the arguments and points made for Mr Bell would be considered by the jury. This would include their consideration of the hearsay evidence which I allowed the jury to receive to the effect that Mr Moloney was tainted by being a money grabber and Mr McIntyre by being a dissident.

Discussion: [28] The words in Article 74(2)(b) "likely to render unreliable any confession" do not require the defence to establish a case that the confession was probably unreliable. In this context "likely" means less than that.

[29] And the issue at this stage is not whether the confession was true because the provision states "notwithstanding that it may be true".

[30] Rather at this point the question is whether any confession made by Mr Bell in consequence of the false guarantee given to him was likely to be rendered unreliable.

[31] In my judgement Mr Bell may well have said what he did as a direct result of the false guarantee of protection. More than that, this so-called guarantee came from someone who was not in any way a professional or neutral interviewer. Mr McIntyre had his own agenda against Mr Adams, the peace process and the Good Friday Agreement. That is clear from the tapes. He is also someone whose work was not being properly scrutinised or verified. The Oversight Committee which was supposed to review and supervise the Belfast Project was never established. Another Professor O'Neill, Professor Kevin O'Neill, who raised concerns in or about 2001 about the manner of interviewing was in his words "frozen out" of further involvement.

[32] Among the various authorities I was helpfully referred to by counsel is R v Proulx [2001] 1 AER 57. In his judgment at paragraph [47] dealing with the equivalent provisions in the legislation applicable in England and Wales Lord Justice Mance stated: "Section 78 of PACE calls for the exercise of overall judgment or discretion. Section 76 of PACE although it includes some judgmental elements involves an essentially fixed scheme. Once it is represented to

the court that the confession was or may have been obtained as stated in Section 76 then it is for the prosecution to prove if it can that it was not so stated. And if the prosecution fails to prove this then the confession must be excluded."

[33] I agree entirely with Mr Murphy's submission that what Mr Bell said in the interviews might be true. I also agree that he might have felt liberated and free to tell the truth and to leave as his legacy his version of the Troubles. The difficulty is that he might also have felt free to settle scores with his former colleagues who he believed had betrayed their cause. He may have felt free to lie, to distort, to exaggerate, to blame and to mislead. The prosecution simply cannot prove beyond a reasonable doubt that whether it is true or not the confession was not the consequence of the false guarantee. I find that the confession is likely to be unreliable in the sense that it may well be unreliable as a direct result of the circumstances in which it was improperly and dishonestly induced by Mr McIntyre working under the auspices of the Project Director Mr Moloney in conjunction with Boston College. In the circumstances I rule that the tapes and transcripts are inadmissible.

Article 76: [34] In case I am wrong in my finding under Article 74(2)(b) I turn to consider whether the confession evidence should be excluded under Article 76 which provides as follows: "In any criminal proceedings the court may refuse to allow evidence on which the prosecution proposes to rely to be given if it appears to the court that, having regard to all the circumstances, including the circumstances in which the evidence was obtained, the admission of the evidence would have such an adverse effect on the fairness of the proceedings that the court ought not to admit it."

[35] This provision requires a broader consideration of fairness than the specific narrower terms of Article 74. For the prosecution Mr Murphy relied by analogy on R v Mawhinney [2012] NICA 27 in which the Court of Appeal dismissed an appeal against a conviction by a jury of murder. In that trial Lord Justice Weir had declined to exercise his discretion under Article 74 or under Article 76 to exclude evidence of interviews with the police or a confession by the defendant to his second wife that he had murdered his first wife. The confession to the second wife was made, allegedly, when he was under the influence of alcohol.

[36] I appreciate that I was referred to this authority in the context of a submission that like Lord Justice Weir I should leave all the multiple issues about the confession on the Boston tapes to the jury.

[37] However, this present case could not be further removed from that scenario. The factual scenario here is almost certainly without precedent. Mr Bell was guaranteed that whatever he said would remain confidential. As I have already indicated above this gave him freedom to speak the truth but it also gave him freedom to lie, to distort, to exaggerate, to blame and to mislead. The person interviewing him had a clear bias and was "out to get" Mr Adams and others. Mr Bell shared that perspective on recent Republican history and its leaders.

[38] In these circumstances I am satisfied that the only proper course is to exclude the tapes and transcripts under Article 76 because having regard to all the circumstances which I have set out above the admission of this tainted evidence would have an incurable adverse effect on the fairness of the proceedings.

[39] In conclusion I want to add the following short comments. The McConville family suffered the murder of their mother and the hiding of her body which was not discovered for 30 years. For more than 25 years the IRA falsely denied any involvement in her murder. That lie greatly aggravated the already huge loss which the family suffered. It is entirely natural that they, perhaps more than most victims of violence here, want the perpetrators to be held to account no matter how long that takes.

[40] However, people cannot be held to account and held to be responsible in a criminal

court without reliable evidence being gathered and put before that court, admitted in evidence and then accepted by a judge or jury as proving the facts beyond a reasonable doubt.

[41] When Professor Kevin O'Neill gave his evidence he said that even though the tapes he listened to in 2001 were flawed they were still valuable. Their value lay in explaining how young people in Northern Ireland got caught up in violence and did what they went on to do. However he believed that the Z tapes 11 and 42 which are relevant to this case and which he only heard in the context of this case were much more compromised than that. This was due to the clear bias shown by the interviewer Mr McIntyre as he led and encouraged Mr Bell. Even though Mr Bell did not inevitably follow that lead the invitation was there to do so. The Professor's analysis seems persuasive to me. When he uses the word compromised he is really questioning the reliability of what Mr Bell said.

[42] The tapes will become public with the end of this trial. Everyone who reads about them can form their own view, informed or otherwise, on the many issues they raise. But in the context of a criminal trial they are just not reliable or fairly obtained evidence.

Death Of Marc Maltby In HMP Nottingham - Jury Find Staff Actions Inadequate

The inquest into the death of 23 year old Marc Maltby concluded on Tuesday 14th October, with the jury finding that his death, by hanging, was a suicide. On 12 October 2017, the date of Marc's death, prison officers used a table tennis table to block his cell door after he started throwing objects through the observation hatch. The jury found that the placing of the table in front of the cell door and the subsequent actions of staff were "inadequate".

Marc was from Chesterfield and was described by his family as being very friendly and with a little cheeky smile which sometimes hid his vulnerability. Marc was the fifth of five prisoners to die at Nottingham in a month from 13 September 2017. Like previous inquests, the jury heard evidence that in 2017 Nottingham prison was "incredibly troubled". Newly qualified staff were ill equipped to manage widespread violence and drug use, which one officer described as a "war zone." The inquest heard that Marc had been recalled to prison and arrived at HMP Nottingham on 22 November 2017. He requested help from the mental health team during his initial health screening. An assessment was scheduled for 8 October but by then, Marc had been moved to a different wing, which had not been communicated to the nurse. The appointment was rescheduled for 20 October which meant a delay of 28 days against a target attendance time of five days.

The jury also heard that Marc faced difficulties in prison. On or around 9 October (the evidence was conflicted, in part because no record had been taken) he had an altercation with his cell mate and the two were separated. A prisoner told the inquest that Marc was aware of further threats of violence but had been initially unconcerned until he learned who the threats were coming from. Marc passed a note to prison staff saying he was under threat, would be staying in his cell for his own protection and that he expected to be "cut". He also asked to move wings again. A violence reduction investigation was never opened. Three days later on 12 October, Marc began damaging his cell. The jury heard that this was likely to be an expression of distress or frustration, aimed at getting himself moved. He asked to call his mother but was told it was too late to make calls. Following this, prison officers moved a table tennis table in front of his cell door to block the observation hatch to prevent Marc from throwing objects onto the landing.

The inquest was told a senior prison officer instructed a new officer to keep an eye on Marc, but the new officer could not remember that instruction, nor what he should expect, or monitor. He said he went to the Marc's cell once after his cell bell was called but did not attempt to

engage with Marc. A prisoner told the jury that officers often switched off cell bells without checking in on prisoners. Shortly before 7pm on 12 October the same prisoner was returning to his cell following an escorted visit to the medication hatch. He moved the table tennis table that had been placed to block the door of Marc's cell. When the prisoner looked into the cell, he saw that Marc was hanging. He could not be resuscitated and was pronounced dead at 7.18pm.

Sharon Whitford, mother of Marc said: "Nottingham prison was not able to listen and respond to prisoners like Marc. Staff did not have the time, and when they did they did not have the experience. Marc was trying to get attention. I think that if he had managed to speak to me that day I would have been able to calm him down. If staff had been able to spend time with him, and deal with his problems, he would have calmed down. Marc did not intend to die. He just wanted someone to listen."

Natasha Thompson, Senior Caseworker at INQUEST said: "Marc's death was entirely preventable. He was in clear distress, but his calls for help were consistently disregarded by those who owed him a duty of care. This once again points to the fundamental failure to treat people in prison with decency and compassion and highlights the systemic inertia to enact changes following previous deaths. At a time when the government is promising more money for prison places, our ongoing casework shows that expanding the prison system is not the solution to preventing further deaths and harms. We must look beyond the use of prison and act upon what are clear solutions - tackling sentencing policy, reducing the prison population and redirecting resources to community health and welfare services."

Jo Eggleton of Deighton Pierce Glynn solicitors said: "Yet again we see the results of a prison being chronically under resourced and under staffed. Bench marking did this. The ministers who did this are responsible. Prisons run with cooperation and understanding, and when they are run down to minimum levels things overheat and ultimately explode. That is what happened in Nottingham in 2017. It is only with proper staffing, and focused attention on things like the Violence Reduction policy and the ACCT (suicide and self-harm monitoring) that deaths like this can be avoided."

Reporting Restriction on Rape Defendant's Name Continues After Acquittal

Doughty Street Chambers: After a trial of six days, AA was acquitted of rape. AA was indicted in his birth names. AA's counsel, Abigail Bright, had sought a reporting restriction of AA's name before the start of the trial with effect for each day of the trial. That application was granted and a reporting restriction was made. Upon AA's acquittal, his counsel applied for the reporting restriction on AA's name to continue until further order. Legal argument was heard. It is rare, in practice, for the public interest not to be served by the press having freedom to publish (at a minimum) the fact of an acquittal and the name in which a defendant was indicted or otherwise known at a trial which was conducted with a jury sitting in open court. AA's counsel submitted on exactly how two articles of the European Convention on Human Rights, articles 2 and 10, were engaged, and why AA's case was a rare case in which article 2 was clearly engaged. The judge was persuaded that AA would be at risk of reprisals such that his life would be endangered in the event that the fact of his name and his acquittal of rape were to be published. Practical arrangements were made for the press to have facility to address the Court, at any time in the future, to revisit this most rare example of a reporting restriction made until further order on the fact of a rape defendant's name and acquittal. AA has a right to be notified of, and to participate in, any such argument and so to submit that the unlimited restriction on reporting of his name and acquittal should be in perpetuity. The case is the only known instance of a reporting restriction on a defendant's name continuing after acquittal of rape.

Ageing Prison Population 'Sees Prison Officers Working as Carers'

Many prisons are not designed to cater for an ageing group of inmates. The ageing jail population has left prison officers providing care for a growing number of older inmates "dying in front of them", officers have said. The warning from the Prison Officers' Association (POA) has come as new figures revealed the oldest prisoner in England and Wales was 104 years old. The data showed there were 13,617 inmates aged above 50 out of a prison population of 82,710 in June 2019. "You're looking at young prison staff that are trained to be prison officers that are becoming carers," said Dave, who has worked in prisons as a custodial manager for more than 30 years. The former officer, who did not want his real name used, said when he started work older prisoners were transferred to less secure jails when they approached the end of their sentences but that had changed. "Now you're getting older prisoners starting big sentences and the young prison officers are coming straight from university, with very, very little life experience and then they're having to deal with major traumatic events like somebody dying in front of them or caring for somebody that is at the end of their life." His concerns were echoed by the chief inspector of prisons, Peter Clarke, who said the Prison Service should consider whether a new type of accommodation was needed, specifically designed to deal with older prisoners. "It feels to me as if they're trying to shoehorn this problem into existing accommodation instead of thinking more radically," Mr Clarke said.

Ken Denton, from West Yorkshire, was released from prison in June after serving a sentence for fraud and threats to kill. Aged 53, he was housed in an over-50s wing at a Yorkshire prison. "When you look at some of the prisons, you know, they're three or four landings high, thin ladder stairways, how do you expect an elderly person to climb them? "When they come in, you are assessed and they'll say well you should be located 'flat' but if there's no space where you going to put somebody? How can you put somebody at second or third landing? You can't, it's inhumane. "I saw people with cancer, saw people with diabetes, long term prisoners that need their medication but can't get to their medication because the medication hatch is on the second floor and they've got to go to a lift but they can't get into the lift because there's no staff to take them. "If you needed a wheelchair, it might take you three to four months to get a wheelchair because one had to be designed for yourself and it also had to come from the specific local authority in the area you came from."

The Prison Service said: "An ageing prison population poses particular challenges, which is why we work closely with local councils and healthcare providers to make sure we meet the needs of elderly prisoners. "Last year, a report by the chief inspector of prisons found there was good work ongoing to adapt prisons for older inmates, and we have updated guidance for governors on how to best support them." However, national chair of the POA, Mark Fairhurst, said the system was failing to meet the needs of elderly inmates. "We need more disabled access cells situated at ground floor level. We need 24-hour healthcare and we need proper training for staff."

Tougher prison sentences and the rise in the number of those convicted of historic sexual offences are believed to be part of the reason for the ageing prison population. In 2016, 101-year-old Ralph Clarke was jailed for 13 years for committing 30 child sex offences dating from the 1970s and 80s. He was believed to be the oldest person convicted in British legal history. The chief inspector of prisons said the issue of an ageing prison population had to be addressed

Dr Mary Turner, reader in health services research at Huddersfield University, said: "People tend to get longer sentences, even in older age, now than they might have done in the past and there are now more older people going into prison than there are being released." She said the situation was not sustainable. "We can't just see these numbers going up and up and trying to cope with it in a prison environment so we're going to get to a point where we have to think of alternatives and we have to find solutions." She said options could include building secure

care homes and considering alternatives to custodial sentence for older offenders. Mr Clarke warned the number of men over 50 being held in jails would rise to more than 14,000 by 2022, representing 17% of the prison population "The Prison Service has so far has said that it's not going to develop an overall strategy to deal with this issue," he said. When prisoners get older, less capable physically or infirm, they don't provide an escape risk, they still have to be held in custody very often and it's not to say they wouldn't present a risk to the public if they were completely at liberty. But the question is do they need to be held still in levels of security which are not needed for their physical capabilities and which inevitably are very expensive as well?"

Judges, Judged to be Injudicious

Three judges face disciplinary charges after a night of revelry ended with two of them being shot outside of fast food restaurant White Castle. Judges Andrew Adams and Bradley Jacobs had been drinking with Judge Sabrina Bell in Indianapolis on the first evening of a judicial conference. The trio had intended to go to a strip club but ended up at a White Castle as the club was closed, The Washington Examiner reports. While they were standing outside, two men in an SUV drove by and shouted at the group, causing Bell to give them the middle finger. Brandon Kaiser and Alfredo Vazquez, the men in the SUV, then allegedly got into a fight with the male judges. Kaiser shot Adams, according to court documents, and “went over to Judge Jacobs and Vazquez and fired two more shots at Judge Jacobs in the chest” before running off. Bell admitted her role in the incident. She said: "I'm not denying that I said something or egged it on because I drink." “I mean I fully acknowledge that I drink and get mouthy, and I'm fiery and I'm feisty, but if I would have ever thought for a second that they were gonna fight or that that guy had a gun on him, I would never, never,” she added. Adams was given a one-year suspended sentence after pleading guilty to a misdemeanor battery charge, while Jacobs returned to his role in Clark County. All three judges, however, now face misconduct charges.

Emma-Jayne Magson Needs Your Support – Solidarity Demonstration

9.30am, Tuesday 19th November 2019, Royal Courts of Justice London: Emma was convicted of the murder of her violent partner, in November 2016 and sentenced to life imprisonment. She met James not long after the end of her relationship with a previous abusive partner. On Tuesday 19 November 2019 the Court of Appeal will hear evidence in support of Emma’s renewed appeal. We have sought fresh evidence from the psychiatrists who met with Emma before her trial; their evidence was not presented to the jury. Both these experts agree that Emma was suffering from an Emotionally Unstable Personality Disorder and that the partial defence of Diminished Responsibility should have been available to her at trial as she suffers from a personality disorder. This personality disorder stems from Emma’s childhood experiences of domestic abuse in the family home, of neglect, of maternal illness, bullying and the death of her sister. None of this background was explored at trial. In addition we have explored the possibility that Emma is on the autistic spectrum. We instructed a Clinical Psychologist and Neuropsychologist to assess Emma and she is of the opinion that Emma suffers from a Pervasive Developmental Disorder Not Otherwise Specified (PDD-NOS). This is a residual diagnostic category on the autistic spectrum. Had this been known at trial then it is possible that Emma would have had the support of an Intermediary to enable her to participate effectively. As it was, she was, arguably, at a disadvantage in understanding the events unfolding at trial. As Emma did not give evidence at her trial. She did not talk about her experience of domestic abuse, both as a child witness and an adult victim. If her appeal is successful then her voice may be heard. Please come and show your support - Justice for Women

List Of Police/Police Employees Sacked, Charged, Convicted of an Offence 2009 To 2019

Huyton Freeman was unlawfully arrested in 2009, fucked about by arresting officers, eventually cleard. In June 2010, Merseyside Police admitted liability for unlawful stop, unlawful imprisonment and assault with regard to the first unlawful arrest. In May 2011, Sgt Charlie Tennant, the Officer who kidnapped and assaulted him was sacked. In October 2013 Joanne Kelly an Officer who assisted Charlie Tennant in the assault and kidnap was also sacked In Sept 2012, accepted an out of court settlement from Merseyside Police for their unlawful arrest May 27th 2009. In June 2013 accepted another out of court settlement from Merseyside Police for their unlawful arrest 23rd November 2009. Decided, it was not enough, set out to compile a list of all Police officers, who had been arrested/charged/ convicted/jailed and the information was in the pulbic domain. Todate he has listed over 700 of these.

NI: Prosecution of Woman Who Bought Abortion Pills for Daughter Dropped

Irish Lega News: The prosecution of a woman who bought abortion pills for her teenage daughter has been formally dropped following the decriminalisation of abortion in Northern Ireland. Belfast Crown Court formally discharged the mother from prosecution on two charges of unlawfully procuring and supplying the abortion drugs, mifepristone and misoprostol, with intent to procure a miscarriage, contrary to the Offences Against the Person Act 1861. Under section 9 of the Northern Ireland (Executive Formation) Act 2019, sections 58 and 59 of the 1861 Act have been repealed in Northern Ireland. According to guidance published earlier this month, no police investigation may be carried out, and no criminal proceedings may be brought or continued, in respect of an offence under sections 58 and 59 of the Act, regardless of when an offence may have been committed. Jemma Conlon, senior solicitor at Belfast-based Chambers Solicitors, said: "This is of immense relief for my client who now finds herself free from the burden of this prosecution that has been in her life for six years. It is a day that she will forever remember and a day that allows her to move on with her life privately."

2019 - CCRC are they 'Duking the Stats'?

['Duking the Stats', making it look like you have achieved something, when, you have not.]

So far this year the CCRC have made thirteen Referrals to the CoA, of these, five served less than six months in prison, and two served no time at all.

Seven of this year's referrals, all more than entitled to have appeals did not necessitate the massed guns of the CCRC!

Five of these are very simple: Immigration offences, charged with failing to produce an immigration document, contrary to section 2(1) of the Asylum and Immigration (Treatment of Claimants) Act 2004. Should have been entitled to rely on the statutory defence under section 2(4)(c) Asylum and Immigration (Treatment of Claimants) Act 2004, and that that defence would have succeeded.

Several of these referrals to the CCRC were made by leading UK Immigration Solicitors, who could have made the appeals of their own volition. The CCRC should have refused the referrals and told them to make the appeals themselves!

Now the CCRC have said they will trawl convictions of anyone arrested by Detective Sergeant Ridgewell in the seventies (his usual tactic was to confront young black men at Tube stations and accuse them of theft as well as assaulting police officers if they resisted arrest).

Well and good, but would the CCRC's priorities be bettered served by getting on with dealing with the hundreds of cases already on their books. Many of whom are doing serious time.

MOJUK or anyone else for that matter, should not infer that the CCRC are "Juking the Stats"

CCRC refer conviction of Mr L to the Crown Court 22nd October 2019 (Immigration)

Mr L appeared at Uxbridge Magistrates' Court where, on the advice of a solicitor, he pleaded guilty to failing to produce a satisfactory immigration document . He was convicted and sentenced to three months' imprisonment.

CCRC refers the case of Miss S to the Crown Court 16th September 2019 (Immigration)

She was arrested and charged with failing to have an immigration document contrary to sections 2(1) and (9) of the Asylum and Immigration (Treatment of Claimants) Act 2004. On advice of a local legally aided solicitor she pleaded guilty at Trafford Magistrates Court and was sentenced to four months' imprisonment.

CCRC refers conviction of Mr C for appeal 30th July 2019 (Immigration)

In September 2011 he used that false passport to board a flight from Greece to Manchester. During the flight he gave the false passport back to the agent. After landing he told airport staff he had no passport and he was arrested.Four days later he appeared at Trafford Magistrates' Court, where, having been advised to do so by a solicitor, he pleaded guilty to the charge of failing to provide a valid immigration document contrary to section 2(1) of the Asylum and Immigration (Treatment of Claimants) Act 2004. He was jailed for four months.

CCRC refers the case of Ms E to the Crown Court 27th March 2019 (Immigration)

Arrested at Gatwick and charged failing to produce an immigration document, contrary to section 2(1) of the Asylum an Immigration (Treatment of Claimants) Act 2004. The following day, on the advice of a solicitor paid for by Legal Aid, Ms E entered a guilty plea at Crawley Magistrates' Court. She was convicted and sentenced to three months' imprisonment. Ms E was not able to appeal against her conviction because there is no right of appeal for people who plead guilty in a magistrates' court.

CCRC refers case of GB to the CoA. 1st March 2019 (Immigration)

After receiving legal advice, Ms B admitted in interview to being a Sudanese national and to using a false travel document to try to board a flight to Canada. In May 2008 at Lewes Crown Court, she pleaded guilty to an offence under section 25(1)(a) of the Identity Cards Act 2006 and was sentenced to 12 months' imprisonment.

CCRC refers the case of Tracey Newell to the CoA 21st August 2019 (No time in prison)

On 29 November 2012, Ms Newell pleaded guilty to seven counts of benefit fraud. The counts related to claims for Housing and Council Tax Benefit covering the period from 1 August 2005 to 5 December 2012. Ms Newell was sentenced to 18 weeks' imprisonment, suspended for 18 months, and 150 hours unpaid work.

CCRC refers conviction of W. Smith t 12/022019 (No time in prison)

Mr Smith was convicted in his absence at Belfast Magistrates Court in June 2011 in relation to a drink driving offence committed in 2005. Fined £400 and banned from driving for 12 months. Mr Smith was arrested on a money warrant on New Year's Eve 2011 due to non-payment of the fine and was taken directly to prison where he spent six days.

CCRC refers the convictions of W. Trew and S. Christie police misconduct. 14/10/2019

Trew and Christie and one other defendant were sentenced to two years' imprisonment. Youngest defendant was sent to Borstal. All four men appealed. Appeals against conviction failed but the appeals against sentence succeeded and the prison sentences were reduced from two-years to eight months.

CCRC refers terrorism case of Michael Devine to the Northern Ireland CoAl. 11th April 2019

Mr Devine convicted in Belfast Crown Court in February 1981 of ten offences including attempted murder, firearms offences, conspiracy to pervert the course of public justice, and membership of a proscribed organisation.

CCRC refers terrorism case of Nicholas Roddis to the Court of Appeal 26th March 2019

He was convicted in July 2008 and sentenced to a total of seven years' imprisonment (two for placing a hoax bomb and five, to run consecutively, for the preparation of an act of terrorism). He was acquitted by the jury on four other charges.

CCRC refers terrorism related conviction of Ismail Abdurahman to the CoA 6/02/2019

Mr Abdurahman pleaded not guilty but was convicted and sentenced to a total of ten years' imprisonment. He appealed and his sentence was reduced to eight years, but his appeal against conviction was dismissed.

CCRC refer joint enterprise conviction of Andre Johnson-Haynes to the CoA 15/012019

Mr Haynes, 17 at the time of the murder, was ordered to be detained at Her Majesty's pleasure with a minimum term of 12 years' imprisonment.

CCRC Refers Arson and Manslaughter Convictions of Peter Tredget 24th October 2019

Mr Tredget (then known as Bruce Lee) pleaded guilty at Leeds Crown Court to 11 counts of arson and 23 related counts of manslaughter on the basis of diminished responsibility. On 20th January 1981 he was sentenced to detention without limit of time in a secure mental hospital.

Stop and Search Up by Almost a Third In England And Wales

The number of stop and searches carried out by police officers in England and Wales has increased by 32% in a year, official figures have shown. In the 12 months to March 2019 there were 370,454 stop and searches conducted by forces under section 1 of the Police and Criminal Evidence Act (Pace), up from 279,728 in the previous 12 months. The rise follows a downward trend in the use of the power between 2010 and 2018, although only 15%, or 58,251, of people who were stopped and searched were arrested. White people made up the largest ethnicity group searched under police powers, at 187,761, followed by black people, who were stopped 70,648 times. However, black, Asian and minority ethnic (BAME) people were still over four times more likely to be stopped than white people. For those who identified as black or black British, the disparity was even greater – they were 9.7 times more likely to be stopped and searched by an officer than a white person. After the Home Office rolled back restrictions to the controversial tactic in August as part of an attempt to curb knife crime, an equality impact assessment warned that more people from BAME backgrounds were likely to be targeted despite not having committed crimes. The government report also warned that relaxed conditions could create "broader issues" among the public in terms of their trust in the police. The statistics, published by the Home Office, also revealed that the number of people being detained under the Mental Health Act rose by 12% in the same year – a total of 33,238 compared with 29,662 the year before. Under the act, an officer can remove someone suffering from mental ill health from a public place to a place of safety if in their judgment the person requires immediate care or control in the interests of their safety or others. A further 13,175 stop and searches were carried out under section 60 of the Criminal Justice and Public Order Act in anticipation of violence – more than five times the number of searches made under this power the year before. Although the most common reason for carrying out a Pace stop and search was on suspicion of drug possession – accounting for 61% of all instances – the number of people searched on suspicion of carrying knives or other weapons also rose to 59,272.A further 13,175 stop and searches were carried out under section 60 of the Criminal Justice and Public Order Act in anticipation of violence – more than five times the number of searches made under this power the year before.

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.