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 768 (20/11/2019) - Cost £1

CPS Charge Police with Murder, Manslaughter Over Death of Dalian Atkinson

Dalian Atkinson died on 15 August 2016 aged 48, following use of force by officers of West Mercia police, including restraint and Taser. Today (7 November 2019) the Crown Prosecution Service (CPS) have announced that criminal charges will be brought against two officers, PC Benjamin Monk and PC Mary Smith. The charges are, in respect of one officer, murder and manslaughter, and in respect of a second officer section 47 Offences Against the Persons Act 1861 (Actual Bodily Harm). The decision comes just over a year after the case was referred to the CPS by the Independent Office for Police Conduct (IOPC), who had conducted a criminal investigation over a period of 16 months. The IOPC has a statutory duty to investigate deaths following police contact. No police officer involved in a death in custody or following police contact has been found guilty of murder or manslaughter since INQUEST began monitoring in 1990. The family has been informed that the officers have not been named because they have indicated that they will ask the court to grant them anonymity. It is hoped the court will swiftly rule on this.

On behalf of the family, solicitor Kate Maynard of Hickman and Rose, said: "Dalian's family welcomes the decision to put the conduct of police officers before a jury but regrets that already more than three years have passed since Dalian died. They ask for their privacy to be respected and press for the criminal proceedings to progress without delay or obstruction." Neither the family or their solicitors will be making any further comment at this time.

Deborah Coles, Director of INQUEST, said: "The hope of many bereaved families, that police officers involved in a death are held to account to a criminal standard, is too often denied. As such, today's decision from the Crown Prosecution Service - though long awaited - is welcome. Two years ago, an independent review of deaths in police custody by Dame Elish Angiolini QC highlighted the negative impact of delays in investigations and prosecutions like this. Angiolini recommended that such cases be dealt with in the same time scales as a civilian homicide case. Clearly there is still much work to be done to meet those standards. We hope the next stages of this prosecution are pursued promptly and that the upmost scrutiny of the actions of these officers is ensured. The death of Dalian Atkinson following use of force and Taser by police raises concerns of significant public interest, not least at a time when we are seeing the increased arming of police with Tasers."

No Charges Against Police Scotland Officers Involved Death of Sheku Bayoh

INQUEST: The Lord Advocate, chief public prosecutor for Scotland, has today confirmed a decision not to charge Police Scotland or the five officers involved in the death of Sheku Bayoh with criminal, corporate or health and safety offences. This follows a submission from the Bayoh family to review the original decision of October 2018, and is despite new evidence arising as part of a BBC Documentary. The family have expressed their feelings of betrayal and disappointment, and do not accept the reasoning of the Crown Office. They do not believe that a Fatal Accident Inquiry (the equivalent to an inquest) under the control of the Lord Advocate would have the remit or the courage to deal with their concerns or the wider public concerns arising. The family now repeat their call for a public inquiry into Sheku's death. Sheku Bayoh was 31 years old when he died after being restrained by up to five police officers on 3 May 2015, in Kirkcaldy, Scotland. Sheku, a black man born in Sierra Leone, was a trainee gas engineer and father of two. His death has been of significant controversy, raising community concern over racism within Police Scotland. On the morning of 3 May 2015, police received a call about a man behaving unusually. Sheku was stopped by police and was held face down on the ground within 46 seconds from the arrival of the first two officers. During the restraint officers used CS spray, batons, leg and ankle restraints and handcuffs. A post-mortem revealed that he sustained facial injuries, bruises to his body and a fracture to his rib. Around an hour and a half after the restraint, he was pronounced dead. Sixteen months after the death, the Police Investigations Review Commissioner (PIRC), who investigate deaths in police custody and contact in Scotland, submitted their investigation to the Lord Advocate. The family waited two years for the original decision and have waited a further year for this review to be completed. In the past five years there have been eight deaths in the custody of Police Scotland, according to an Freedom of Information request published by The National newspaper. All are awaiting FAIs and no investigation reports have been published.

Kadi Johnson, the sister of Sheku Bayoh, said: "We the family lost confidence a long time ago in the ability of PIRC to carry out a robust and impartial investigation, but we have tried desperately to maintain confidence in the present Lord Advocate and his team. Today's decision feels like police protection. Before my brother was met by the very first two officers who handcuffed him he had no injuries. Soon after his body was covered from head to toe in injuries, including gashes and scratches all over his face, a broken rib and haemorrhages in his eyes – which is a sign of asphyxiation. Despite the overwhelming evidence from before and since the original prosecution decision, the Lord Advocate and his team stand by their initial decision. It seems no lesson had been learnt from the Macpherson report and the introduction of the Race Relation Amended act 2000. I say this again: if my brother Sheku Bayoh was restrained and died by civilians and not police officers, they would have automatically been treated as suspects. Why should police officers be above the law in a civilised society like Scotland."

Deborah Coles, Director of INQUEST said: "The disproportionate use of force against black people by police, in the UK and internationally, is well documented. A robust response to deaths like Sheku's is an essential part of meeting human rights requirements and is of significant public interest. Sheku's family have faced lies, denial and obfuscation since his death. Like too many bereaved families in Scotland, their struggle for truth, justice and accountability has been unnecessarily long and hard. This frustrates the key function of these processes to prevent future deaths. This decision not to prosecute the police at an individual or corporate level is deeply disappointing and is based on a fundamentally flawed investigation. A public inquiry is now needed to ensure the circumstances of this death and broader issues around institutional racism, police restraint practices, and the Scottish systems for responding to deaths, are examined thoroughly."

Aamer Anwar who represents the family said: "The Bayoh family feel totally betrayed by the Lord Advocate, for not holding power to account, for his broken promises, his betrayal of justice and failure to act in the public interest. Neither the family or the legal team accept the Crown's reasoning for no criminal charges. The Lord Advocate has presided over a 4 and a half year investigation which was deeply flawed from the moment Sheku lost his life. The family do not have the trust or belief that an FAI under the control of the Lord Advocate would have the remit or the courage to deal with serious public concerns, the wider issues of deaths in custody, use of restraint techniques, allegations of racism, lack of police accountability and the insufficient powers of the PIRC, nor will the findings of an FAI be binding on Police Scotland. We will accept nothing less than a public inquiry from the Scottish Government."

Share of Convicted Children who are BAME Doubles in Eight Years

Maya Wolfe-Robinson, Guardian: Diversion of minor offenders away from courts seems to have mostly helped white children. The proportion of children convicted of a crime who are from black, Asian and minority ethnic backgrounds has nearly doubled in eight years, an increase experts have described as an urgent problem. The steep rise comes despite a drastic drop in the overall number of youth cautions or sentences handed down, which one academic described as an indictment on the whole justice system.

In 2018, 27% of the 10 to 18-year-olds who received a youth caution or sentence were from a minority ethnic background, compared with 14% in 2010, according to official figures from the Ministry of Justice released earlier this year. Just 26,681 children were cautioned or sentenced in 2018 compared with 106,969 in 2010, thanks to a shift toward dealing with less serious offenders out of court. The increased use of "diversion", however, in which minor offenders and those deemed at low risk of reoffending are steered away from the courts, seems to have disproportionately benefited white children. When the Guardian monitored all cases passing through Greater Manchester youth court in August, of those defendants whose ethnicity we could establish, 36% were from a black, Asian or minority ethnic (BAME) community. All were male, and many were also in the care system. Only 22% of Greater Manchester's youth population are not white. The Labour MP for Tottenham, David Lammy, published a review of the overrepresentation of BAME individuals in the criminal justice system in 2017. He said the figures had got worse since and that "the fact that half of our youth prison population comes from a black or ethnic minority background would [attract] far more comment and scrutiny" had the political debate not been so focused on Brexit.

Becky Clarke, a senior criminology lecturer at Manchester Metropolitan University, said the "failure to act, given these issues of racial injustice have been known and worsening for many years, is an indictment of the whole justice system". She said the increase in levels of disproportionality was a direct consequence of BAME children being dealt "different treatment by practitioners across the criminal justice system", and called for wholesale changes to policing, transparency in the charging and prosecution of cases, and an end to the unequal application of laws such as joint enterprise. Clarke welcomed the overall reduction in criminalisation of children but said negative racial profiling meant it "hadn't benefited all groups equally, meaning BAME children cannot be diverted out of the system in the same ways as their white counterparts". She put this down to "perceptions of risk and criminality" in the police, Crown Prosecution Service (CPS), courts and youth justice service. The Guardian spoke to senior representatives of all four groups and few could point to positive changes in outcomes since the Lammy review, which cited youth justice as the "biggest concern".

Olivia Pinkney, the chief constable for Hampshire and national policing lead for children and young people, conceded there was still "so much more to be done" and "none of us should rest and be comfortable" with the rise in the proportion of young BAME people criminalised. "It's certainly something that will be unwitting, but we need to understand why." She said the police were taking steps to tackle the problem, pointing to the increased focus on the use of stop and search and mandatory equality and inclusion training. Gerry Wareham, a senior prosecutor and CPS lead for young people, said the CPS could only choose to prosecute from the cases that the police brought to it. "We're in a demand-led position. We get what the police bring to us," he said.

Lammy said his review not only showed the disproportionate criminalisation of black youth, but also similar trends for young Muslims and a "historic problem" of overrepresentation of young people from Gypsy and Traveller backgrounds. The youth justice system is in need

of further reform, he said. "There's a real need to get a grip on how we're supporting families, how we're supporting young people, what second chances they are getting. Those are big questions that obviously affect all young people who fall into the criminal justice system, but they are generally young people from working-class and poor socio-economic backgrounds and most definitely young people from ethnic He said the government had accepted the "lion's share" of his recommendations, but had chosen not to impose targets for improving diversity in the judiciary, where he believed there were "still real issues". Only 12% of magistrates and 7% of district judges are from BAME backgrounds, according to figures published in July. Youth cases are either heard by three magistrates or a district judge. The Office for National Statistics (ONS) puts the UK's minority ethnic population at 13.8%.

John Bache, the chair of the Magistrates Association, said some magistrates had found it "very difficult to accept the results" of the Lammy review. He said the reason for that was "absolutely obvious, because every magistrate believes that they are acting with scrupulous fairness … so to be given a report that suggests that that might not be the case is first of all surprising, but also very upsetting because none of us want to be unfair to anybody who appears in front of us." Unconscious bias training for all magistrates and legal advisers launched in June this year. The Magistrates Association, which represents the 15,000 justices of the peace in England and Wales, has recently convened a group to address disproportionality, including representatives from the Ministry of Justice, the CPS, the Youth Justice Board and charities. The group agreed it was an "urgent problem, especially in relation to the alarming disproportionality illustrated by the proportion of BAME children and young people in custody". It proposed recruiting more diverse magistrates and promoting awareness among magistrates of the different factors that BAME individuals face.

The Ministry of Justice said: "The issues that lead to black, Asian and ethnic minority children being overrepresented in youth custody begin before they enter the criminal justice system, which is why work is under way across the system to change race disparity."

Judge's Handling of Case and Ruling - 'Unjust' And 'Wholly Unsatisfactory'

Scottish Legal News: The guardian of a child who was made the subject of a care order has successfully challenged the decision after an appeal court ruled that the judge's "wholly unsatisfactory" handling of the case amounted to "serious procedural irregularity". The England and Wales Family Court found that the district judge had "crossed the line" during the course of the guardian's examination in chief, creating a "hostile atmosphere" which made it "impossible to have a fair hearing". His Honour Judge Mark Rogers held that the decision of District Judge Mian was "unjust" and allowed the appeal by the mother and appointed guardian of the one-year-old child, who had been made subject to a care order rather than being placed with her grandparents. The Family Court in Nottingham heard that the district judge had decided to make a care order followed by a placement order to facilitate a care plan for the adoption of the child "M". The judge rejected the alternative option of a placement with the child's maternal grandparents, due to an existing care plan which was in place for one of the child's three siblings, "N".

'Serious procedural irregularity' Fourteen-year-old N, who has medical and behavioural issues, was due to return to live with his grandparents, but his challenging and aggressive behaviour posed a serious threat to the safety and wellbeing of those around him, including baby "M". Both the mother and M, through her guardian, challenged the decision and both complaints arose from the central factual issue of how the Judge had to deal with the complicating feature of N's care plan. The mother's appeal was essentially a challenge to the sub-

stantive decision, but the guardian's appeal alleged "procedural unfairness". On behalf of the guardian it was argued that the conduct of the judge amounted to "serious procedural irregularity", which denied the parties an opportunity for a fair hearing and thereby breaching the fundamental article 6 of the European Convention on Human Rights.

The judge's frustration stemmed from her view that the guardian had not grappled with the central issue of the case, namely the interplay of the care plans. HHJ Mark Rogers said he had listened to the recording of the hearing himself and heard "with dismay, the anger and tension in the judge's voice", adding that he also heard her "banging her desk". At one point the district judge intervened in the questioning of the guardian, and clearly exasperated, she said: "No. No. No. Oh my God, I am sorry. I am sorry. I am really sorry. I am going to try one more time and then we are just going to carry on with the hearing. I do not know how many ways in which to say this. I cannot interfere with N's plan." But no party was suggesting the judge could or should interfere with the plan - she was simply being asked to to bear in mind the reality that there was credible evidence that the likelihood was that the plan would never be implement.

The district judge's treatment of the guardian and her barrister was described as "unacceptable". The judge's conduct was exemplified by, in the words of the child's barrister, "blasphemous words, shouting, storming our of court and general intemperate behaviour". She was being "sarcastic, shaking with rage, turning her chair away from the court and sitting with her back to everyone for several seconds, mimicking the advocate's words and intimidating the guardian".

'Judge crossed the line' Having taken the decision to deliver a full judgment on the appeal and identify the district judge by name, HHJ Mark Rogers said: "I have no wish to embarrass or discomfort the judge, but I am convinced that the public interest in the Family Court being transparent and open to scrutiny is the decisive factor. " HHJ Rogers said it was a "fundamental tenet" of fairness to listen carefully to competing argument before coming to a firm decision. Her exchanges with the child's barrister were "sharp and substantially inhibited counsel from doing her job".

The appeal judge considered that the district judge had "overstepped the mark". The judgment stated: "She effectively prevented a proper debate. By intervening as she did, she distracted everyone from the proper focus. "Even if she had her misgiving about the relevance or practicality of the discussions, she should, in my judgment, either have held back expressing a concluded view until her judgment or resolved the matter, subject to appeal rights, at an interlocutory stage. The judge permitted examination in chief but then effectively prevented counsel from conducting it. It was, in my judgment, wholly unsatisfactory and degenerated into a critique of the guardian's perceived failure of approach. Effectively cross-examined the guardian as if she were representing another hostile party. In my judgment, there and in many places elsewhere the judge went far beyond clarification or amplification and descended into the heart of the arena."

He added that family proceedings should not be "unnecessarily adversarial". "One important function of a judge," he continued, "in a quasi-inquisitorial jurisdiction, is to help the witnesses give their evidence in a clear and unflustered fashion. Of course, points can be questioned and tested but not, in my judgment, to an extent that a witness is unable properly to fulfil his or her role. This, it seems to me, is all the more so in care proceedings when a guardian is trying to explain her professional view to the court." HHJ Rogers concluded: "In short, looking at the whole picture, I am quite satisfied that the judge on this occasion crossed the line and that the hearing amounted to a serious procedural irregularity." After the hearing, the child's grandparents wrote to the guardian saying parts of the hearing were "extremely distressing" with a "constant barrage of interruptions aimed at professional witnesses and barristers questioning them", which was "particularly unprofessional" and brought into question the "impartiality of proceedings".

Complaints About Judges Fall – But Sanctions on the Rise

Jemma Slingo, Law Gazette: Disciplinary action against the judiciary is on the rise despite a drop in the number of complaints. In its annual report for 2018/19, the Judicial Conduct Investigations Office (JCIO) said 55 sanctions were issued this year, the highest number since 2014/15. Over 60% of these related to magistrates. The overall number of complaints against the judiciary dropped by almost a quarter however, from 2,147 in 2017/18 to 1,672. While the majority of complaints related to judicial decisions and case management, there were also 293 complaints about inappropriate behaviour and comments. The JCIO removed 15 judicial members in total, including 13 magistrates. Performance levels at the JCIO itself continued to drop this year, with the statutory office missing all of its targets. While the organisation aims to respond to 95% of complaints within two working days, it only managed to respond to 81% in this time frame. The JCIO also aims to issue a first substantive response to 85% of complaints within 15 working days. However, it managed to respond to little over half in that time, blaming a spike in complaints and staff shortages. The report said: 'We are disappointed to have fallen short of our targets despite the best efforts of the team in challenging circumstances. We experienced an unusual spike in complaints between April and June 2018 and knock-on effects were felt for approximately six months. Last year's trend in terms of staff shortages continued to affect performance with an average vacancy rate of three (20% of our headcount) throughout the reporting year.'

Bail Reforms Which Left Thousands in Legal Limbo to be Reviewed

Pre-charge bail laws that have left thousands of suspects languishing in legal limbo will be reviewed, the government announced hours before parliament was dissolved due to next month's general election. The Law Society, which has called for a rethink, said the review is 'not a moment too soon'. Pre-charge bail allows police to release a suspect from custody, usually subject to conditions, while officers continue their investigation or await a charging decision. A 28-day time limit for police bail came into force in April 2017. The reforms were supposed to prevent people languishing for long spells under pre-charge bail. However, the London Criminal Courts Solicitors' Association said tight police resources meant it was unrealistic to complete many investigations within 28 days or seek a bail extension. The only workaround was to release suspects under investigation. As a result, suspects face uncertainty without time limits or constraints on the police.

The association surveyed criminal defence practitioners this year to investigate the impact of the government's reform - the first attempt to gather hard data. The 109 solicitors who responded reported a total of 6,519 cases where their client had been released under investigation in the past three months. One firm had 200 such cases. More than half of respondents had cases under police investigation which had already lasted between 18 months and two years. These included 22 cases involving rape allegations. Police figures obtained by law firm Hickman & Rose, published in a Law Society policy briefing last month, showed that at least 193,000 suspects were languishing in legal limbo in 2017/18. The data also revealed lengthy spells under RUI status.

The Centre for Women's Justice made a 'super-complaint' drawing together what it said were failures by the police to utilise four separate legal protections that exist for the benefit of vulnerable people experiencing domestic abuse, sexual violence, harassment and stalking. These included failures to impose bail conditions where suspects are released under investigation without bail. In its policy briefing the Society called for RUI time limits, emailing or texting the accused with updates rather than relying on a single 'postal requisition' letter, a central register of the number of people released

under investigation and fairer remuneration for defence solicitors.

The Home Office said yesterday that it will consider updating the rules to better support police officers investigating crimes and ensure that pre-charge bail is being used where most appropriate - including where conditions are needed to protect victims and witnesses, such as in domestic abuse cases. The review will ensure pre-charge bail supports the timely progression of cases to courts, the department added.

Simon Davis, president of the Society, said: 'In the interests of transparency, there should be a centrally-held register of numbers of people released under investigation, broken down by police authority area and offence. Current data collection is inconsistent at best. We look to contribute further to the review process moving forward.' Solicitor Nick Barnard, an associate at London firm Corker Binning, said it was difficult to see the review concluding that the law was too onerous for the police to protect the public. HM Crown Prosecution Service Inspectorate is expected to publish the findings of its investigation on how police forces are managing changes to bail next year.

CCRC Refers Firearms Offences of Gary Lee Williams To Court of Appeal

Mr Williams pleaded not guilty but was convicted in May 2007 at Wolverhampton Crown Court of Possession of a Firearm with Intent to Endanger Life, Possession of a Prohibited Firearm, Possession of Expanding Ammunition, Violent Disorder and Wounding with Intent to Cause Grievous Bodily Harm. The charges related to two separate incidents. He was sentenced to Imprisonment for Public Protection (IPP) with a minimum of seven years to serve for the wounding and the possession of a firearm with intent, and to five years' imprisonment, to be served concurrently, for possession of a prohibited firearm and possession of expanding ammunition. No separate penalty was imposed for the violent disorder. The Court of Appeal declined Mr Williams' application for leave to appeal in January 2011. He applied to the CCRC for a review of his case in July 2017.

Having considered the case in detail, the Commission has decided to refer for appeal Mr Williams convictions for Possession of a Firearm with Intent to Endanger Life, Possession of a Prohibited Firearm and Possession of Expanded Ammunition, because it believes there is a real possibility that the Court of Appeal will quash the convictions. The referral is based on new evidence that Mr Williams did not bring the firearm to the scene of the first incident.

Police Illicitly Access Police Computers Including Checks on a Partner's Criminal Record

Charles Hymas, Telegraph: Hundreds of police officers and staff have illicitly accessed police databases for their own ends including checking the criminal records of partners. Freedom of Information requests show 237 officers and staff have been disciplined for accessing the highly-sensitive police national computer or other IT systems in the past two years. Just half of the 45 forces responded to the requests, which suggests as many as 500 officers have misused databases that contain confidential personal information on millions of people, their property and the movements of vehicles across the country. They have included a case of a police officer accessing his force's crime management system to check on the criminal record of a woman with whom he had a four-year relationship. He also checked up on her credit record and financial history using the Experian data site to "reassure" himself about her background. The officer in Leicestershire Police received a six-month jail sentence, suspended for a year, after admitting three counts under the Computer Misuse Act 1990.The judge said that Lewis had sought to "reassure" himself at the beginning and the end of a relationship by accessing information about a girlfriend who was not the mother of his children.

In a separate case, a Metropolitan Police officer illegally accessed a police database to monitor a criminal investigation into his own conduct. The sergeant was found to have trawled the database, sending himself documents from it and viewing details of other suspects in criminal investigations. He was convicted under the Computer Misuse Act and ordered to complete 150 hours of community service and pay £540. Another officer used the police national computer to check on the log of a search warrant executed at a property owned by a family member. The Bedfordshire police officer was found guilty of misconduct and dismissed after it also emerged he had failed to disclose a business interest and notify his senior officers that a family member had a criminal conviction. Nine police officers from West Yorkshire Police were disciplined for viewing their family record without a policing purpose, while in Nottinghamshire a staff member used computer systems to check the records of people with whom he was involved in a civil dispute.

Patrick Sullivan, chief executive of the think tank Parliament Street, which obtained the information under FOIs, said: "In a time when we are all digital citizens, it's essential that police forces act swiftly against those who exploit the public's personal data. "It's high time the most serious data breaches are punished with custodial sentences and criminal records." Computer expert, Sheila Flavell, of FDM Group, said: "With cyber crime on the rise, it's vital that those tasked with keeping us safe are proficient with technology and acutely aware of the importance of data protection rules." The police computer system contains five highly sensitive databases. One, Quest, enables the search of the names database to identify suspects including physical descriptions and personal features. A second allows users to search the vehicles database using registration numbers, postcodes and colour details to narrow the list to potential suspect vehicles. The ANPR (Automatic Number Plate Recognition) uses a nationwide network of cameras to take images of number plate of vehicles moving around the country, a fourth can search for items that are lost and found and fifth matches incidents to help police solve serial criminals.

Litany of Failures at Inquest Into Death of Darren Williams at HMP Woodhill

The inquest into the self-inflicted death of 39 year old Darren Williams concluded yesterday. The jury found a series of critical failings that contributed to his death including a 'consistent failure to follow due processes and relevant protocols' in Woodhill prison. On 4 January 2019 at 3.50pm Darren was found suspended from a ligature in his cell and could not be revived. He was the first of four men to die in the prison in 2019. The most recent inspection of HMP Woodhill found the prison is 'still not safe enough'. The inquest heard that drugs were widely available in HMP Woodhill which simultaneously entailed a culture of debts, threats and violence. On four separate occasions Darren seriously self-harmed as a result of threats of violence. On each occasion suicide and self-harm procedures (known as ACCT) were started and he was moved to another wing within the prison. However, evidence was heard that he was not offered victim support services, which was in breach of the prison's violence reduction policy, and that no action was taken when Darren named those who were threatening him.

The jury found causative failures relating to information sharing, ACCT processes and the handling of reports made by Darren explaining the threats he was facing due to being in debt. In a detailed narrative, the jury found 'a consistent failure' to follow applicable processes and protocols. Prison's suicide and self-harm prevention measures (ACCTs) were inadequately followed; there was a significant failure to complete and allocate actions in Darren's care maps, an integral part of the ACCT process; Darren's applications to move to the vulnerable prisoner's unit were either not documented or incorrectly considered and; information about Darren's history of self-harm and suicidal ideation was not suitably shared between relevant prison departments.

Further found that the support provided to Darren was 'inadequate and lacking' in key areas such as violence reduction, victim support, mental health and family engagement. The jury also made clear that, in light of Darren's long term history of drug abuse, debt accrual and mental ill health, it was 'vital [that] these services were offered to him in full'. At the conclusion of the inquest the coroner indicated that he would be making a report to prevent future deaths to the Governor concerning the need for members of healthcare to attend ACCT reviews and for previous ACCTs to be reopened when the same concerns recur rather than starting the process afresh.

Carri Williams, Darren's sister, said: "It's very important to us as a family that Darren be seen as the person he was and not just a number in the system. He was a son, brother, grandson, uncle and a good friend to many. As a family we believe that his passing was completely preventable, which makes our loss even more unbearable. This has impacted our lives in a terrible way and every day we suffer and question the 'what ifs'. We now have to visit a cemetery on a regular basis to even feel close to him and stare at mud and ornaments. It's just awful and unfair. He should have been kept safe."

Selen Cavcav, Senior Caseworker at INQUEST said: "It is chilling that the circumstances and failures of Darren's death are so familiar. How many more people must lose their life as a result of these deplorable failures in the prison's duty of care? Darren's death is one of four self-inflicted deaths in Woodhill prison this year. As deaths in custody spiral and recommendations from inspections, investigations and inquests are ignored, a vicious cycle goes into tailspin. The current system for implementing change is not fit for purpose. A national oversight mechanism is urgently needed, to ensure official recommendations are systematically followed up and to prevent another family from experiencing this loss."

Jo Eggleton of Deighton Pierce Glynn solicitors said: "We learnt during the inquest that the re-categorisation of Woodhill prison from a local remand prison to a category B training prison which was originally planned for March 2018 has begun at last. No explanation has been provided for the delay, during which eight more men have died there. None the less it will come as a great relief to the still grieving families I have represented over the years that Woodhill will no longer hold remand and short term sentence prisoners."

Deportation: Ghosts Of Convictions Past

Gherson Immigration: Deportation is a statutory power given to the Home Secretary to order the removal of a person from the UK if that person is not a British citizen and they are deemed not to be 'conducive to the public good'. The UK Borders Act 2007 states that a deportation order must be made against a 'foreign criminal' unless certain exemptions apply. The exemption relied upon most commonly is the assertion that removal from the UK would breach that individual's Human Rights (particularly the right to family and private life). Prior to 2012, private or family life rights were weighed against the public interest using the Razgar proportionality test, and a wide variety of factors would have been taken into consideration. This approach lead to significant debate and criticism, not only because foreign criminals were being given the right to appeal deportation decisions, but also because (admittedly few) foreign criminals were winning these appeals on seemingly tenuous private and family life grounds. The government's argument was that the rights of the individual were not sufficiently balanced against the public interest, with too much weight being given to unsubstantiated and weak human rights claims, resulting in foreign criminals remaining in the UK. As a result, new rules were drafted in July 2012 to define the qualities which a family or private life claim would need in order to outweigh the public interest in deportation cases. The updated rules also asserted that any foreign criminal who had received a prison sentence of 4 years or more would not be able to rely on the private or family life exceptions, and would only be able to quash a deportation decision if "very compelling circumstances" were proved.

The recent case of OH (Algeria) v Secretary of State for the Home Department [2019] EWCA Civ 1763 called into question whether a limitation period should be applicable to criminal convictions which were incurred historically. The facts of the case were as follows: OH was a migrant in the UK with a "long history of criminal offending" and who was subsequently sentenced to eight years in prison for grievous bodily harm in 2004. He successfully appealed the Home Office's decision to deport him and was granted discretionary leave to remain in the UK. In 2015, OH was sentenced to 12 months' imprisonment for assaulting his daughter and the Home Office sought again to deport him based on this new criminal conviction. He appealed the decision and his appeal was allowed by the First-tier Tribunal on the basis that his deportation would be "unduly harsh" on his wife and five children who were all in the UK. Since OH's latest offence resulted in a sentence of between 1 to 4 years, the First-tier Tribunal considered his private and family life claims in determining whether OH's human rights outweighed the public interest.

However, because OH had previously been convicted and sentenced to more than 4 years' imprisonment, the Upper Tribunal found that he would also have to show that there were "very compelling circumstances" which went over and above the "unduly harsh" requirement that would render his right to remain in the UK more important that the public interest need to remove him. Although the law at the time of OH's previous conviction in 2004 (for which he was sentenced for more than 4 years) did not require him to prove "very compelling circumstances", the Court of Appeal deliberated whether that old conviction could trigger this higher threshold in a deportation order made after July 2012. Effectively, could a historic conviction which had already been considered in a previous deportation claim be resurrected many years later under a stricter and less forgiving law? OH argued that only the offence which prompted the deportation order should be considered, not his entire criminal history. Nevertheless, the Court of Appeal found that there was no exclusion in law stating that multiple offences or periods of imprisonment could not be considered in a deportation case. OH's previous criminal convictions were still relevant to his deportation case, even though they did not trigger the order. Further, it was argued that the very decision to deport a person should elevate the degree to which public interest is considered by recognising the degree of criminality which has provoked such dire consequences for that individual in the first place. It would therefore be justifiable and necessary to analyse the individual's whole criminal history rather than just the most recent offence.

Half of Rape Victims Drop Out of Cases Even After Suspect is Identified

Owen Bowcott and Caelainn Barr, Guardian: Almost half of rape victims are dropping out of investigations, as a growing proportion do not want to pursue a prosecution even when a suspect has been identified, according to a Cabinet Office report leaked to the Guardian. The figures, which were prepared for a secret internal government review earlier this year, reveal a system in crisis as tens of thousands of women are reluctant to pursue their alleged attackers when faced with invasive disclosure demands, a lower likelihood of securing a conviction and lengthy delays in seeing their case brought to court. The report, which has emerged during an election campaign in which the Conservatives are making fighting crime a central tenet of their election strategy, suggests a lack of resources, owing to austerity, is impacting the criminal justice system's ability to pursue rape cases.

Reported rapes are on the rise. However, police are referring fewer cases to the Crown Prosecution Service, which in turn is prosecuting even fewer cases. The highly sensitive data was assembled earlier this year by the prime minister's implementation unit as part of an urgent

investigation into the dramatic fall in rape prosecutions in England and Wales. Rape prosecutions are at their lowest level in more than a decade. The briefing shows senior civil servants acknowledging the way the criminal justice system deals with crimes “is particularly poor for rape” and expressing suspicions – never publicly aired – that problems may be due to lack of resources. The document, marked as “official – sensitive”, notes: “Police are assigning certain unsuccessful outcomes after shorter investigations than in previous years.” It also says: “The drivers for this are unclear, but it may be indicative of ‘rationing’ of police time and resources to more ‘solvable’ cases.” While recorded rapes increased by 173% between 2014 and 2018, the police referred 19% fewer cases for charging decisions and CPS decisions to prosecute fell by 44% in the same period.

One of the most concerning changes is the growing proportion of cases resulting in “outcome 16”, whereby a suspect has been identified after a police investigation but the victim does not support further action. The document reveals that from 2015 to 2018, the proportion of cases dropped owing to an outcome 16 rose from 33% to 48%. Last year, more than 20,000 women – an average of one every 30 minutes – decided not to proceed with a rape investigation, even when the suspect had been identified. Campaigners believe the sharp rise may reflect victims being discouraged from pursuing complaints because they face disclosure of their intimate, private life through requests for the contents of their phones and laptops. The sheer length of time from offence to completion at court, which has increased by 37% to an average of two years since 2014, may be deterring others. Claire Waxman, who is London’s first victims’ commissioner, said the figures highlighted significant problems in the way the criminal justice system deals with rape. “There is such inconsistency between police forces and areas over the way they handle rapes,” she said.

Appeal Judges Review ‘Lady in the Lake’ Murder

The conviction of Gordon Park for killing his wife who had gone missing in 1976 finally reached the Court of Appeal this week. The case became known in the media as ‘the lady in the lake’ after scuba divers discovered Carol Park’s body in Coniston Water, Cumbria in 1997. Gordon Park was convicted of her murder in 2005 but always maintained his innocence. He appealed against his conviction but the appeal was dismissed in November 2008. Little over a year later, the former teacher took his own life in his cell at HMP Garth in Lancashire. This week’s appeal follows a referral by the Criminal Cases Review Commission after an application by members of his family applied to the CCRC in the same year he died. The CCRC referral draws on non-disclosure of both expert opinion undermining the implication by the prosecution that Park’s climbing axe could be the murder weapon and information undermining the reliability of a prosecution witness who gave evidence of a prison confession. The commission also cites new scientific evidence showing that Park was not a contributor to DNA preserved within knots of the rope used to bind the body; and expert evidence that a rock found in the lake near Carol Park’s remains could not specifically be linked to rocks the family home. Judgement has been reserved and the ruling will be given at a later date.

Murder Charge After Knife Awareness Course Attack

A teenager has been charged with murdering a man stabbed at a knife awareness course in London. Hakim Sillah, 18, was attacked in the youth offending service department of the Hillingdon Civic Centre in Uxbridge on Thursday. The Metropolitan Police said a group had gathered at the venue when a fight broke out. Mr Sillah was taken to hospital but died an hour later. A 17-year-old boy will appear before Uxbridge magistrates on Saturday. A teenage boy who sustained a knife wound to his ear was praised by detectives for "bravely" trying to break up the fight. In a statement, Mr Sillah's family described him as "a lovely lad who cared about his family". "He loved looking after his little brother, who had been ill," they said. Det Ch Insp Noel McHugh said: "A young man with his whole life ahead of him has been fatally attacked and his family are absolutely devastated."

IPP Sentencing Regime in England And Wales 'Deeply Harmful'

Jamie Grierson, Guardian: Justice officials in England and Wales are facing renewed calls to deal with thousands of prisoners still jailed under an abolished Kafkaesque sentencing regime that a report has branded “deeply harmful” for families. The imprisonment for public protection (IPP) sentence, scrapped in 2012, was a form of indeterminate sentence in which offenders were given a minimum jail tariff but no maximum for a range of crimes. Those given an IPP sentence are placed on licence indefinitely after release, and are only eligible to have their licence removed after 10 years. There are 2,223 people serving IPP sentences who have yet to be released and a further 1,206 serving an IPP sentence who are back in prison having been recalled while on licence. Despite its abolition in 2012, 93% serving an IPP sentence are still in prison having passed their tariff expiry date.

A joint report by the Prison Reform Trust and Southampton University has called for legislation to be introduced to “end the injustice it represents for those serving it” and for the government in the meantime to provide support to alleviate the “painful burden” it places on families of IPP prisoners. Peter Dawson, the director of the trust, said: “The suffering caused by this disastrous sentence goes on and on. It extends far beyond the people still unjustly held in prison, affecting parents, partners and children, all totally innocent. “Legislation is needed to finish the job of putting right the injustice done to so many by the IPP sentence. But in the meantime there is scope to do more to support families, reducing their pain and helping them to help their loved ones make a success of life after release.”

The most recent statistics show that among the unreleased IPP prison population there are 187 inmates who were given a minimum tariff of two years who have been behind bars for more than 10 years. The figures show for the first time more IPP prisoners were returned to custody after licence recall than were released from custody in the past 12 months. In the year to 30 June, there were 433 releases of IPP prisoners, but 636 IPP prisoners were returned to custody after licence recall. The report, A Helping Hand: Supporting Families in the Resettlement of People Serving IPPs, found that the pain caused to families of people serving IPP sentences had not been addressed by criminal justice agencies. This meant that the contribution families could make to the rehabilitation and resettlement of IPP prisoners was not being realised, the report said. The report’s authors have recommended more consistent communication and the provision of specific support for families.

Dr Harry Annison, one of the authors, said: “Families of people serving IPPs carry considerable burdens in supporting their relative through their sentence. All criminal justice organisations should avoid inadvertently placing further burdens on those who have often given years of devoted support to their relative. “Additional information, guidance and support for families, and actions to ameliorate some of the pains experienced, would help to ease the burden on families and enable them to better support their loved ones in prison and on release.”

Introduced in 2005, IPPs were designed to detain indefinitely serious offenders who were perceived to be a risk to the public. The Home Office initially estimated that the sentence would result in 900 people going to prison. However, more than 8,000 IPP sentences were imposed, placing severe strain on prison, probation and parole board resources. As a result of these concerns and mounting legal challenges, the IPP sentence was abolished in 2012. However, its abolition was not retrospective.

HMP Swaleside – Disappointing too Little Progress

Inspectors found a disappointing lack of progress at HMP Swaleside in following up recommendations for improvement from a full inspection in 2018. Swaleside is a complex and challenging prison on the Isle of Sheppey holding many prisoners who presented risks to the public, staff and other prisoners. At an inspection in 2018, inspectors noted a prison where progress since 2016 had been "lopsided." Peter Clarke, HMCIPs, said: "We judged safety and respect to be better than at the 2016 inspection but work to rehabilitate prisoners and plan for their release had deteriorated." Though the overall safety assessment had improved in 2018, from poor in 2016 to not sufficiently good, levels of violence had increased considerably over the two years. Action to address suicide and self-harm was also found to be weak in 2018. Illicit drug use was a fundamental problem at that inspection and, although relationships between staff and prisoners were generally very good, many prison officers had only just been recruited and many lacked the authority to challenge antisocial behaviour by prisoners

When inspectors returned in September 2019 for an independent review of progress, Mr Clarke said, they found that not enough had been done to meet the concerns at the 2018 inspection. Overall, the number of violent incidents remained high. "Despite this, managers had not thought hard enough about what was driving violence at the establishment. There was no meaningful strategy or action plan to reduce levels of violence." Likewise, there had been no reduction in the number of self-harm incidents, yet managers had not developed a strategy or action plan to address this problem. Mr Clarke added: "The lack of diligence and application by senior managers was exemplified by their poor response to our concerns over the use of special accommodation. Other than reminding staff to seek a governor's approval before using it, no progress had been made since the inspection. This extreme custodial tool was still used far too often, for too long and with poor managerial oversight." On a more positive note, prison managers had reduced the use of illicit drugs. The prison had also acted to support inexperienced staff by restructuring its staffing model, improving training and introducing a buddy scheme. These actions were laudable, Mr Clarke said, though they had yet to translate into a confident and authoritative staff group. "We saw many examples of antisocial behaviour going unchallenged by staff."

Problems with the living conditions identified at previous inspections remained. Inspectors found dirty communal areas, food left out overnight and biohazard waste left beside a walkway. Many showers remained in very poor condition, and were some of the worst in the prison estate. Disappointingly for a training prison, there were not enough activity spaces for the population, and too many prisoners remained unemployed or underemployed. Attendance at activities was poor, and those who did go to work and education classes often arrived late.

Managers had made good progress in protecting the public. Monthly public protection meetings were now well attended, and multi-agency public protection levels were confirmed in advance of prisoners' release. However, there was insufficient progress in other areas of rehabilitation and release planning. As at the time of the inspection, about three-quarters of the population did not have an up-to-date assessment of their risk and need. "We found a single offender supervisor managing 170 prisoners convicted of sexual offences, which was simply unworkable," Mr Clarke added.

Overall, Mr Clarke said: "This was a disappointing review, and too little progress had been made in the nine months since the inspection. Managers had, in our view, failed to act with sufficient diligence and rigour concerning the key recommendations we made in 2018. There were signs that when managers focused on a problem, they could make good progress, as their work on drugs and public protection showed. The challenge is to replicate this progress on other key recommendations."

Irish Legal Heritage: The 'Long' History of Quackery

Róise Connolly, Irish Legal News: Social media is replete with various examples of quackery; from detox teas and bee-sting facials, to more sinister bleach therapies and cancer cures. Far from being a novel issue, quackery in Ireland has a long history, and many of us who have grown up in rural areas have heard stories of people who you'd visit for 'the cure'. While leaving a banana skin on a wart isn't going to cause you too much stress regardless of efficacy, there are opportunists who prey on some of the most vulnerable people in our society, offering expensive and unproven 'cures' for uncurable illnesses. Perhaps worse, 'alternative therapies' are often peddled to people with diseases which can be treated using conventional medical techniques.

In *Brehon law, non-qualified medical practitioners "were subject to penalties if their treatment failed and they had not informed the patient of their irregular status" (J Fleetwood, 'Irish Quacks and Quackery' (1990) Dublin Historical Record). To plug the current gap in the law, in 2018, a private member's Bill was introduced in the Dáil proposing new penalties for the "publication of any advertisement containing an offer to treat any person or provide any remedy for cancer, or any advice in connection with the treatment of cancer, or which suggests that a medical consultation, diagnosis, treatment or surgical operation is unnecessary for the treatment of cancer"; and this week the Health Products Regulatory Authority took action to block misleading advertisements which claimed to treat autism using stem cell therapy.

One of the most notorious Irish quack 'doctors' was John St. John Long, who was born in Newcastle, Co Limerick in 1798. He trained as an artist at the Royal Dublin Society School of Design, and worked as an art teacher in Limerick for a number of years before moving to London in 1822. Despite his lack of training, Long assumed the position of a 'doctor' and claimed to have a cure for tuberculosis (also known as 'consumption' at the time). Within a few months of opening his medical practice, Long was so successful that he moved to London's Harley Street, adding prestige to his persona as a medical specialist.

Long's cure for tuberculosis involved scrubbing the patient's back or chest with a sponge soaked in a "secret formula" which turned out to be turpentine, vinegar, and egg yolk (S Hempel, 'John St John Long: Quackery and Manslaughter' (2014) The Lancet). The vigorous scrubbing of the patient's skin, which occurred for up to ten days, would cause a weeping wound that would then be covered with cabbage leaves and left to heal. The weeping wound, he said, was evidence of the body 'secreting' the infectious disease.

It is evident from his first book, Discoveries in the Science and Art of Healing, that Long's alternative therapies attracted criticism from the medical community. In addition to a string of "letters" from patients commending his treatment, the title page contained the following quote: "Persons who object to a proposition, merely because it is new, or who endeavour to detract from the merit of the man, who first gives efficacy to a new idea, by demonstrating its usefulness and applicability, are foolish, unmanly, envious, and illiberal objectors; they are unworthy of the designation either of professional men, or of gentlemen". (John St. John Long, Discoveries in the Science and Art of Healing (1830)) The same year his book was published, two of John St. John Long's patients died – leading him to be tried for manslaughter. The manslaughter trials and Long's final years will be explored in next week's Irish Legal Heritage.

The first person to die in John St. John Long's care was Ms Catherine Cashin. Ms Cashin was 24 years old when she arrived in London in August 1830 with her mother, Lady Cashin, and younger sister, Ellen. Lady Cashin went to Long seeking a cure for Ellen who was reported to have tuberculosis; however, Long said Ellen's case was "hopeless" and convinced her to leave Catherine

in his care in case she "might also be attacked with this dreadful disorder". Although Catherine did not have any symptoms of tuberculosis, Long proposed treating her by creating a wound to allow the infection to leave the body and applying his infamous lotion. The wound increased in size and became infected, causing Catherine to become severely ill – for her constant vomiting, Long was said to have prescribed mulled wine. Within weeks of entering Long's Harley Street clinic, Catherine was dead.

At Long's manslaughter trial in October 1830, he blamed Catherine's death on a doctor, Sir Benjamin Brodie, who had tended to Catherine on the day before her death. Indeed, in his book, A Critical Exposure of the Ignorance and Malpractice of certain Medical Practitioners in their Theory and Treatment of Disease (1831), Long blamed Catherine for her own death: "Suffice to say, that the patient was consumptive: did not restrict herself to the regiment I had prescribed; indulged frequently in eating unripe fruits, a fact that has transpired since the trial, and which might have produced inflammation of the stomach, ending in death" Notwithstanding the string of witnesses produced by Long who gave evidence about his miraculous curing abilities, the jury found him guilty of manslaughter. Unfortunately, Long's punishment was limited to a £250 fine.

The manslaughter verdict did not seem to detract from Long's reputation as a miracle healer, as the second of his victims sought him out for treatment the very month of his conviction. 48-year-old Mrs Colin Campbell Lloyd put herself into Long's care on 5 October 1830, complaining of occasional "choking" in her throat when she had a cold. Mrs Lloyd was said to have inhaled something given to her by Long, which, within days, had caused severe irritation and erosion of her "tongue, mouth, and fauces". Mrs Lloyd's condition continued to deteriorate, and she died on 8 November 1830. Again, Long was tried for manslaughter; however, this time he was acquitted. Long spent the next few years writing about the cases for which he was tried and attributing the jealousy of the medical profession as a reason for his prosecution. In fact, he also sued those who called him a "quack" – in one case, he was awarded £100 in damages. Somewhat ironically, Long is reported to have contracted tuberculosis himself, and after refusing his own treatment regime, he died in 1834.

*Brehon Law: bBody of ancient native Irish law which was generally operational in Gaelic areas until the completion of the English conquest of Ireland in the early 17th century. They were first set down on parchment in the 7th century and were named after wanderings lawyers, the Brehons

Scottish Government Announce Public Inquiry Into Death of Sheku Bayoh

Humza Yousaf, Cabinet Secretary for Justice in Scotland, has today announced the setting of a public inquiry into the death of Sheku Bayoh. This follows a meeting this afternoon (12 November) between First Minister Nicola Sturgeon and Humza Yousaf, Sheku's family, their lawyer Aamer Anwar, and Deborah Coles the Director of INQUEST. The announcement comes after the decision of the Lord Advocate, chief public prosecutor for Scotland, not to charge Police Scotland or the officers involved in the death with criminal, corporate or health and safety offences.

Kadi Johnson, the sister of Sheku Bayoh, said: "The last 4 and a half years hasn't been easy for us. We want this inquiry to mean something and Sheku's death not to have been in vain. His name has been tarnished in the past 4 years. This is about achieving justice for Sheku and for a fairer Scotland for all irrespective of race and background."

Deborah Coles, Director of INQUEST said: "This is a welcome decision and shows the Scottish government recognise the serious issues raised by Sheku's death. This inquiry must have the family voice at its heart, terms of reference which can scrutinise the systemic issues raised, and a diverse panel.

Those entrusted with the role of policing must be subject to accountability before the law.

This inquiry can help examine concerns about racial injustice and the way deaths in custody are investigated in the hope that future deaths are prevented. Today is a positive step in the family's search for truth and accountability. It is in both the family and public interest."

Aamer Anwar who represents the family said: "The Bayoh family welcome the First Minister and the Cabinet Secretary for keeping their promises to meet with them and taking on board their concerns. Following yesterday's devastating news, today's announcement by Humza Yousaf in the setting up of a Public Inquiry is a critical moment for Scottish justice, the rule of law and important step forward in the family's campaign to establish accountability.

The family are deeply grateful to the Scottish Government for their announcement of a Public Inquiry. This is an important first step in holding power to account and establishing the truth, because without truth there can be no justice."

Adamčo v. Slovakia (application no. 45084/14)

The applicant, Branislav Adamčo, is a Slovak national who was born in 1978. He is currently in detention in Leopoldov (Slovakia). The case concerned his complaint that he had not been given a fair trial when he had been convicted for murder. In 2001 Mr Adamčo was charged with murder related to an organised-crime contract killing. He was first acquitted of being an accomplice in that crime but the prosecution appealed and the charge was modified as identifying him as the actual killer. The modified charge relied, among other things, on testimony by a witness who had also given evidence at earlier stages of the trial but who had then changed his version of events, incriminating the applicant. Mr Adamčo was convicted of murder and his subsequent ordinary appeal and an appeal on points of law were unsuccessful. In 2011 he lodged a complaint with the Constitutional Court, arguing that modifications to the composition of the formations dealing with his case at the trial level and at the appellate level had been irregular and that he had not had access to prosecution observations in either of his two appeals. He also submitted that the evidence from the prosecution witness had been unreliable as the witness had benefited from his actions because the prosecution had dropped cases against him. The Constitutional Court rejected his complaint as inadmissible.

Relying in particular on Article 6 (right to a fair trial) of the European Convention on Human Rights, Mr Adamčo complained, inter alia, that he had no access to prosecution observations on his ordinary appeal and his appeal on points of law, and that his conviction had been based to a decisive extent on the testimony of a witness who had had an obvious motive to give evidence in favour of the prosecution rather than tell the truth. Violation of Article 6. Just satisfaction: 5,000 euros (EUR) for non-pecuniary damage and EUR 8,000 for costs and expenses.

Serving Prisoners Supported by MOJUK: Giovanni Di Stefano, 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.