**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 776 (15/01/2020) - Cost £1**

**In Our Secret Family Courts, Judges Still Don't Understand What Rape Means**

Louise Tickle, Guardian, When is rape, you know, real, proper rape? Shockingly, in our family courts, it seems it's only when you put up a fight and have the injuries to show for it. Never mind that you might clearly not consent to sex but in the end submit, terrified of what might happen if you were to actively resist. In one recently reported case in the family courts a woman had complained to the court that she was a victim of domestic violence and had been raped. Judge Robin Tolson ruled that because the woman had taken "no physical steps" to stop the man from raping her, "this did not constitute rape", and consequently ruled against her.

Legally speaking, this means that when it comes to that same judge deciding whether or not, say, it is safe for a father to have contact with his child, claims of sexual violence will not be taken into account. Because, in the eyes of the court, that rape simply didn't happen. The fact that the family law system in this country is hidden behind a veil of secrecy means that these offensively vintage attitudes to rape and domestic violence can persist in courts that tens of thousands of separating couples must pass through every year. And it raises the question: what other outrageously sexist decisions are being made by out-of-touch judges behind closed doors? The woman in the above case was so horrified at the judge's finding that she challenged it via appeal. Unlike in a normal family court hearing, appeals are heard in public, and findings can be openly reported.

It is only because of this tiny chink in the family justice system's protective shield that we are able to glimpse inside Judge Tolson's courtroom, and see such attitudes for what they are. The usual level of secrecy in the family courts stifles investigation and reporting of what goes on. I am typically contacted several times a week by women who say family judges have not taken their evidence of domestic abuse seriously. These women, often mothers fearful of the man they say abused and sometimes raped them, are without question retraumatised by a system presided over by some judges who have simply not accepted a modern understanding of what is and is not domestic abuse or sexual assault.

You don't need to be physically forced, there don't need to be bruises, you don't need to scream, for it to be rape Women point particularly to difficulties in proving coercive control, a dangerous pattern of abusive behaviour that can indicate a risk of homicide. Coercive control is now a criminal offence; but in family courts, I am repeatedly told, judges are reluctant to name it, even if they find that emotional and psychological abuse has occurred. Not only that. Women say that judges can even agree domestic abuse has occurred but not consider it serious enough to protect the victim and child from what we now know to be its damaging continuing effects: an abusive ex can easily continue their controlling behaviour throughout many years of court-ordered contact with a child.

If it were "just" scores of women telling me that this is happening, then these allegations would be exactly that: allegations. However, I recently sat through days of evidence in a family court case involving claims of domestic abuse and a dispute around child contact arrangements. The judge in that case made it clear he is unlikely to publish a judgment, and it is therefore unlikely at this stage that he will agree to allow the media to publish any part of what went on in court. But I can say that I emerged from that courtroom astonished, dismayed and alarmed for very similar reasons to those that prompted the woman described above to appeal against a different judge's findings about what constitutes rape.

In the year ending March 2019, more than 58,000 allegations of rape were made to police in England and Wales. It is an uncomfortable fact that many women are forced to have sex without their consent within relationships. It may be inconvenient for a family law system that operates on the principle that children are better off having contact with both their parents to acknowledge this truth. But surely any judge who grasps the mechanisms and psychological effects of coercive control should understand that you don't need to be physically forced, there don't need to be bruises, and you don't need to scream, in order for it to be rape.

This is 2020, not 1920. Society has moved on. So have the criminal courts, which are open to scrutiny and would be instantly challenged should any barrister or judge articulate such archaic attitudes. Unless you have the courage and the cash to go to appeal, however, the family courts are essentially unaccountable to the public they serve. Thanks to one of the most senior judges in the land coming firmly down on the side of the woman in the Judge Tolson case, she won her appeal. But it may well feel like a hollow victory. She will now have to relive every aspect of her evidence of domestic abuse and sexual assault at a new fact-finding hearing. This will be in front of a different judge. But that court will, once again, sit in private. How can we – or she – know what attitudes to sexual violence lie in store for her there?

• Louise Tickle is a journalist who specialises in social affairs and family law

**Four Days to Comply With New Money Laundering Rules**

*Neil Rose, Legal Futures:* Money laundering: Due diligence requirements change, Lawyers have until just this Friday to ensure they comply with the Fifth Money Laundering Directive, the government announced just before Christmas. The Money Laundering and Terrorist Financing (Amendment) Regulations 2019 were made on 20 December 2019 and will come into force on 10 January, making changes to various pieces of anti-money laundering (AML) legislation. Among the changes to customer due diligence (CDD) are explicit requirements for regulated persons to take reasonable measures to understand the ownership and control structure of their customers, and to verify the identity of senior managing officials when the beneficial owner of a corporate body cannot be identified. The explanatory memorandum to the regulations say electronic identification processes will be allowed where these are: independent of the person whose identity is being verified, secure from fraud and misuse, and "capable of providing an appropriate level of assurance that the person claiming a particular identity is in fact the person with that identity".

Lawyers will now have to check beneficial ownership registers of legal entities in scope of the People with Significant Control (PSC) requirements before establishing a business relationship. Where there is a discrepancy between the beneficial ownership information on the registers and the information given to them in the course of carrying out CDD, these will have to be reported to Companies House. The regulations also amend specific customer risk factors in relation to enhanced CDD measures, which are required for business relationships with a person established in a high-risk third country or in relation to any relevant transaction where either of the parties is established in a high-risk third country.

The Treasury consulted on the regulations last April and said in the memorandum that it received over 200 responses, which were "broadly supportive of the overall policy objectives". Their summary and response of these submissions has not yet been published, but it said there was "significant engagement" on electronic identification processes, among other issues. "Responses agreed that additional clarification is needed on what constitutes secure electronic identification processes but were mixed on the question of whether this clarification should be

included in the MLRs themselves or in government-approved guidance. The government therefore decided to take a high-level, principles-based approach to the regulations, in line with the general approach to CDD in the regulations. More detailed discussion of the elements of secure electronic identification will be covered in HM Treasury-approved guidance for each sector." The response to obligations to report discrepancies in beneficial ownership information was "mixed", it conceded. There was also "significant interest" in the government's approach to the national register of bank account ownership. "It is a requirement of the [directive] which the government will endeavour to implement in the most effective way for the UK system, taking considerable input from industry, competent authorities, law enforcement and civil society into account."

**Inmates Missing After Deadly Riots at Mississippi Prison**

Marisa Iati, Indpendent: Two inmates are missing from the notorious Mississippi State Penitentiary at Parchman after five prisoners were killed and several others injured this week across the state's corrections system. The state's prisons are on lockdown as authorities try to identify what sparked the violence at three facilities. "Major disturbances" that started 29 December were partly provoked by gangs, the Mississippi Department of Corrections (MDOC) said. The most recent inmate death happened early Friday, when authorities said Denorris Howell injured his neck during a fight with his cellmate at Parchman. "Things are kind of surreal at this point," Sunflower County coroner Heather Burton told the Clarion Ledger in Jackson, Mississippi. "Every time the phone rings at this point, it's another one."Officials promised to prosecute aggressors "to the full extent of the law" and said movement at three state prisons, three privately managed prisons and 15 regional prisons is limited to emergencies. Parchman's inmates have been transferred to more-secure housing units at the facility in an attempt to quell the outburst, authorities said.

During an emergency count about 1.45am Saturday, Parchman staff noticed that David May and Dillion Williams were missing, officials said. May is serving a life sentence for two aggravated assault convictions, and Williams is serving 40 years for residential burglary and aggravated assault. State and local police are helping corrections officials search for the men. The chaos comes the same week a federal judge ruled that previously bad conditions at East Mississippi Correctional Facility had been fixed and that the privately run facility had resolved any constitutional violations that may have existed.

The American Civil Liberties Union and the Southern Poverty Law Centre brought a lawsuit in 2013 alleging that prisoners lived in "barbaric" conditions, where illnesses went untreated, rats climbed over beds and guards used excessive force, among other issues. Mississippi has one of the highest incarceration rates in the country, and the prison system has struggled with a lack of funding, declining numbers of guards and accusations of abuse. An investigation by ProPublica and the Mississippi Centre for Investigative Reporting found that a 2014 prison reform law had failed to significantly improve the system. "Unfortunately, this is another chapter in what is a history of mismanagement and neglect that have infected the Mississippi prison system for decades," said Eric Balaban, senior staff counsel at the ACLU's National Prison Project.

Governor Phil Bryant, a Republican, said that he was in contact with corrections officials about the latest disturbances across the state and that gang violence would not be tolerated in the prisons. Governor-elect Tate Reeves, a Republican, wrote on Twitter: "There is much work to be done in our correctional system." The spate of violence began when Terrandance Dobbins was killed 29 December at South Mississippi Correctional Institution, the Clarion Ledger reported. According to



Ms Burton, Walter Gates and Roosevelt Holliman were fatally stabbed during gang-related riots at Parchman on Tuesday and Thursday, respectively. And Gregory Emary was killed Thursday at the Chickasaw County Regional Correctional Facility, according to the Clarion Ledger. Authorities have not specified how Dobbins and Emary were killed. They declined to identify the gangs involved in the conflict, but the Associated Press reported that the ongoing confrontation was between the Vice Lords and the Black Gangster Disciples.

"These are trying times for the Mississippi Department of Corrections," MDOC Commissioner Pelicia Hall said in a statement. "It is never a good feeling for a commissioner to receive a call that a life has been lost, especially over senseless acts of violence." Dobbins's sister, Candice Dobbins, told the AP that her brother felt unsafe at South Mississippi Correctional Institution and that she had been trying to get him transferred. Dobbins was serving a life sentence for a murder in Adams County and eight additional years for aggravated assault in Sunflower County, the Clarion Ledger reported, citing corrections officials. Dobbins hoped to open a barber shop if he was ever released and told his young relatives to stay out of trouble so they would not get locked up, Candice Dobbins told the Clarion Ledger. "Really the prisoners run the facilities," she told the AP. "I know guards have to talk with inmates to keep control of other inmates."

Corrections officials said Howell's death and a "minor fire" at Parchman appeared to be unrelated to the main disturbances. Kaye Sullivan, an office administrator for Burton, said in an email that a chaotic environment, poor lighting and significant amounts of spilled blood made investigating the deaths at Parchman "extremely difficult". At full capacity, Parchman houses 3,560 male inmates, including some on death row. Inmates make textiles and metals as part of the prison's work program. Several lawsuits have alleged that conditions at Parchman are inhumane. Prisoners told PBS NewsHour that the roofs leak, windows are broken and inmates can easily access contraband, including drugs. Grace Fisher, communications director for the Mississippi Department of Corrections, disputed that characterisation to PBS. On Tuesday, Ms Hall announced that she will be leaving the Mississippi Department of Corrections in mid-January to accept a position in the private sector. She did not release details about her new job. Fifty inmates died in Mississippi prisons in 2014, the most recent year for which data is available. Sixteen inmates died in August 2018 alone. Corrections officials attributed most of those deaths to natural causes or illnesses, including cancer and heart disease.

**'Freedom of Expression': European Court of Human Rights Rules on Article 10**

Article 10 of the European Convention on Human Rights is a cornerstone of the Convention. It enshrines the right to freedom of expression, but as can be seen from paragraph 2 it is not an absolute right. The Convention provides: Everyone has the right to freedom of expression. This right shall include freedom to hold opinions and to receive and impart information and ideas without interference by public authority and regardless of frontiers. This Article shall not prevent States from requiring the licensing of broadcasting, television or cinema enterprises.

The exercise of these freedoms, since it carries with it duties and responsibilities, may be subject to such formalities, conditions, restrictions or penalties as are prescribed by law and are necessary in a democratic society, in the interests of national security, territorial integrity or public safety, for the prevention of disorder or crime, for the protection of health or morals, for the protection of the reputation or rights of others, for preventing the disclosure of information received in confidence, or for maintaining the authority and impartiality of the judiciary.

The extent of Article 10 rights was considered by the European Court of Human Rights in the

recent case of Zarubin and Others v. Lithuania (applications nos. 69111/17, 69112/17, 69113/17 and 69114/17). The case concerned Lithuania's expulsion and ban on re-entry of four Russian journalists working for Russian state-owned broadcaster Rossiya-24 after their actions at a conference in Vilnius. In its decision, the European Court ruled by a majority that the applications were inadmissible. The decision is final. The Court was prepared to accept that the measures taken against the applicants had constituted an interference with their right to freedom of expression under Article 10. However, it further held that the authorities had demonstrated that the measures had been necessary in the interests of national security and had been proportionate. In particular, the applicants' behaviour at the conference – characterised by the authorities as aggressive and provocative – had not been in accordance with the tenets of responsible journalism.

**The Topsy-Turvy World of 2020**

*I tell you naught for your comfort, Yea, naught for your desire, Save that the sky grows darker yet, And the sea rises higher.*

Simon Warr: I was hoping to start 2020 on a positive note, looking forward to making progress with the reform of our dysfunctional criminal 'justice' system and a return to common sense over the way in which the police and Crown Prosecution Service (CPS) handle the investigation of rape and sexual assault complaints. Sadly, however, it seems that the words above – by G. K. Chesterton – are more grimly appropriate in view of a series of recent events that are already spreading a sense of gloom over even the most optimistic of those of us who campaign to raise awareness of false allegations and on behalf of those suffering as a result of miscarriages of justice.

The first blow of the new year came with the truly appalling (and incomprehensible) decision to award Alison Saunders, the former Director of Public Prosecutions (DPP), the high honour and distinction of an 'Order of the Bath' damehood in the New Year's Honours List. While it is customary for an outgoing DPP to receive a knighthood or similar award, the conferring of one upon this particular individual can be seen only as a grossly disrespectful slap in the face for all those of us who suffered – and continue to suffer – as a direct result of the disgraceful and deeply unjust prosecution policies over which Ms Saunders (I will never bring myself to use her undeserved title) presided from 2013 until 2018.

While I acknowledge that the foundations of the descent of the CPS into the realms of ideologically-skewed gender politics were laid by an equally awful predecessor, Keir Starmer – of whom more later – Ms Saunders not only entrenched Starmer's utterly unjust 'you WILL be believed' dogma in respect of sexual allegations into daily practice, but she also championed such toxic policies with great enthusiasm. Her deeply ingrained view on so-called 'social justice', in fact, created hundreds, perhaps thousands, of true victims: those who have been falsely and maliciously accused of heinous sexual offences that never actually took place.

Encouraged by the ideological climate within the CPS, the ludicrous 'you WILL be believed' dogma gave police detectives licence to abandon the basic rules of policing – to investigate thoroughly without fear or favour – in pretty much every case of a sexual complaint. The most transparent lies and blatant inconsistencies in complainants' statements were ignored, or else attributed to 'trauma'. The most elementary detective work, such as confirming whether a former pupil, who was subsequently accusing a teacher of historical sexual abuse, had actually been a pupil at the same school at the same time as his target, were brushed aside and ignored. Highly relevant evidence, such as social media messages and phone texts sent by complainants, were at best not passed to defendants' legal teams or, in the worst cases, actively concealed by police officers and prosecutors.



Predictably, terrible miscarriages of justice occurred on Ms Saunders' watch, just as they did under Keir Starmer's. Innocent people – mainly men – were dragged through the courts; others were wrongfully convicted of the most appalling sexual crimes by juries on the balance of probability, in the absence of any actual evidence. Branded as perverted criminals and, in most cases, jailed for years, even decades, their lives, careers and reputations, as well as the lives of their families, including young children, were utterly ruined. Even those of us who were falsely accused, and then either swiftly acquitted or never charged, faced the usual social media opprobrium and the inevitable ending of our careers. Some innocent victims have been driven to suicide by malicious accusations, very often made by evil chancers solely in the hope of being awarded undeserved monetary compensation for assaults that existed nowhere but in the warped imaginations of the liars and fraudsters themselves. Yet Ms Saunders and her like-minded cronies would have us believe that these imposters and perjurers were genuine victims and witnesses of truth. In the aftermath of Operation Midland, we all know where this blinkered approach led and the wicked injustices that have ensued.

Convicted serial rape liar and fraudster Carl Beech truly is the poster boy for the consequences of indiscriminate 'believing' within our criminal justice system, as promoted by Mr Starmer and Ms Saunders. Beech committed his crimes, but the legal and policing policies which enabled him were the work of ideologically-inspired politicians and bureaucrats. As more and more appalling cases of false sexual allegations have come to light, the pressure on the CPS increased to boiling point. It was clear to just about everyone (other than the most rabid of the gender warrior cultists) that Alison Saunders had to go. Her clear inability to manage the crisis, let alone abandon the toxic policies that had created it, led virtually every national newspaper to demand she fall on her sword. Like so many others, I grew weary of seeing her increasingly sour and petulant attempts to defend her toxic legacy. Her formal departure from the post came as a relief. And now this final example of how the powers-that-be decided to cock a snook at the CPS' many innocent victims and, wider public opinion, by this disgraceful display of cronyism. If any unmerited award of state honours has ever brought the entire system into disrepute, then this is it.

*Devalued: Order of the Bath:* It is a mark of the deep revulsion over the conferring of this title upon Ms Saunders that so many of the CPS' innocent victims have raised their voices in protest. We have witnessed the anguish of people such as student Liam Allan and teacher Kato Harris, whose lives have been turned upside down by false sexual allegations. What an absolute slap in their faces this damehood represents. It's as if the establishment is determined to make it clear to everyone that those who campaign against false allegations, inept policing and wrongful convictions are of no account. Liam, for example, has repeatedly been sidelined or ignored by politicians and civil servants, despite it being his terrible ordeal that raised public awareness of the scandal surrounding the withholding of key evidence - such as phone and message records - from defendants' legal teams. By speaking out and continuing to campaign, he is performing a great public service. If Ms Saunders had the merest shred of public decency she would have quietly declined the offer of this high profile honour and retreated into well deserved obscurity. It is of no surprise she did not. Her shamelessness and utter lack of repentance are shocking.

And as if that were not enough, 2020 has already delivered further blows. We have learned this week that it seems entirely likely that Ms Saunders' predecessor as DPP – Keir Starmer (another 'knight' who shall not be addressed as such by me) – will be installed as the new leader of the Labour Party. So, we may have a new Leader of the Opposition who played a major role in institutionalising injustice within our criminal 'justice' system with his edict to all

police forces that complainants of sexual abuse, whether present day of historical, must be believed automatically. How utterly misguided to make such a preposterous statement.

Cyprus: mobbed on social media: Finally, we are being treated to the unedifying spectacle of one of Britain's oldest allies – Cyprus – being pilloried in both the national media and online for the heinous 'crime' of daring to prosecute a young British woman who has been accused – and who apparently confessed – of falsely accusing a group of underage boys and young men of gang rape. Her conviction for 'creating mischief', which could see her jailed for up to twelve months and facing a fine, has been adopted as a rallying cry by those who seemingly cannot accept that ANY woman could ever make up a claim of rape. There is now a vociferous (and at times blatantly racist) campaign to boycott Cyprus – a member of the Commonwealth – as a holiday destination, as a direct result of the court's verdict in her case. Social media is abuzz with incendiary hashtags and examples of the sort of 'mobbing' that goes on whenever people who have no direct knowledge of an issue jump onto a fashionable bandwagon. Needless to observe, the fact that the boys and young men who were accused of rape happened to be Israeli citizens has brought the usual vile anti-Semitic slurs to the surface.

I don't know whether the young woman in question is innocent or guilty of telling lies. Equally, I don't know if the Cypriot legal system (which is based on the British model) is any better or fairer than our own. Indeed, there may be legitimate criticisms made and an appeal against the verdict is pending. She may be cleared by a higher court. However, I do believe that this tawdry affair reveals much about the cultish mindset of a very vocal minority who are patently willing to damage our long-standing strategic relationship with Cyprus in order to 'punish' an entire country, including trying to destroy the livelihoods of many Cypriots by wrecking the country's tourist industry, because an independent court handed down a verdict that has offended the 'you WILL be believed' cultists on social media and beyond.

Protesters targeting Cyprus: Some seem convinced that any court verdict (especially if abroad) can simply be reversed or quashed if enough vocal activists scream and shout loudly enough. This misguided campaign, shamefully promoted by certain national newspapers, appears to have all the hallmarks of ignorance and arrogance, mixed with racism and with a dash of old fashioned gunboat imperialism thrown in for good measure.

In part, at least, I believe that this current hoo-ha is being orchestrated deliberately by narrow, ideologically-motivated interest groups who are determined to intimidate anyone who dares to question the very fact that false sexual allegations ARE made. In today's Britain we have become inured to the steadfast refusal of the police to investigate, and the CPS to prosecute, almost anyone who makes bogus sexual accusations, even where trials of defendants have collapsed due to compelling evidence of perjury or when convictions have been quashed after a complainant's lies have been exposed.

As those of us who have direct experience of being falsely accused know only too well, the vast majority of liars and fraudsters simply get away with the human devastation they have inflicted, just as long as their lies are sexual in nature. They even get to keep any compensation they have extorted from their victims, the Criminal Injuries Compensation Authority or corporate insurers. When other countries, such as Cyprus, take a much harder line over bogus sexual allegations and seek to bring suspected false accusers to justice, the self-righteous mob engages in a feeding frenzy of hatred and denigration. It is a sad reflection of what those of us who campaign to raise public awareness of the false allegations industry face on a day-to-day basis. Welcome to 2020.



**Case Management and Expert Evidence**

In a recent case the Vice-President of the Court of Protection made some important comments in relation to case management. The CoP team at 39 Essex Chambers reports. The case of London Borough of Southwark v NP & Ors [2019] EWCOP 48 (Hayden J), concerned with the welfare of a 17 year with cerebral palsy and atypical anorexia, is of interest on the facts for the way in which the court had to consider the complexity of a relationship between a mother and daughter and the influence of the latter upon the former. It is of broader significance for the observations made by the Vice-President, Hayden J, about case management.

Hayden J was concerned that the young woman's treating psychiatrist who was giving, in effect, expert evidence was doing so on the basis of incomplete information and incomplete information-sharing. At paragraph 30, Hayden J noted that he had: enquired of the very experienced counsel in this case whether in Court of Protection proceedings, they have ever had experience of an Expert's Meeting being conducted. Only Ms Paterson had and then only on two occasions. For my part, I do not remember a document reflecting such a meeting being filed in any proceedings that I have heard. In a court arena where conflicts of expert evidence arise regularly and in which such evidence is commonplace this is, to my mind, very unusual. Additionally, I note that I am rarely called on to make Disclosure Orders and have frequently been concerned by blockages in channels of communication which ought otherwise to have been regarded as integral to informed decision taking. […] What requires to be considered, to my mind, is whether the Court and the lawyers can improve case management more generally. I am convinced that we can.

Accordingly, Hayden J set down a set of "general principles" at paragraph 31 concerning both case management generally and expert evidence in particular: i. Though the avoidance of delay is not prescribed by the Mental Capacity Act 2005, the precept should be read in to the proceedings as a facet of Article 6 ECHR (see: Imperial College Healthcare An NHS Trust v MB & Ors [2019] EWCOP 29). Any avoidable delay is likely to be inimical to P's best interests; ii. Effective case management is intrinsic to the avoidance of delay. Though the Court of Protection, particularly at Tier 3, will frequently be addressing complex issues in circumstances of urgency, thought should always be given to whether, when and if so in what circumstances, the case should return to court. This will require evaluation of the evidence the Court is likely to need and when the case should be heard. This should be driven by an unswerving focus both on P's best interests and the ongoing obligation to promote a return to capacity where that is potentially achievable. iii. Where, at any hearing and due to the circumstances of the case, it is not possible prospectively to anticipate what future evidence may be required, the parties and particularly the Applicant and the Official Solicitor (where instructed) should regard it as an ongoing obligation vigilantly to monitor the development of the case and to return to the Court for a Directions Hearing when it appears that further evidence is required which necessitates case management; iv. Practice Direction 15A, Court of Protection Rules 2017 is intended to limit the use of expert evidence to that which is necessary to assist the court to resolve the issues in the proceedings; v. The Practice Direction sets out the general duties of the expert, the key elements of which require to be emphasised:

1.It is the duty of an expert to help the court on matters within the expert's own expertise. 2.Expert evidence should be the independent product of the expert uninfluenced by the pressures of the proceedings. 3.An expert should assist the court by providing objective, unbiased opinion on matters within the expert's expertise, and should not assume the role of an advocate. 4.An expert should consider all material facts, including those which might detract from the expert's opinion. 5.An expert should make it clear—(a) when a question or issue falls outside the expert's expertise; and(b) when the expert is not able to reach a definite opinion,

for example because the expert has insufficient information. 6.If, after producing a report, an expert changes his or her view on any material matter, such change of view should be communicated to all the parties without delay, and when appropriate to the court.

vi. In Court of Protection proceedings, the Court will frequently be asked to take evidence from treating clinicians. Invariably, (again especially at Tier 3) these will be individuals of experience and expertise who in other cases might easily find themselves instructed independently as experts. Treating clinicians have precisely the same obligations and duties upon them, when preparing reports and giving evidence as those independently instructed. Further, it is the obligation of the lawyers to ensure that these witnesses are furnished with all relevant material which is likely to have an impact on their views, conclusions and recommendations. (see: Re C Interim Judgment: Expert Evidence) [2018] EWFC B9 ). This should not merely be regarded as good litigation practice but as indivisible from the effective protection of P's welfare and autonomy; vii. Evidence of clinicians, experts, social workers, care specialists etc is always to be regarded as individual features of a broader forensic landscape in to which must be factored the lay evidence. One expert or clinician is unlikely ever to provide the entire answer to the case (see: Re T [2004] 2 FLR 838 ). It follows that Experts meetings or Professionals meetings should always be considered as a useful tool to share information and to identify areas of agreement and / or disagreement; viii. When evaluating the significance of expert evidence and particularly when the issues being considered are, as has regularly been the case in the Court of Protection, at the parameters or frontier of medical or expert knowledge, this should be properly identified and acknowledged. In considering the evidence, it is always helpful to reflect that yesterday's orthodoxies may become today's heresies. (see: R v Harris and Others [2005] EWCA Crim 1980); ix. Witnesses from whatever disciplines may be susceptible to 'confirmation bias'. This is to say they may reach for evidence that supports their proffered conclusion without properly engaging with the evidence that may weaken it. ((see: Cleveland Report (report of the enquiry into Child Abuse in Cleveland 1987 Cm 412 London: HMSO 010/1041225)); x. Consideration must always be given to relevant, proportionate written questions to an independently instructed expert.

Comment: The Vice-President's observations about case management sit alongside and amplify the obligations already imposed upon the parties (and, it should be added, the court) by both Part 1 of the Court of Protection Rules 2017 and the Case Pathways Practice Direction (PD 3B), both of which can be most easily accessed via the Court of Protection Handbook website here. This article was written by the Court of Protection team at 39 Essex Chambers.

**Prosecutors Could be Allowed to Direct Police Investigations**

*Jon Robins, Justice Gap:* Prosecutors could be allowed to direct police investigations as a consequence of Boris Johnson's promised royal commission on criminal justice. The Conservative 2019 election manifesto has pledged £3m for the first royal commission since the 1993 Runciman commission which was set up on the very day that the Birmingham Six walked out of the Old Bailey as free men after 16 years wrongly convicted. According a report in The Times, the commission is to look into the case for replicating the procurator fiscal model in Scotland, in which prosecutors have the power to direct police investigations into serious crimes. Prosecutors have similar powers in France. The Times reports that the commission comes 'amid warnings that the criminal justice system in England and Wales is "at breaking point" after a decade of cuts, with sharp falls in convictions for rape, robberies involving the use of knives, theft and fraud'.

Nazir Afzal, a former chief prosecutor, told the paper; 'I know from experience many cases that fail in England and Wales could have been saved through earlier involvement of prosecutors, as happens under the procurator fiscal. Put the citizen first, not the lawyers.' 'In most serious



crimes the golden hour immediately afterwards is when much of the evidence can be obtained and a prosecutor who is 'thinking trial' right at the beginning is likely to identify lines of inquiry that may not occur to a police officer. It will strengthen cases that cannot be 'fixed' later.'

Fundamental to the existing system is the institutional separation between police and prosecutors. Police investigations are entirely independent from the CPS which acts on the file presented after police investigation. The CPS was established by the Prosecution of Offences Act 1985, previously England was one of the few countries that allowed the police to prosecute cases. This was the result of miscarriage of justice scandals (not least the Maxwell Confait case) as well as the 1984 Phillips royal commission on criminal procedure. It was decided that the police were not best suited to be prosecutors because of how much they had invested into individual investigations. The Times report also noted that in Scotland the procurator fiscal 'can directly oversee police investigations and also investigate unexplained deaths'. 'Prosecutors in Scotland also use a "double corroboration" approach, requiring two sources supporting allegations before a case can be taken to court,' it read.

**Man, 81, Seeks to Quash Conviction for Apartheid Protest**

Rob Evans, Guardain: An 81-year-old retired academic is seeking to overturn a criminal conviction he received after taking part in an anti-apartheid protest that had been infiltrated by an undercover police officer. Jonathan Rosenhead is challenging his conviction for a public order offence during a demonstration in 1972. He recently discovered that one of the men who was convicted alongside him was an undercover police officer who was pretending to be a leftwing campaigner. The spy called himself Michael Scott and adopted a fake identity to infiltrate three leftwing groups, including the Anti-Apartheid Movement, for five years. Scott's superiors authorised him to use his fake identity in the criminal trial and to be convicted under his alias.

Rosenhead's lawyers have written to the Crown Prosecution Service asking for copies of official documents relating to his conviction, which he plans to lodge an appeal against. The CPS said it believed that there was no reason to overturn his conviction. His case highlights how a significant number of protesters since 1968 could potentially have been unjustly convicted as key evidence gathered by undercover police officers was withheld from their trials. So far, 57 campaigners have established in recent years that they were wrongly convicted or prosecuted after discovering their protests had been infiltrated by undercover officers. An official report commissioned by the government has identified another 83 political campaigners whose convictions could also be in doubt because undercover operations were hidden from their trials. The 2015 report, by Mark Ellison QC, found that a Scotland Yard undercover unit that infiltrated political groups between 1968 and 2008 routinely ignored legal rules about disclosing the involvement of police spies to criminal trials. He reported that the unit at times failed to correct evidence given in court which it knew was wrong.

Rosenhead, who studied operational research for 50 years at the London School of Economics, was involved in the campaign against apartheid for many years. In May 1972 he took part in a demonstration against the English rugby team which was about to go on tour in South Africa, at a time when campaigners were pressing for a sports boycott of the apartheid state. He and the other protesters blocked a coach carrying the team as it left a Surrey hotel for the airport. They left two locked vans and a car at the entrance of the hotel. Police arrested Rosenhead and 13 others. What he and the protesters did not know at the time was that Scott, one of those arrested, was an undercover police officer.

Scott used his fake identity to infiltrate the Anti-Apartheid Movement, the Young Liberals and the Workers Revolutionary Party between 1971 and 1976. He was a member of the undercover unit, known as the Special Demonstration Squad, whose members spied on more than 1,000 political groups over 40 years. They developed elaborate fake identities and pretended to be political activists in deployments that usually lasted around five years. Scott is one of three undercover officers in the unit who are known to have spied on the Anti-Apartheid Movement in the 1960s and 1970s. A press report from the time recorded that he had told the court that his name was Scott and that he lived in Earls Court, west London. He also said he worked compiling estimates in the construction industry. Scott was convicted of obstructing the highway and a police officer, fined and given a conditional discharge. Rosenhead was fined the equivalent of £130 in today's money and ordered to pay another £130 in legal costs for obstructing the highway.

Last year, a judge-led public inquiry that is examining the undercover infiltration of political movements notified Rosenhead of Scott's true identity. Rosenhead said: "I think that this unit was out of control. It was violating our human and legal rights." A CPS spokesperson said: "We received a request from the defendant's legal team to review the circumstances of his arrest and conviction after the anti-apartheid protest in Richmond, Surrey, in 1972. The CPS concluded that there is no basis upon which the convictions could be said to amount to a miscarriage of justice.

**Prisoners: Literacy 34% of Prisoners Below Level Expected of an 11-Year-Old**

To ask the Secretary of State for Justice, what recent estimate he has made of the proportion of the prison population who are illiterate; and what steps he is taking to tackle illiteracy in the prison population. The Department for Education publishes data on English & maths screenings undertaken when someone is received into prison. English screening data provides information on the proportion of prisoners who have very low levels of literacy.

For English, approximately 34% of prisoners were below the level expected of an 11-year-old. These prisoners would be regarded as having a high priority level of need. We have recently overhauled the prison education system, giving Governors control over the education budget for their prison, and have implemented two new prison education frameworks: the Prison Education Framework (PEF) and the Dynamic Purchasing System (DPS). Governors have the freedom to commission bespoke English education for prisoners with low levels of literacy through the PEF, aimed at addressing their high priority needs. The impact would be improvement in, for example, prisoners' reading and writing.

**Why Investigative Journalism Is Needed Even More Than Before**

*Open Democracy:* The British government has an unusually strong penchant for secrecy, part of a culture of superiority among those born to rule. It becomes especially clear in the release of government papers via the 'thirty-year rule', so often countered by the needs of national security. This week we see another example: the Daily Maverick reports that British dealings with Saudi Arabia back in the 1990s have been withheld from public scrutiny. The strong suspicion is that this links to more recent and controversial arms sales relating to the war in Yemen. Even stronger state control may well follow the recent general election, making it much more important that high-quality investigative journalism survives and thrives. openDemocracy is already a major player in this regard, perhaps one of the reasons that The Sun included it in its short-lived pre-election 'revelation' of "an extraordinary network of hard-left extremists pieced together by former British intelligence officers" that had Jeremy Corbyn at its centre.



More seriously, the election result has given us a Conservative Party in Westminster with two distinctive features: it has moved decidedly to the right, even further than it did in the Thatcher era; and it has an eighty-seat overall majority, enabling further moves in a neoliberal direction once the annoyances of Brexit are out of the way.

The Tories under Boris Johnson might relish that kind of future, but the more thoughtful among them could worry that the neoliberal era, that forty-year turbo-capitalist experiment, may well be comfortably past its prime even as society's elites do their very best to ensure its survival against the odds. In these circumstances we should expect that dissent against the government will grow and the need to maintain control will then express itself in renewed secrecy of actions and firmness of unaccountable governance.

This is why investigative journalism is needed even more than before, and two first-class additions to the limited library of competent books in this field will be published later this month. One is Phil Miller's eye-opening account of the growth of one of the most secretive of the UK's privatised military companies, 'Keenie Meenie: The British mercenaries who got away with war crimes' (Pluto Press). It concerns Keenie Meenie Services Ltd, which operated from 1975 to the late 1980s, before being subsumed into Saladin Security. KMS described itself as "the original company to offer specialist security services in difficult and high-risk areas of the world".

Keenie Meenie warrants an article on its own later in the month, but of more immediate relevance in the wake of the election result is 'The State of Secrecy: Spies and the Media in Britain' (I.B. Tauris). This is a hugely welcome contribution from Richard Norton-Taylor, the long-serving security specialist on The Guardian, providing a richly informed discussion of the relationship between the British security system and the press.

Three initial points to make about 'The State of Secrecy' are that it is part memoir, part analysis; it reflects Norton-Taylor's early career experience covering Brussels in the early 1970s; and is seriously readable yet has sufficient footnotes to encourage the reader to look further.

Benefitting from his experience of many whistle-blowing episodes and combined with his own work of bringing out into the open all too many examples of government incompetence and cover-up, Norton-Taylor draws a highly informed picture of governments' single-minded determination to maintain narrative control. His chapters on Whitehall tactics and the techniques of the security agencies are as good an account as you will find anywhere.

Ranging over a remarkable spread of examples he highlights consistent incompetence, especially in MI6, which an enduring culture of superiority has made far easier to hide. Beyond the security agencies – MI5, MI6, GCHQ and the rest – he also focuses on the military-industrial-academic-bureaucratic complex and its closed world of the revolving door, well-funded lobbyists, monopoly providers and persistently corrupt export markets.

As Norton-Taylor points out, the litany of failures and cost overruns in military equipment over decades includes the Type 45 destroyers, Chinook helicopters, the Nimrod maritime patrol aircraft, the army's Bowman communication system, the Watchkeeper reconnaissance drone and another drone that didn't work when it rained. Perhaps the classic was the army's new Ajax light tank that turned out to be too big to fit in the Royal Air Force's new A400 transport aircraft, a programme that itself has been subject to long delays and cost inflation.

One thing that makes life difficult for journalists in the mainstream print media is that the great majority of papers have a consistent right-wing stance in which the UK's defence prowess harks back to its imperial past. This makes critical coverage of a defence story difficult to get past the editor unless there is evidence of gross incompetence and 'wasting the

taxpayers' money' on a grand scale. Proving that is tough in an era of secrecy, especially if a defence correspondent needs the cooperation of the military for information.

As Norton-Taylor highlights, this becomes even more difficult when covering British special forces, where opacity is near-total, with includes a cross-party consensus on maintaining nil parliamentary accountability. Not that this prevents the judicious leaking of pro-SAS stories, usually to the Daily Mail or The Daily Telegraph, helping to ensure their high status in the public eye.

The Labour government of Tony Blair did bring in the Freedom of Information Act in 2000, but it was a decision that Blair later regarded as one of his worst mistakes. Norton-Taylor notes that he wrote in his memoir, 'A Journey': Three harmless words. I look at those words as I write them, and feel like shaking my head 'till it drops off. You naïve, foolish, irresponsible nincompoop. There is really no description of stupidity, no matter how vivid, that is adequate. I quake at the imbecility of it.

Once I appreciated the full enormity of the blunder, I used to say – more than a little unfairly – to any civil servant who would listen: Where was Sir Humphrey when I needed him? We had legislated in the first throes of power. How could you, knowing what you now have allowed us to do such a thing so utterly undermining of sensible government?

Blair's problem with this self-inflicted wound persisted for years afterwards, and the Freedom of Information Act is still seen in Whitehall as the bane of "sensible" government despite its many limitations. We can be sure that its relevance will diminish still further when the government is up against the full challenge of ruling a post-Brexit UK. It this which makes 'The State of Secrecy' such a necessary primer for the Johnson era.

**David Bryant Miscarriages of Justice: Compensation**

To ask the Secretary of State for Justice, on what date the Miscarriage of Justice Service received the application from Mr David Bryant of Christchurch for compensation; what the timeframe is for a decision to be made on that application; and if he will make a statement. The Miscarriage of Justice Application Service ('MOJAS') received Mr Bryant's application on 8 March 2018. Each application is necessarily fact specific and enquiries need to be undertaken so that the Secretary of State has all the required information before making a decision. This involves, amongst other matters, contacting external agencies (such as the Crown Court, Court of Appeal or Crown Prosecution Service) to confirm the facts for each application and obtain documentation such as judgments and court files. Over the past weeks, MOJAS have been carefully reviewing all the requisite material in Mr Bryant's case in line with the requirements of section 133 of the Criminal Justice Act 1988. We remain hopeful of reaching a decision within the next three months.

**Ciupercescu v. Romania - Jail ConditionsViolation of Article 3**

The applicant, Dragoş Ciupercescu, is a Romanian national who was born in 1971 and lives in Bucharest. The case concerned his complaints of inadequate conditions of detention. Mr Ciupercescu was sentenced to 18 years' imprisonment in 2005 and was detained in various prisons until his release on parole in 2016. During that period, he lodged complaints with the post-sentencing judge about the conditions of his detention in Giurgiu Prison from January 2009 and then in Jilava Prison where he was transferred in January 2015, essentially on account of overcrowding and inadequate heating. The judge found for the applicant, but did not award compensation. As a result of the applicant's complaint about overcrowding, he was placed in a cell in Jilava Prison with more personal space as of March 2015. Mr Ciupercescu also brought complaints before the domestic courts about being exposed to cigarette



smoke while being transported to court for hearings on his case and while in the waiting rooms at the courts; of inadequate dental treatment; about not being able to communicate online with his wife, who was living in Italy; and about having to inform the prison authorities of all the telephone numbers he wished to call, alleging an infringement of the confidentiality of his communications. The courts dismissed all the complaints, except for the one about online communication where it acknowledged a breach of his rights owing to a lack of regulation. Relying in particular on Article 3 (prohibition of inhuman or degrading treatment) of the European Convention on Human Rights, Mr Ciupercescu complained about the conditions of his detention in Giurgiu Prison and Jilava Prison. Violation of Article 3 – in respect of Mr Ciupercescu's material conditions of detention in Giurgiu Prison and Jilava Prison from 24 July 2012 to 23 March 2015. Just satisfaction: 3,000 euros (EUR) (non-pecuniary damage)

**Investigation After Liridon Saliukar Found Dead In Cell At Belmarsh**

*Owen Bowcott, Guardian:* A remand prisoner has been found dead in his cell at HMP Belmarsh after a dispute over whether he should have been classified as disabled. Liridon Saliuka, who was born in Kosovo and held a British passport, was found reportedly unresponsive in house block 4 of the high-security prison in the early evening of 2 January. The Prison Service confirmed he had died. The Prisons and Probation Ombudsman is investigating. It is understood the authorities are treating the death as self-inflicted, but the family – who say there have been delays to the postmortem – disagree.

Saliuka, 29, from Harrow in north-west London, had been in custody since last summer when he was arrested and charged with murder in connection with a fatal shooting at a club in east London. He denied being involved. He was the third prisoner to have died in Belmarsh within the past year. Another inmate was found dead there in November. Saliuka's sister, Dita, told the Guardian he had been determined to clear his name. The family said the autopsy had still not been carried out and they had been told they would only be able to see his face afterwards. Saliuka underwent extensive reconstructive surgery after a car crash two years ago. He was given metal plates that made it difficult for him to walk or stand still for long periods.

Dita, 31, said she had nursed her brother back to health as he recovered. A report by a surgeon, commissioned by the family, had concluded that he should be considered as "permanently disabled". At Belmarsh, she said, he was initially put in a special cell with an orthopaedic mattress but had recently been transferred to a standard cell. "They didn't let him make a phone call from Boxing Day until New Year's Day when I saw him," Dita said. "My brother said people who committed suicide were weak and selfish. I heard from others there had been an altercation that day. He was being bullied. I called the prison repeatedly to [to raise concerns about his disability] but no one came back to me. He was moved on New Year's Eve, and he said he had been sleeping on the floor because the mattress was so uncomfortable. He was on remand. Now my brother will never be able to clear his name in court."

Saliuka had been supported in his defence by the campaign group Joint Enterprise Not Guilty By Association ). Gloria Morrison, a spokeswoman for the organisation, said: "A young man has lost his life and we don't know why." Selen Cavcav, senior caseworker at Inquest, an organisation that supports relatives at coroner's courts, said: "Liridon's death is of significant concern. It is vital that it receives the upmost scrutiny. His family must be allowed to meaningfully participate in the investigation processes and establish the truth about the circumstances of his death." A Prison Service spokesman said: "HMP Belmarsh prisoner Liridon Saliuka died in custody on 2 January and our thoughts remain with his friends and family. As with all deaths in custody, there will be an independent investigation by the Prisons and Probation Ombudsman."

**Bronzefield Prison: Maternity Services:Written Question**

Asked by Lord Beecham: To ask Her Majesty's Government what steps they have taken following the disclosure of incidents involving pregnant women prisoners and their children at HMP Bronzefield. Answered by: Lord Keen of Elie: The recent incident at HMP Bronzefield is tragic. As there are a number of ongoing investigations, including an investigation by the police, it is not appropriate to comment further on the specific details of the incident. We are currently undertaking a fundamental review of the Mother and Baby Unit policy and the policy on managing pregnant women in custody. This will conclude in 2020. In the meantime, all pregnant women are seen by a professional midwife at least fortnightly, or more frequently if required. Healthcare in prisons is provided by specially trained medics and nurses. Medical emergencies are dealt with by 999 calls and prisoners have access to an emergency bell to alert staff at night. Women in prison have access to the same range of services as they would in the community. Following the events at HMP Bronzefield, we have introduced hourly checks throughout the night for all heavily pregnant women, and fortnightly pregnancy review boards are being held for them, involving a multidisciplinary team, in addition to existing support provisions.

**HMP Winchester - High Levels of Violence, Self-Harm and Self-Inflicted Deaths**

An inspection of HMP Winchester – a category B local prison and category C resettlement unit on the same site – in the summer of 2019 was disappointing, with high levels of violence, self-harm and self-inflicted deaths in the local prison. The smaller resettlement unit was assessed as reasonably good for safety and respect. However, purposeful activity – work, training and education – was poor on both sites. Peter Clarke, HM Chief Inspector of Prisons, published a report on the inspection at the Hampshire prison in June and July 2019. In the local prison, inspectors found significant deterioration since the previous inspection in 2016. In the category C unit, though purposeful activity and rehabilitation and release planning had both deteriorated, inspectors found some evidence that the decline had been arrested and some tentative improvements made. Winchester was not safe enough, Mr Clarke said. Violence remained rare on the category C site but had increased markedly in the local prison, particularly against staff. Fortunately, most recorded incidents were not classified as serious. Almost a quarter of prisoners said they felt unsafe and well over half reported feeling victimised. Use of force by staff had increased since 2016, which the prison attributed in part to the inexperience of their staff. Special accommodation was used too frequently and the segregation unit remained “a dismal place”. The mandatory positive drug testing rate had fallen from 30% to 16%, suggesting that some supply reduction initiatives were having an impact, but 59% of prisoners nonetheless thought it was easy to obtain drugs in the prison. The lack of improvement in work to reduce self-harm remained a significant concern for inspectors. Recorded incidents of self-harm had doubled since 2016, leading to levels higher than any other local prison in the country. Seven prisoners had taken their own lives since the last inspection, three in the previous 12 months. The prison’s response to recommendations made by the Prisons and Probation Ombudsman following investigations was not robust.

However, most prisoners indicated that they could turn to staff for help and keyworker arrangements had been introduced successfully. Inspectors highlighted the comprehensive recording by keyworkers of prisoners’ behaviour and progress as good practice. Cells on the category C unit were well equipped. In the local prison living conditions were not as good, and overcrowding and poorly equipped and damaged cells were common. Time out of cell for prisoners on the local site was very poor. During the working day about a third of prisoners were locked up and far too few were in purposeful activity. Those not at work or in education were typically out of their cell for just 90 minutes on a weekday and those on restricted basic regime had as little as 45 minutes. Most prisoners were locked up for most of the day at weekends. Prisoners on the category C site were unlocked from their cells. Ofsted inspectors assessed the provision of work and skills as ineffective. In the area of resettlement work inspectors found “pockets of good rehabilitative practice” but the purpose of the category C unit was unclear and it certainly did not fulfil a resettlement function.

Mr Clarke said he seriously considered invoking HM Inspectorate of Prisons’ Urgent Notification process, which would have required the Secretary of State to produce an action plan for improvement within 28 days. “It would have been very easy to justify doing so. However […] I believe the Urgent Notification process is best reserved for when there is no other obvious or feasible solution, when the intervention of the Secretary of State is needed to bring about some strategic or significant organisational change. In the case of Winchester, we did not consider that this was the case and believed the changes needed to bring about improvement were all within the gift of the prison itself.” Overall, Mr Clarke said, senior managers had been appointed relatively recently and were supported by a team of managers “who impressed us as optimistic and committed.” He added: “There [is] a lot still to do at Winchester. Safety was a priority, but improvements here need to be linked to the introduction of a coherent and deliverable regime that would get prisoners out of their cells and using their time purposefully. In our view, managers need to focus on the basics, ensuring they measure and assess improvement critically, based on evidence. They then need to ensure such improvement is sustained.”

**Aidan Mcanespie: Former Soldier to Stand Trial For Shooting**

A former soldier is to stand trial accused of manslaughter over the 1988 killing of a Catholic man at an Army checkpoint. Aidan McAnespie, 23, was hit by one of three bullets fired from a machine gun in Aughnacloy, County Tyrone. He was on his way to a Gaelic football match. David Jonathan Holden aged 50, a former Grenadier Guardsman, was 18 years old at the time of the incident in February 1988. Mr Holden, whose address was given as his lawyer's office in Victoria Street, Belfast, appeared at Dungannon Magistrates' Court on Wednesday. He had previously been charged with manslaughter, but the charge was dropped in 1990. The Public Prosecution Service reviewed that decision in 2016 following a request by the Attorney General John Larkin, leading to the current legal proceedings. A district judge ruled that there is sufficient evidence for the accused to stand trial. A defence application that the defendant could not receive a fair trial due to the 32-year delay was also dismissed. Mr Holden responded "no" when asked if he wished to say anything, give any evidence or call any witnesses at this time.

Serving Prisoners Supported by MOJUK: Walid Habib, 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, Peter Hannigan.