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 771 (11/12/2019) - Cost £1

Donald Adams Died in Prison - Conviction Quashed Posthumously

Source Safari: Donald Adams (who died in custody in October 2018) has had his convictions for indecent assault against a male (G) plus indecent assault and rape against a female (M) quashed posthumously after leave to continue his appeal was granted to his widow. The original trial took place when Donald Adams was 77 years old. The convictions related to incidents alleged to have occurred between 1980 and 1987 – in other words, "historic abuse". Facebook records revealed that M and G, who had known each other as youngsters when they were both in a brass band of which Donald Adams was also a member, and had remained in touch since, had met up in a pub in Cardiff in 2016. At this meeting, the allegations were discussed between them. One of the two complainants, M, has a history of mental health issues, which was the subject of formal admissions at the trial, including the fact that M has been diagnosed with and treated for Dialectic Behaviour Disorder, a condition which is characterised by taking extreme positions. It was the appellant's case at the trial that M was now, many years after the event, viewing her past relationship with him through that prism in a distorted way, and that she was manipulative and capable of influencing others to support her allegations. Donald Adams admitted at trial having had a sexual relationship with M in the past but stated that all acts were consensual and none had occurred before M was 16 years old. The Court of Appeal found that the trial Judge had erred in not giving the jury any direction about whether, and if so how, they could rely on the evidence of each complainant when considering the allegations made by the other. In addition, the trial Judge was found to have been wrong not to have directed the jury about the possibility of collusion between M and G. As Rix LJ observed in R v H [2011] EWCA Crim 2344, at paragraph 24, the reality is that independent people do not make allegations of a similar nature against the same person in the absence of collusion or contamination of their evidence. The jury, therefore, should definitely have been directed as to whether or not each complainant's evidence could be used to support the allegations made by the other, and particularly where the two complainants had been discussing the matter between themselves before any complaint was made, three decades after the events were alleged to have happened. The Court of Appeal stated: "In this case, as we have indicated, no such direction was given. Moreover, it was a case in which, as we see it, the question whether the evidence of each complainant was admissible in relation to the allegations made by the other was potentially of great significance to the jurors' decisions. In these circumstances, we consider that the failure to give any such direction makes the appellant's convictions unsafe."

The matter of Donald Adams' death from pneumonia, while in custody, was the subject of an investigation by the Prisons and Probation Ombudsman. Their findings were that his clinical and social care fell far below the level he could have expected to receive in the community; that Prison GPs did not adequately manage Mr Adams' abnormal blood test results or inform him of the need for prompt investigation; that his weight loss appears to have gone unnoticed by prison and healthcare staff until early August when such weight loss should have prompted an urgent medical review and investigation; and that Prison staff did not share information with healthcare staff or social care staff about Mr Adams' deteriorating health or mobility despite concerns being raised by Mr Adams' 'buddy' and a wing officer, and, as a result, essential assessments were not completed, and staff failed to provide adequate care. [R v Donald Gordon Adams [2019] EWCA Crim 1363.]

CCRC Refers Murder Conviction of Adrian Jones to Court of Appeal

Mr Jones was convicted at Swansea Crown Court in July 2008 for the murder of Kelly Hyde who was killed while walking her dog in September 2007. The prosecution case was that Mr Jones, who was aged 16 at the time, was responsible for the murder of the deceased. Mr Jones claimed that he did not know and had had no contact with her. Because of his age at the time he was sentenced to detention at Her Majesty's pleasure with a minimum prison term of 11 years and 79 days. Mr Jones tried to appeal against his conviction but his appeal was dismissed in October 2009. After his appeal Mr Jones accepted his responsibility for the killing. He applied to the CCRC for a review of his case in September 2015.

The Commission has conducted a detailed review of the case which has included considering reports from a number of psychiatric experts and commissioning its own psychiatric expert evidence. The Commission has decided to refer Mr Jones murder conviction to the Court of Appeal on the basis of new psychiatric evidence relating to his mental state at the time of the killing which raises a real possibility that the Court of Appeal will now quash the murder conviction and substitute a conviction for manslaughter on the grounds of diminished responsibility. Mr Jones died of natural causes while in custody in February 2018. His family have pursued the application on his behalf. In light of that, the Commission has decided to refer the case, not only on the basis that there is a real possibility that the Court will quash the conviction, but also because it considers that there is a real possibility the Court of Appeal will approve Mr Jones' Mother under subsection 3 of section 44A of Criminal Appeal Act 1968, to appear in lieu of her son. Mr Jones/the Jones family were not legally represented during their application to the CCRC.

Targeting of Supt Robyn Williams 'Example of Met Institutional Racism'

Vikram Dodd, Guardian: The pursuit of a senior officer under paedophile laws when she is not a sex offender is discriminatory and an example of institutional racism still poisoning the police force, the Black Police Association has claimed. The comment came after Supt Robyn Williams, a decorated senior police officer convicted last week of possessing a child abuse video, was sentenced to do unpaid work and put on a register meant for sex offenders. She was sent the unsolicited video in February 2018 by her sister who wanted the paedophile behind it hunted down and caught. The judge sentenced her accepting she had no sexual interest in children and said he had to improvise a sentence because of the "very unusual circumstances" of the case.

Williams, one of the most senior female African-Caribbean officers in Britain, was praised for her work after the Grenfell fire disaster. Despite her conviction last week, the public gallery at the Old Bailey in central London was packed with people who came to show their support for her. She was sentenced to 200 hours of unpaid work with her job after 36 years of "stellar" service. Her lawyers are considering an appeal. Her sister, Jennifer Hodge, who suffers from anxiety and depression, had been outraged the video was circulating on social media and sent it to all 17 people in her WhatsApp contacts list. Williams claimed she was unaware her sister had sent her the video.

The common serjeant of London, Judge Richard Marks, said Williams' claims of ignorance were "fanciful", especially given Hodge was extremely upset by the video and the two sisters had spent hours with each other without Williams reporting it. The judge told her: "It is a complete tragedy you find yourself in the position you now do." Williams was acquitted last week of another charge of corruptly failing in her duty to report the video because she wanted to avoid getting her sister in trouble. The jury convicted on five of the six counts brought against Williams, her sister and her sister's partner.

The treatment of Williams, 54, has caused concern among some in policing in the Police

Superintendents' Association, among Williams' staff and the Black Police Association. For black officers, the concerns boiled over publicly on Tuesday as Williams, one of the BPA founding members who was awarded honours for her work, was facing what the judge called "immense consequences" for her career. In a statement, the Met branch of the BPA said the Met had the discretion not to pursue Williams, but had chosen to do so. "The MetBPA believes that the internal guidance on this matter allows for any person in innocent possession of any image of this kind to be treated with discretion, especially when the investigation has concluded that there has been no sexual gratification. The question that is now asked, is why was this discretion not afforded to Supt Williams. "The MetBPA position is that this is a classic example of institutional racism. The clip was sent to 17 people and only three people were convicted. It is well documented about the disproportionally that exists within mis Janet Hills, chair of the BPA, said: "There have been many examples in the last couple of years of black senior officers being held to account at a higher level than their white counterparts. This has to stop. The finer detail of this case needs to be scrutinised to ensure that there is fairness for all."conduct and complaint of officers and staff from an African, Caribbean or Asian background."

The video came to light when some of those who received it reported it to police. The jury acquitted Williams of corruptly failing in her duty, but convicted her of possession. In his sentencing remarks, the judge gave an interpretation of the verdict. Williams had been sent the video unsolicited by her sister on a Saturday morning. Williams said she had become aware only the following Monday morning when telephoned by her sister, who had by then been arrested by police. The judge said the jury had rejected Williams' account and that by 7pm on the Saturday, eight hours after receiving the video, she was aware a video was on her phone and of "its broad context", given her sister's extreme reaction to it. The judge said it was "a grave error of judgment" by Williams to do nothing about the video, adding that, because of her experience as a police officer, she knew the "imperative" to act to safeguard the five-year-old child shown in the video being abused by an adult. The judge said as he sentenced Williams: "The fact that you did nothing about it was a grave error of judgment on your part, especially given the fact that by dint of your job, you knew the imperative of so doing and had the ready means at your disposal to act … It is though an error of judgment from which you neither gained nor stood to gain in any way which makes it all the harder to understand."

The Met deputy assistant commissioner Matthew Horne said: "The prosecution called this a 'sad case' and referred to the 'serious errors of judgement' made by those involved. "The Independent Office for Police Conduct is carrying out an independent misconduct investigation into the actions of Supt Williams and we await the outcome." The court heard that Hodge, who was convicted of distributing the image, had lost her job with the charity Scope after 17 years and it had destroyed her relationship with her sister. She was sentenced to carry out 100 hours of unpaid work. "I have no doubt you are a thoroughly decent woman," the judge told her. He accepted she sent the video in outrage and the court heard she had wanted those behind it caught and jailed. Throughout the three-week trial, Williams stayed away from Hodge and her partner, and did not seem to exchange a word or glance. Hodge's partner, Dido Massivi, has lost his job as a bus driver after 20 years. The court heard he blamed himself for the damage inflicted on Williams and her career, and his partner. Massivi, 61, was sentenced to 18 months' imprisonment suspended for two years, and to carry out 200 hours of unpaid work. He was convicted of distributing two indecent images and possessing an extreme image.

Police Agree to Delete Prevent Referral of Primary School Child

Following court action, the Metropolitan Police has agreed to delete information relating to a referral of a primary school age child under the government's PREVENT programme. The other referring authorities also agreed to correct and delete the relevant records. DPG's client was concerned that the records could be used against them in the future, even though they were based on a mistake. They relied on the Data Protection Act and Human Rights Act in order to secure deletion of the relevant PREVENT records. Following settlement, all relevant records have now been deleted, including from the National Police Counter Terrorism Headquarters Prevent Case Management (PCM) database, the existence of which was only recently made public (read about it in this Guardian article). Without deletion, such records would have been retained for at least 6 years under the police's National Retention Assessment Criteria (NRAC) policy, which does not differentiate between adult and child-related records. The police had refused to give any reassurance that such records would not be used again in relation to the child or would not feature in any Disclosure and Barring Service criminal records checks against them as an adult. However, this is no longer a concern as a result of the settlement in this case. The facts of the case and the settlement terms are confidential.

Mahdi Mohamud to Serve Life Sentence in Hospital for The Foreseeable Future

Having heard submissions over the course of two days, Mr Justice Stuart-Smith sentenced Mahdi Mohamud to life imprisonment, with a minimum term of eleven years and a hospital and limitation direction, for three offences of attempted murder committed during a 'terrorist' attack at Manchester Victoria train station last New Year's Eve. One of the three victims was a police officer and the injuries sustained were found to be serious and long term. The defendant who suffers from paranoid schizophrenia will serve his sentence at Ashworth High Security Hospital until and unless he becomes well enough to be transferred to prison. In passing sentence Mr Justice Stuart-Smith found that, although the defendant retained responsibility for his acts, his mental illness had made a significant contribution, probably by exacerbating the seeds of radicalization and by a disinhibiting effect.

German Murderer Wins 'Right to be Forgotten'

BBC Neww: A German man convicted of murder in 1982 has the right to have his name removed from online search results, Germany's highest court has ruled. The constitutional court in Karlsruhe ruled in favour of the man, who was handed a life sentence for murdering two people on a yacht in 1982. He was released from jail in 2002 and says he wants his family name to be distanced from his crime. The ruling could force publications to restrict access to online archives.

What was the case? The man was onboard the sailing ship Apollonia in the Caribbean when he shot and killed two people and severely injured another during a row. A book and TV documentary were made about the case. In 1999, the Der Spiegel magazine uploaded three reports from 1982 and 1983 which included the man's full name to their website. The articles can still be found with a simple Google search.

What was the complaint? The man became aware of the articles in 2009 and requested they be removed. He claimed they violated his rights and his "ability to develop his personality," a court statement says. The case was initially thrown out in 2012 by a federal court which said his right to privacy did not outweigh public interest and press freedom. But the constitutional court has overturned that decision and the case will now return to the federal courts. Publications are allowed to keep archived articles online but could be forced to remove them if asked. The issue of the "right to be forgotten" is a controversial one, resulting in disputes between the EU and Google.

Obituary: Ian Macdonald Barrister who Specialised in Human Rights Law

Geoffrey Robertson, Guardian: Ian Macdonald, who has died aged 80 from a heart attack, was the leader of the British bar in immigration law over the past half century. His forensic commitment to equality and race relations dated back to his successful defence of the Mangrove Nine in 1970, when an Old Bailey jury rejected an attempt to frame denizens of the Mangrove cafe in Notting Hill, west London, and he was still working on immigration and extradition cases at the time of his death. Although some of his comrades took, in time, knighthoods and judgeships, Ian remained to the end a jobbing advocate – one with an intellectual influence on the subject, through his textbook on immigration law, greater than that of any judge or academic. The son of Ian Macdonald, a banker, and his wife, Helen Nicolson, Ian was born and grew up in Glasgow, went to Rugby school, then studied law at Clare College, Cambridge, joining the bar via the Middle Temple in 1963. He became a member of the Campaign Against Racial Discrimination at its inception in 1964, lobbying the Labour government to set up a race relations board.

In 1971, however, came an avowedly racist Immigration Act with its invented category of "patriality" designed to exclude as many black people as possible. Ian turned to the study of the civil liberties implications of immigration law, a subject which at the time was disgracefully neglected by university law faculties. In 1983 came the first edition of his textbook Immigration Law & Practice – now in its ninth edition and still the leading work on the subject. It managed from the outset to be sufficiently authoritative to require judicial respect while at the same time infused with humanitarian principles and ideas for extracting them from the common law, which was difficult enough years before the Human Rights Act. When that was passed, in 1998, a new edition of Macdonald on Immigration was soon available to guide practitioners. In 1984 he founded the Immigration Law Practitioners' Association,which he chaired for the next 30 years, evincing, as his friend the writer Gus John has put it, "intellectual muscle and unwavering commitment to holding the state to account and defending the rights and entitlements of those whom it capriciously seeks to exclude".

I first met Ian at the Old Bailey in 1971 – he was in court No 1 defending the Angry Brigade, former Cambridge and Essex students who planted small bombs at the Miss World contest and the like, while I was in court No 2 (the security court) defending those the state regarded as more dangerous, the hippy editors of Oz magazine charged with "conspiracy to corrupt public morals" for publishing a cartoon of Rupert Bear with an erection. These were bizarre times and a virtually all-white, all-male, private-school bar had not developed the tactics for exposing the institutional racism in the Met, police corruption and the wrongful convictions soon to be inflicted on Irish terrorist suspects. We recognised the need for new thinking, new ways of defending (in particular, harnessing public law disclosure procedures) and the need to build up chambers of like-minded barristers who would pool their energies to resist state oppression of minorities and journalists. Ian became head of his chambers – Garden Court – in 1975 and, together with his co-head, Owen Davies, guided its collective expertise in immigration law.

Ian was counsel in many notable cases, from the Balcombe Street siege (the convictions were later exposed as a miscarriage of justice), the Stephen Lawrence inquiry (representing Stephen's friend Duwayne Brooks) and the New Cross fire inquest, into the death of 13 young black people – Ian was seen jumping on his bike to ride to the high court for urgent orders quashing the decisions of a legally ignorant coroner. He was appointed by Manchester city council to conduct an independent inquiry into racism in local schools after the murder of a Bangladeshi schoolboy, Ahmed Ullah. The council refused to publish his report, although it subsequently emerged as a book, Murder in the Playground (1990). In 1988, Lord (Quintin) Hailsham was succeeded as lord chancellor by the more fair-minded Lord (James) Mackay of Clashfern, whose first QC appointments were said to include "radicals". Ian was one, his appointment to silk after 25 years being well overdue.

In 1997 he submitted to security vetting and accepted appointment by the attorney general as a "special advocate" for the Special Immigration Appeals Commission (SIAC). This was a device which helped the government pretend that SIAC's proceedings were fair: special advocates were allowed to challenge evidence that their client was not allowed to see on grounds of national security. Effective challenge in such circumstances, as he later explained to a parliamentary committee, was difficult if not impossible without being able to talk to clients. It was never, on principle, satisfactory and when SIAC was additionally tasked to order indefinite detention without trial of terrorist suspects, Ian publicly resigned in protest, refusing as a matter of conscience to "provide false legitimacy" to indefinite detention, which was "contrary to our deepest notions of justice".

This episode, in 2004, highlights Ian's integrity. He was a gentle and amusing man who mixed easily and congenially with his clients and their supporters from community groups. Members of the immigration bar were inspired over the years by his leadership and his scholarship. Macdonald, who was three times divorced, is survived by his fourth wife, Brigid Baillie, whom he married in 2008, and by four sons and five grandchildren. • Ian Alexander Macdonald, barrister, born 12 January 1939; died 12 November 2019

Grace Millane's Trial Exposes a Dark Trend in Coverage of Violence Against Women

Daisy Richards, Rights Info: The murder of Grace Millane in 2018 seized front pages of media outlets worldwide, with article after article fixated on details of her personal history. These details implied that the sexually violent nature of Millane's death was somehow a product of her own actions, and this treatment is itself part of a much larger media trend in how violence against women is represented. From the day that her family reported her missing on 5 December to the discovery of her body on 9 December, media outlets reported unremittingly on the circumstances surrounding Millane's disappearance, in a manner that should no longer be acceptable.

On November 4 2019, the trial began and the man charged with her death entered a "not guilty" plea. The media latched on to the trial, covering the defence's attempt to form an alternative narrative that could throw doubt on just "what kind of girl" Millane had been. They argued their client had not intended to kill Millane. Instead, he had simply followed her instructions and it was she who had initiated violent sex, as she was "a fan of 50 Shades of Grey" and had learned from an ex-partner. From this moment, the media coverage of Millane's murder trial focused almost exclusively on details of her sexual preferences, previous partners, and alleged proclivity for BDSM. Headlines broadcasted interviews with Millane's friends and ex-boyfriends who had been interrogated by the defence. Articles were preoccupied with her "kinky fetishes," "other sexual partners" and described her as a "naive and trusting girl."

A Historic Problem: By sensationalising Millane's murder and directing focus towards her intimate preferences and not her killing, media outlets continue to contribute to and perpetuate societal attitudes of victim blaming. Unfortunately, this kind of journalism isn't new. It was seen in the coverage of the murder of Mary Nichols, the first victim of Jack the Ripper, more than 100 years ago. Papers included extensive descriptions of Nichols' injuries – even mentioning that her body was "warm" when discovered – and focused upon her alleged prostitution and alcoholism. It continues to be seen today, as within a 2018 listicle of the most horrific Valentine's Day crimes. Almost all of these featured the murder of a woman by a male partner. Journalistic efforts to responsibly cover stories of violence against women have unrelentingly failed. Sadly, profit is

– and always has been – the solitary pursuit of any given news outlet, and cultural appetites for stories featuring details of violence against women are seemingly insatiable.

Representations Of Male Victims: It is known that the media's treatments of female victims of violence differs radically from that of male counterparts. For instance, research by Marian Meyers in 1996 demonstrated that women are more likely to be infantilised and referred to in articles by their first names. This a journalistic practice usually reserved for pets and children. Articles also rarely present violence against women as a systemic societal issue. Instead, the focus is largely episodic, which implies violence against women occurs in individual situations, instead of as part of women's everyday lives. Data published in 2018 by the Office for National Statistics found that the majority of victims are female, with about 560,000 female victims and 140,000 male victims in 2017.

As in the case of Millane, there is a tendency within the media to sensationalise and make abstract the bodies of abused, assaulted, and murdered women. These women are dehumanised by reporting that decontextualises them from their day-to-day lives as loving daughters, dedicated students, and loyal friends. This often means that they are remembered through the limited lens that the media places on them after death. These women, who are physically and metaphorically voiceless, cannot defend themselves, and so myths around women who "ask for it" are subsequently upheld. By focusing on her sexual preferences, and the way in which she "naively" messaged men on fetish dating apps, articles surrounding Millane's murder framed her as partly responsible for her own brutalisation.

The implicit journalistic messaging throughout the coverage of the trial was that "women should be more careful", as opposed to "men should not murder." This is evident within headlines surrounding Millane's murder which prioritise the defence's argument that she encouraged her killer to apply more force and that her "ex-lover" knew she liked to be choked. This is also seen within the publication of photographs of her in supposedly "revealing" clothing, alongside the suitcase her body was buried in. It is also unmistakable in the kind of linguistic model used to describe her murder. Instead of cultivating phrases that refer to the actions of the perpetrator who killed Millane, articles repeatedly use passive syntax to describe Millane as having "been killed". By employing this kind of language, women themselves are consistently framed as inactive victims with no individualisation or agency. Continually, the focus of this kind of media coverage shifts the blame back to the victim, instead of the perpetrator.

Wrongly Immortalised: Between 2000 and 2015, the number of articles concerning violence against women rose from 2,000 to 25,000. As the frequency of this kind of reporting has increased, groups have formed to highlight the injustice and indignity of this kind of coverage. We Can't Consent to This is a campaign striving to dispel myths around "the increasing numbers of women and girls killed in violence claimed to be consensual". We Level Up focuses on lobbying media for more responsible reporting of domestic abuse cases. Such cases often depict male perpetrators as the "perfect family men", despite their crimes and histories of violence. In fact, a 2015 study found that media outlets not only distort depictions of domestic violence cases, foregrounding the most provocative details, but are also more likely to report on female perpetrators of domestic violence. This is despite the fact that two women per week are murdered by male partners in the UK. As women's charity Our Watch states: newspapers focus on the method of the murder rather than histories of violence, as if it is "more important for readers to know how but not why men kill their partners".

Despite arguing that her death was a "sex game gone wrong", Millane's murderer was found unanimously guilty on November 22 2019. As Brian Dickey, crown prosecutor for the trial, concluded: "You can't consent to your own murder." These women also cannot consent to the

ways in which their intimate histories are manipulated by press coverage. The inclusion of irrelevant details within stories of women who have been murdered by men preserves the idea that these women are not real people. Instead, it paints them as a composite of body parts designed to be ogled, and a series of private decisions designed to be scrutinised. Women like Millane are wrongly immortalised by news outlets obsessed with sexualising and objectifying their every move even after death, while articles focused on male victims somehow manage to offer the deceased a relative degree of respect. The name of Millane's killer was surpressed (some outlets have gone on to leak his name), while hers has been tarnished. This is wholly and unashamedly wrong. Millane deserved better, and the media must do better.The Conversation This article is republished from The Conversation under a Creative Commons license.

Letter From Kevan Thakrar – Violence in HMP Full Sutton Close Supervision Centre

On the evening of Monday 21st October 2019 at HMP Full Sutton's Close Supervision Centre (CSC), a serious incident occurred which has led to a police investigation. The Close Supervision Centre system is designed to hold the 50 most dangerous prisoners in the country, with Full Sutton holding 8 of them within their dedicated unit. The 'Close Supervision' is supposed to prevent incidents of violence, but Monday saw the fourth such event in less than 18 months. A growing and serious management problem, especially within the CSC, is the prevalence of racist extremist prisoners. Likeminded racists too afraid to mix in the general population have formed the gang calling themselves 'Death Before Dishonour' (DBD), which boasts such high profile members as Charles Bronson (now Salvador), and the sex offending natural lifer Douglas Gary Vinter. A letter sent from DBD member and racist CSC prisoner Jason Gomez is suspected to have sparked the recent violence.

Before being referred to the CSC for murdering the weakest prisoner on the wing, Jason Gomez spent several years on protection under what is known as Vulnerable Prisoner (VP) status, for amassing large drug debts and seeking to pay it off in sexual favours. Whilst on the VP units, he met fellow junkie John Mansfield imprisoned for killing and elderly woman and robbing her, Mansfield also managed to obtain CSC status in similar fashion to Gomez, although he did not murder he picked victims to attacks so he could be removed from general population to avoid paying his debts.

In September, Kevan Thakrar, was transferred to Full Sutton's CSC. As he is mixed race and Muslim, as well as having a history of conflict with prison officers, it is not unusual for the DBD gang working in collaboration with officers to seek to target him. A letter sent from Gomez to Mansfield was delivered on Monday which is believed to have contained an order to attack Kevan Thakrar.

Without saying a word, Mansfield filled a metal flask with boiling water to make it a more useful weapon, then attempted to sneak up on Kevan Thakrar. He swung the tool with as much force as he could seeking a knock-out blow in full view of 4 prison officers. Fortunately, Kevan saw it coming and was able to use his background in martial arts to block his initial shot, then evade the follow-up. Aware that he could not win a fight with Kevan, Mansfield quickly retreated and officers stepped in stopping any retaliation.

Strangely, CSC management are planning on forcing these two to mix again which is certain to end up with much more serious injuries than the bruised arm Kevan Thakrar is currently suffering with. It is believed that at any future incident, as well as this one, are likely to cost the prison service thousands as litigation from Kevan usually follows any harm he sustains.

Kevan Thakrar A4907AE, HMP Full Sutton, Stamford Bridge, YO41 1PS

Blood Sunday: Man Shot in Chest Awarded £350,000 Compensation

A man shot in the chest by a British soldier as he ran to safety on Bloody Sunday is to receive £350,000 compensation. Joe Friel, 68, claimed for injuries and false allegations at the High Court. It was claimed he had been an armed terrorist when paratroopers opened fire in Londonderry in January 1972. His lawyers described it as a "blatant, malicious and outrageous lie" which persisted until he was publicly exonerated more than 40 years later. The payout also covers Mr Friel's loss of earnings after he was forced to retire early from his job as a tax official due to deteriorating health. Mr Justice McAlinden expressed hope that the resolution in the action against the Ministry of Defence (MoD) will enable the father of three to obtain some degree of closure. In 2010 the Saville Inquiry into the shootings established the innocence of all of the victims. Those findings led to David Cameron, the then British prime minister, issuing a public apology for the soldiers' actions. He described the killings as "unjustified and unjustifiable".

Nearly £3 million has now been paid out in a series of settlements and awards made in claims against the MoD on behalf of those bereaved or injured. With liability accepted in all cases, proceedings brought by Mr Friel centred on the level of damages. Aged 20 on Bloody Sunday, he was shot at Glenfada Park as he tried to escape the gunfire. He suffered chest wounds and was carried to a house where he remembers women saying the Rosary, the court heard. Soldiers then stopped the car being used to transport him to hospital, striking the driver on the head with a rifle butt and firing a plastic baton round at another passenger who fled, it was contended. A member of the Royal Anglian Regiment, known as Lance Corporal 104, who took the car to a military aid post later alleged Mr Friel admitted to him that he had been carrying a gun that day. Brian Fee QC, for the plaintiff, said: "This was a blatant, malicious and outrageous lie, but it was one which was relied upon by the defendant for over 40 years until it was conclusively dismissed by Lord Saville's report in 2010." Eventually Mr Friel was brought to Altnagelvin Hospital, where he was twice administered the Last Rites due to his condition.

With Mr Friel unable to work since his medical retirement in 1992, the court was told he still has a degree of anger and resentment at what happened. "He was alleged to have been an armed terrorist on Bloody Sunday," Mr Fee said. The allegation that Joe Friel admitted he had a gun was a carefully targeted, specific, malicious lie." Counsel also described how Lance Corporal 104 went abroad without attending the Saville Inquiry, avoiding "what should have been the day of reckoning".

'Unique' Bloody Sunday case: Outside court Mr Friel's solicitor, Fearghal Shiels of Madden & Finucane, said the action was unique among the Bloody Sunday litigation. "He was the only one of those shot and injured against whom soldiers maintained an allegation that he was shot whilst handling a firearm," the lawyer said "That was a malicious lie which was peddled by the British Army before the Widgery Inquiry in 1972 and again before the Saville Inquiry. "Ultimately the soldier who made the allegation failed to attend to have his evidence tested, although it was not until the publication of the Saville Report that Mr Friel was finally exonerated." The action was settled for £350,000 and costs.

The Iniquity of Privatised Prisons

Nicholas Reed Langen, Justice Gap: In the midst of Labour's proposals to nationalise everything that isn't firmly in the hands of corporate hegemons, it can be easy for proposals that are both laudable and practical to escape notice. Labour's intention to bring prisons back into public ownership is one such example, a praiseworthy commitment which recognises that privatisation is not an unalloyed good, with market forces not necessarily a route to higher standards and lower costs. More importantly, however, is that it acknowledges (even if implicitly) that there

are certain services which the state has a moral imperative to operate. The genesis of private prisons was with Margaret Thatcher's government, who sought to privatise the prison estate in the hope of exposing it to market efficiencies and shrinking the size of the state. There are now 15 privatised prisons in the UK, with 14% of the prison population detained by one of three corporations- G4S, Serco and Sodexo. Meanwhile, despite their manifest failure to effectively run prisons, these companies have been further welcomed onto the terrain of the state, operating immigration detention facilities, and until recently, the probation service as well.

Our prisons are drug-infested, overcrowded and poorly maintained, havens for further criminalisation, and privatisation has done little to remedy this. HMP Birmingham fell into such chaos earlier this year that G4S was stripped of the contract, whilst prisons like Doncaster have squeezed in as many inmates as possible, with the levels of overcrowding there at 152%. Given figures like this, it is hardly surprising to see that rates of violence are higher in private prisons, nor to see that reoffending rates are rising across the board, with those incarcerated for less than twelve months still more likely to offend upon their release than not.

Nonetheless, whilst private companies are culpable, they are only responding to a government policy that opened prisons to market forces. In privatising the responsibilities of the state, the government is acknowledging that prisoners will be used as a means of making a profit, and that profit will be the focus of the company. Whilst it would be admirable to see companies refuse to run prisons on the basis that it is immoral, it seems hopelessly naive to expect them to do so.

To expect the state to prevent companies from running prisons, however, is not hopelessly naive. The notion that the state has higher responsibilities, beyond that of mere profit, is not a novel one, but a view espoused by thinkers ranging from Aristotle to Hamilton. In the context of prisons, the state is responsible for punishing inmates, but also, more importantly, for rehabilitating them, an obligation that must take precedence over economic savings. Nor does the fact that state run prisons are as inadequate as privatised justify privatisation. Even if the economics and efficacy supported privatisation, allowing private companies to detain individuals would still violate their human dignity, allowing them to become a mere means by which a company can make a profit. In a civilised society, we do not allow people to decide to hold others captive. I cannot be detained by my bank for failing to pay off a credit card debt, nor by a neighbour for stealing his wallet. Only the state can authorise detention, and only the state should be able to enforce such a decision.

As part of our social contract, we agree to abide by the laws of the land, acknowledging that we may be prosecuted and imprisoned, should we break them. In agreeing to this, the state does not get the right to delegate away its responsibilities to whoever it sees fit, as though its responsibilities are mere commodities. Much as we would view with scepticism the state privatising the army, or the police force, so we should view privatisation of prisons. Such roles are unique to the state, part of our relationship with it, and with our fellow citizens. Such a relationship was recognised by Israel's Supreme Court, where Aharon Barak declared that privation went against Israel's Basic Law, offending the dignity of those detained. Similarly to the UK, Israel had sought to privatise prisons to reduce state expenditure, but the privatisation was struck down, the Court declaring that prisoners do not lose their 'constitutional right to human dignity', and that privatisation undermines the 'public purposes that…give it legitimacy', with imprisonment instead reduced to 'becoming a means for a private corporation to make a profit'.

The relationship between the citizen and the state is a complex one, and cannot be reduced to a crude monetary value. In allowing citizens to become a means of making a profit, it degrades their humanity, stripping them of their dignity, reducing them to mere figures on

a spreadsheet. Reducing people to this means that when the numbers no longer add up, the motivation to act falls away, as we saw with Grayling's attempted privatisation of the probation services, where the attempts to save money saw probation officers rarely meeting with probationers, a cut in officer numbers, and a bailout from the government of £500m, before the policy was reversed. At a time when making easy, vote-winning promises is all to tempting, Labour should be credited for adopting a policy which may not be welcomed, but which is right. The Conservatives and Liberal Democrats should embrace such an approach, recognising that the private sector is not a universal cure, and that there are obligations which cannot be reduced to figures on a Treasury calculator.

Putting Descartes Before the Hearse

A university is facing criminal action for selling bodies and body parts donated for research purposes over the course of a decade. The Centre for Body Donations at Paris Descartes University has admitted mistreating thousands of cadavers, keeping them in rat-infested and overheated rooms. However, a doctors' union has now claimed that some bodies have been sold to private companies for inappropriate uses such as car crash tests. The Times reports that the centre allegedly charged €900 for a body and €400 for a limb. While the centre has been trading in body parts to raise funds, staff have been accused of selling them to make money for themselves, according to Guy Vallancien, a surgeon who was its director between 2014 and 2018. Mr Vallancien said: "There was traffic. Workers sold parts to surgeons who took them away on Saturday mornings." The higher education ministry has ordered an inspection of the centre and its temporary closure until inspectors have completed their report.

Kyle Major: Targeted for Life

I'm writing today to highlight a recent article about South Yorkshire Police also to inform the public how I am being treated by South Yorkshire Police maybe the public can compare and make their own opinion and decision. What is happening to me is seriously unfair and wrong. A person has maliciously lied to destroy my life, and for a while, it did that. South Yorkshire Police have seen this as an opportunity to persecute me and twist/manufacture evidence against me to try and take life away from me, for what this person has done to me.

As stated in my last article, I have been charged with an alleged offence that has taken place in January 2018 that's 22 months to bring a case against me it's corrupt, it's criminal. At the time I was genuinely disabled, and yet the Police see me on (CCTV) before and after the alleged incident in my wheelchair they've still proceeded to try and prosecute me its absolute bullshit! It's plain and simple to see this is desperate! [Kyle Major sentenced on Thursday 28th November 2019 to 29 months - pretty sure he has already done 22 months!]

The alleged victim is in prison for fraudulent claims which resulted in the death of an older adult yet the Police have failed to mention this and clearly edited the transcripts of the interview tapes to miss this vital bit of information out. Its genuine corruption do you not think the (CPS) should know whether the alleged victim is in custody for fraudulent claims which resulted in the death of an older adult and whether he is a reliable witness or not? This man is a malicious liar, and I know I will be exonerated without a doubt. I then come to the proceeds of crime applications by South Yorkshire Police to steal, or their words recover my jewellery which has been paid for. Yet there has been no (criminal activity) or (a criminal offence) that I have been charged and convicted of that I could have benefitted from or earned assets from (criminal assets) It's just

more abuses of process and corruption, furthermore plain and simple targeting and corruption 100%. They have clearly influenced the courts into abusing their position. These are civil proceedings being heard in a criminal division court. The courts aren't giving me a fair hearing (Sheffield Magistrates Court) the Judges are not advising of the areas of Law how they are supposed to in a civil Court and treating the proceedings as (criminal proceedings) it's just grossly unfair and targeted if not bullying by (South Yorkshire Services) from the heart.Since I got released from the (CSC system) into the community in (2012) my life has never been the same,

I've been harassed, Abused, targeted and treated so unfairly a reasonable person in the community would not understand or come to terms with the complexities of my circumstances it's unimaginable and that's genuine. They attack and attempt to destroy and decimate every part of you, your character, appearance, your personality, emotions and mentality it's crazy! At times I think the world hates me, but I've been able to recognise its her Majesty's Prisons and Probation Services using their influence within the community and with extended/related services and agencies to target and rip my life apart and destroy every part of it 100%. It doesn't matter what I do; it doesn't matter how I live; they will never leave me alone. I have a target on my back for life, and I know deep down they will never leave me alone targeted for life.

Some people look at certain things and think very tunnelled in their visions, but please understand some people's circumstances are not in the same category as your own so think before you speak 100%. I know there are people in the system suffering, and I feel for them every day because I know what they are going through and my heart goes out to you 100%.

I will now come to the article surrounding South Yorkshire Police and what I would like the public to do is just think for a minute if the Police can do this to (children) what are they capable of doing to an adult such as myself? A Police force has been told to take "immediate action" on how it deals with children in custody after one was held for eight hours without a review. A report found South Yorkshire Police was not "consistently" meeting the requirements of codes of practice for detention under the Police and Criminal Evidence Act and the Children and Young Person Act 1933, inspectors said around 100 cells in Barnsley, Doncaster and Sheffield Custody Centres which held 22,229 people between June 2018 and May 2019 were examined.

While the force has made some improvements there were "several causes of concern and areas that required improvement" the inspection in June found a joint report by Her Majesties Inspectorate of Constabulary and Fire and Rescue Services and HM Inspectorate of Prisons made a series of recommendations for improvement, including over concerns raised about how the force was in breach of rules surrounding children. The report said "the force had few arrangements in place to provide children with specific support" they were not prioritised during the booking in process, which meant they could be held "with adult detainees in the holding areas especially when it was busy." No easy-to-read rights and entitlements documents were available to help them understand their rights, although a photocopied guide to custody was sometimes handed to them. "Although it was the policy of the force to review the detention of children every four hours, the records we looked at did not demonstrate that this was happening consistently.

"In one case, a child left custody after eight hours without having a review of detention. "In addition, girls were not in the care of a female adult as legally required by the Children's and Young Persons Act 1933". The force "must take immediate action to ensure that all custody procedures comply with legislation and guidance and that officers implement them consistently," Inspectors said.Officers also should make sure the use of force in regards to all was" safe and proportionate to the risk or threat posed" and detainees should only be strip-searched when necessary while making sure their

dignity is respected. Chief Inspector of Prisons Peter Clarke and Inspector of Constabulary Wendy Williams said in a joint statement "While we found a couple of positive features there was several causes of concern and areas that required improvement. This personally, when I read it made me feel sick, I can only imagine the corrupt and criminal acts they've been getting away with 100%. Please understand I am suffering genuine abuse and corruption by South Yorkshire Services.In solidarity; Kyle Major: A8397AJ, HMP Doncaster DNS 8UX. (Support needed).

Irish Legal Heritage: Ned Kelly

Róise Connolly, Irish legal News: Edward "Ned" Kelly was a famous Irish-Australian bushranger and outlaw who was executed in November 1880. A martyr in the retelling of the British settlement of Australia, the story of Ned Kelly attracts a great degree of controversy as people disagree about whether he should be remembered as a hero or a villain. Ned's parents were Irish and both had arrived in Australia in 1841 – although their passages were under very different circumstances. Ned's mother, Ellen Quinn, was born in Antrim in 1832. Ellen's parents were "bounty immigrants" who set off for Australia in the hope of a better life. Ned's father, John "Red" Kelly, was a Tipperary man who, at the age of 21, had been convicted of stealing two pigs and sentenced to seven years transportation. After serving out his sentence in Van Diemen's Land, John moved to Wallan Wallan, Victoria, where he found work on a farm owned by Ellen's father. John and Ellen got married in 1850, and settled in Beveridge, a small town north of Melbourne where Ned was born in January 1855 (John Maloney, Ned Kelly (Melbourne University Press 2001).

When Ned was nine, his father fell on hard times and had to sell the family home he had built in Beveridge. Thereafter, the Kelly clan moved to Avenel, where they were one of the few Irish Catholic families in the area. Although Ned had grown up listening to his father's stories about the persecution of Catholics back in Ireland, it was in Avenel that Ned's perception of the British land-owning classes was shaped as his family was allegedly harassed by the police. Within a year of moving to Avenel, Ned's father was sentenced to six months' hard labour for illegal possession of a cow hide – and the following Christmas he died. It wasn't long after his father's death that Ned found himself on the wrong side of the law. By his early teens, Ned had become the protégé of an Irish-born bushranger called Harry Power – an association that caught the attention of the police.

In 1869, the Kelly family were living in Greta when the local police arrested 14-year-old Ned on suspicion of assault and robbery – however, when the case went before a magistrate, the charges were dropped due to conflicting witness statements. The following year, Ned was accused of carrying out a series of robberies with Harry Power, but again the charges didn't stick. His first stint in prison was in October 1870, when he was sentenced to six months hard labour for summary offences (John Barry, 'Edward Kelly (1855-1880)' in Australian Dictionary of Biography (MUP 1974)). Within a month his release, Ned was back in prison for being in possession of a stolen horse – for this charge, Ned spent nearly three years in prison.

The horse that landed 16-year-old Ned with three years of hard labour had actually been stolen – or "borrowed" by a horse-breaker called Isaiah "Wild" Wright. Wright had failed to inform Ned that the horse was stolen, so when he got out of prison in February 1874, Ned had a bone to pick. In August 1874, the two men faced each other in a twenty-round bare-knuckle boxing match. Ned was victorious, and hailed the boxing champion of the district.

Ned was able to stay out of harm's way for the next few years, although it's believed that he became heavily involved in horse and cattle stealing with his step-father, George King, during what is often described as his "going straight" years. Ned's demise started with the Fitzpatrick affair,

which involved him shooting a police officer and thereafter going on the run to escape the charge of attempted murder. Constable Alexander Fitzpatrick was an Irish-Australian who had only joined the force in 1877. Fitzpatrick was friendly with the Kelly family, and depending on what version of events you believe, he was a regular visitor at the Kelly home in Greta and was romantically involved with Ned's younger sister, Kate Kelly. On 15 April 1878, Fitzpatrick went in search of Dan Kelly, for whom an arrest warrant had been issued. When Fitzpatrick arrived at the Kelly home, he didn't initially tell the family why he was there, but instead waited for Dan to return for dinner. When Dan did arrive back, Fitzpatrick informed him of the warrant, but agreed to let Dan have a bite to eat before being taken to the police station. In the meantime, Ned had been informed of Dan's arrest and came to the house with guns blazing. Ned shot at Fitzpatrick three times, and one of the bullets hit Fitzpatrick's wrist. It's claimed that after this, Ned said that if he knew it was Fitzpatrick was the policeman who was there to arrest Dan he would never have fired at him (Dr Doug Morrissey (Author of Ned Kelly: A Lawless Life) on La Trobe University Biography Podcast (September 2017)). Ned and Dan went on the run, and in their absence, three others who Fitzpatrick claimed had participated in the incident were arrested – including Ned's mother, Ellen, who had just had a baby. For aiding and abetting the attempted murder of a police officer, Ellen Kelly served three years in prison.

Transgender Paedophile Sues NHS for Refusing Reassignment Surgery While in Prison

Telegraph: Atransgender paedophile has sued the NHS for refusing her reassignment surgery after she transitioned from male to female while in prison. The 60-year-old, known only as KK for legal reasons, is serving an indefinite sentence for public protection for making indecent photographs of children, and also has a previous conviction for sexual activity with a young girl. She has been in prison for over a decade and has been living as a woman for the last eight years, The High Court heard. The prisoner claims the Tavistock and Portman NHS Foundation Trust has unlawfully adopted a "de facto policy" of refusing to refer serving prisoners with gender dysphoria for gender reassignment surgery (GRS). But the trust argues that the reason KK was not referred was because "the treating clinicians at a world-class clinic for gender dysphoria did not consider it clinically appropriate to refer her for surgery".

On Thursday, 28th November, KK's barrister David Lock QC told a judge in London that the refusal to refer his client was "solely based on the fact that the claimant has lived as a woman in prison for the last eight years as opposed to living outside of prison". He submitted that the trust refused to make the referral over "concerns that there was a possibility that the claimant may not wish to continue to live as a woman following her release from prison". Mr Lock concluded that KK "was forced to endure her present level of distress by being denied otherwise clinically appropriate medical treatment because of the minority chance that she would later express regret at having had GRS".

In written submissions, Jenni Richards QC, for the trust, argued that the court should not interfere in a decision involving "the application of clinical expertise in a developing area of medical practice". She said the number of patients affected by gender dysphoria was relatively small, adding: "The number of patients affected who are in prison is smaller still. "The number of prisoners who are imprisoned as a result of sexual offences, which further complicates the clinical picture, will be still smaller." Ms Richards said GRS is "major, irreversible surgery which may destroy existing parts of a patient's body, personality and sexuality". She argued that "the fact that the claimant's real life experience (as a woman) has been acquired in prison ... is relevant to the determination of whether surgery is an appropriate intervention for her, at this stage and in her present circumstances". Mr Justice Supperstone, who is hearing the case, is expected to reserve his judgment.

Get Out of Jail Free - Not Bloody Likely

Dennis Challeen, now deceased was a judge in the US who spent over 30 years on the faculty at the National Judicial College. Challeen was one of the first judges in the States to identify the need for alternatives to mass incarceration. Here he lays bare the ironies which abound in the treatment of prisoners, rendering absurd the rehabilitative argument for punishment. Challeen made these observations in 1986 and they are sadly just as true today.

Prisoners: We want them to have self-worth, so we destroy their self-worth.

To be part of our community, so we isolate them from the community.

To be positive and constructive, so we degrade them and make them useless.

To be non-violent, so we put them where there is violence all around.

To be kind and loving people, so we subject them to hatred and cruelty.

To quit being tough guys, so we put them where the tough guy is respected.

To quit hanging around losers, so we put all the losers under one roof.

To quit exploiting us, so we put them where they exploit each other.

We want them to take control of their own lives own their own problems and quit being parasites, so we make them totally dependent on us."

Paedophile Vigilante Group Get It Badly Wrong

A same-sex couple, Ben & Jordan, have been targeted by a vigilante group calling themselves "Yorkshire Child Protectors" (YCP). First, the group pulled them from the car, then falsely accused them of committing paedophilic offences and live-streamed a confrontation between themselves and Ben & Jordan to around 30,000 people. They also, according to Ben, hurled homophobic abuse, calling them 'pooffs' and 'gay nonces'. The group then seized Ben & Jordan's phones from them as they believe they would contain proof of inappropriate communication with their decoy who was pretending to be a child. The police eventually arrived, and the officers took Ben and Jordan's phones. Ben said: "The paedophile was still messaging their decoy while we were standing there and the police had our phones".

This proved that Ben and Jordan were completely innocent. In a statement, the group said: 'We at YCP take responsibility for our part played in these innocent men being arrested, but we won't be taking all the blame." Instead, they blamed the sting on false intelligence from other vigilantes. As far as we are aware, they made no apology for the homophobic abuse they allegedly hurled at Ben & Jordan – which is hate crime. The live-stream was seen by 30,000 people, but their apology would only have reached a tiny minority of that figure. Supt Alan Farrow said: 'There can be nothing more important than the ongoing protection of our children, but this has to be spearheaded by the police and other law enforcement agencies.' SAFARI agrees. If you know a crime is being committed, tell the police, but do not confront the potential culprit. We hope YPC compensate Ben & Jordan for the terrible ordeal they were put through, although we doubt they will. We do not know if the members of YPC involved have faced any charges for their own crimes, including the assault on Ben and Jordan.

The All-Party Parliamentary Group on Miscarriages of Justice ceases to exist while Parliament is dissolved for the General Election during which there are no Members of Parliament. The website and other communications channels will not be updated until after the election on 12th December 2019. After four oral evidence sessions, the Westminster Commission on Miscarriages of Justice has been continuing with its consideration of written submissions. Further updates will be made in the new Parliament. The report following the inquiry, containing its findings and recommendations, remains set to be published in early 2020.

Mark Duggan Shooting Report Challenged by Human Rights Groups

The official report into the police shooting of a man whose death sparked the 2011 riots is facing a new challenge from human rights investigators who say a virtual model of the shooting shows its main conclusion is wrong. The shooting of Mark Duggan, 29, in Tottenham, north London, in August 2011, triggered the biggest riots in modern English history. An investigation by the police watchdog found he was most likely shot while holding a gun that he was probably "in the process of throwing" away. An illegal firearm was found over a fence and 14 feet (4.35 metres) from where Duggan fell. None of the police officers surrounding him saw it flying through the air.

Now work by Forensic Architecture, a London-based research organisation that uses modern technology to search urban areas for evidence, claims it was unlikely that Duggan was holding a gun when he came face to face with police. They used the official accounts from officers and official records to recreate a virtual model of the scene. They say it allows people to experience what each officer could have seen throughout the incident, and their fields of vision. Prof Eyal Weizman of FA said their work undermines the finding by the police watchdog, which was then called the Independent Police Complaints Commission. He said: "We generated a precise 3D model of the site within which we played the different scenarios proposed by the police officers involved as well as the accounts of the official IPCC investigation and the inquest, checking their plausibility." Weizman said if the gun had been tossed away, it would have been in the field of vision of officers. "The model allowed us, for the first time, to give a depiction of what each of the police officers on site could have seen. We found that the conclusion arrived at by the IPCC, that Mark Duggan held the gun in his hand and threw it when he was shot, is incorrect," Weizman added. FA is based at Goldsmiths University in London and has investigated alleged human rights abuses around the world on behalf of clients such as the United Nations special rapporteur for counter-terrorism and human rights and Médecins Sans Frontières.

And Finally... Ball And Chain

An undercover cop coaxed a criminal suspect out of hiding by offering to marry him and then arrested him when he showed up for the wedding. The bizarre incident unfolded in New Delhi, where police were forced to resort to unconventional means to track down Balkishan Chaubey, wanted in connection with 16 crimes including murder. As police knew Mr Chaubey was looking to marry, they arranged for a woman from the force to contact him by phone, pretending to have dialled the wrong number. Tilak Singh, superintendent of police for the Chhatarpur sub-division, said: "Chaubey called her back and they started talking to each other. After a week, the woman proposed marriage to him." Mr Chaubey agreed and arrived at the temple as arranged, but was immediately arrested and jailed on remand,

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.