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 777 (22/01/2020) - Cost £1

'Ridiculous' Charges Dropped Against Migrant Sex Workers Who Shared Flat

Aaron Walawalkar, Each Other: Members of the English Collective of Prostitutes celebrated with two Brazilian migrant sex workers outside Staines Magistrates' Court. The Crown Prosecution Service has dropped its charges against two migrant women who faced conviction for letting each other use their shared flat to do sex work. Ms O and Ms R – who EachOther has chosen not to name – are friends and have worked out of a flat they rent together in Surrey for safety, according to campaign group the English Collective of Prostitutes (ECP). The women, who are both from Brazil and aged 33 and 36, each faced a charge of "a tenant permitting premises to be used as a brothel".

The prosecution told Staines Magistrates' Court on Wednesday (8 January) that the Crown wished for all charges to be withdrawn without stating why. The charges were brought after police raided their flat in September 2019, confiscating around £1,000 in cash, as well as mobile phones and their passports. The women believe the police were tipped off by a vindictive client who tried to extort them. The prosecution had offered the women police cautions – admitting guilt. This would have meant that their money would not be returned and it could have implications on future applications for settled status in the UK, and for certain jobs where detailed backgrounds checks are required. Before the hearing took place, Ms O wept outside the courtroom. "I feel so depressed," the mum-of-two told EachOther. "I do this work because the money is better for helping my family." She spoke of how she had been doing sex work for five years, without coercion, and has faced few problems. 'A Ridiculous Prosecution'. Standing the courtroom, Ms O clasped her head in disbelief as the magistrate, Gilly Crichton, said all charges had been dropped against her. Supporters in the public gallery cheered.

Ahead of the hearing, the ECP, which advocates for sex work decriminalisation, called on its supporters to join them in submitting letters to the CPS asking it to drop its charges against the women. "Ms O and Ms R are friends and neither was forcing the other to work," the letter reads, "What is the public interest in these two women being prosecuted?" On the result, ECP spokeswoman Niki Adams that said she is "absolutely delighted" but the charges "should never have been brought in the first place". She said: "We think it is as a result of the campaign but also the bravery of the women to stand up to these charges when they were really genuinely terrified about the implications of being criminalised like this. "It has been really traumatic for them – not only the drama of the police raid but also the torture of the court action and the possibility of a criminal record, which will have lifelong implications."

Speaking afterwards, defence solicitor Nigel Richardson said: "It was a ridiculous prosecution in the first place. The police were just trying to find something with which to charge [both women]. "By prosecuting like this, it just deters women from working together in safe conditions – making it more difficult and dangerous." The CPS spokeswoman said: "The CPS keeps all cases under regular review and following a review of the case, it was decided that it was no longer in the public interest to proceed." It is not illegal to sell sex but organisational aspects of sex work – such as soliciting in a street or public place, or working collectively in a brothel – are punishable offences. Organisations including Amnesty International, the World Health Organisation, UNAIDS, and the Royal College of Nursing have called for sex work to be fully decriminalised. They argue that criminalisation undermines the rights and safety of sex workers by pushing it underground. National Policing Sex Work guidance states that "simple enforcement does not produce sustainable outcomes and can actually increase the vulnerability of sex workers to violent attack". It adds: "Brothel closures and 'raids' create a mistrust of all external agencies including outreach services. It is difficult to rebuild trust and ultimately reduces the amount of intelligence submitted to the police and puts sex workers at greater risk." In 2016, the Home Affairs Select Committee recommended that the government fully decriminalise sex workers as the best means of ensuring their safety. However, the Home Office responded by arguing that there is not enough evidence to warrant a change in legislation. Last year, EachOther commissioned a poll which revealed that more people in the UK support sex work law reform than those who oppose it.

Jogee: No Winners In This Case

An insight into what it's like being a young defendant in a gang-related murder trial. Did Jogee change the 'odds'? Is the doctrine still a stark reality? On the streets, there is a code. But the courtroom also has a code: a strict one with few positives for a young person charged with murder. 'The criminal justice system exists to control crime. A prime function of that system must be to deal justly but effectively with those who join with others in criminal enterprises,' said Lord Steyn in R v Powell and English [1997] UKHL 45. How does this statement fit with the realities of what has become a high-stakes game of Russian Roulette, where very few are acquitted and where there are ultimately no winners? Misplaced swagger and bravado played out on the streets of our towns and cities, predominantly by young men, is the start of their own undoing; the seed of joint enterprise has already been sown.

Remember that the immediate position before R v Jogee [2016] UKSC 8 was that the secondary party will be guilty of unlawful killing committed by the primary party with a knife if he contemplates that the primary party may use such a weapon. One justification for this shift was a policy that the rise of gang crime had to be met with a robust jurisprudential response (see Lords Steyn and Hutton in Powell & English). The Metropolitan Police at the time produced a series of anti-gang violence posters warning any would-be member of a joint enterprise just how effective the doctrine could be as a tool to combat crime. In Jogee, the Supreme Court identified the 'wrong turn' taken in R v Chan Wing-Siu [1985] AC 168 and Powell & English and recognised the 'over extension in the law of murder and reduction in the law of manslaughter' (Dennis Kavanagh, 'The world post-Jogee', Counsel April 2016). But while the old approach to joint enterprise may have ended, the fear of gang violence and increased murders involving youths is still very much an issue of great public concern. What is it like being a young defendant (and their barrister) in these contentious cases – often from areas disproportionately affected by gang violence, and which come to assume national prominence?

'Relief' at being wrongly accused and desperate belief that 'man can bust the case' is not the reality for many. Being charged with murder along with your 'bredren' may be 'fun' at the beginning. The plan is to stick to the same story and see how things play out. That is a code used on the streets by the so-called 'family', but even blood-related families suffer from disloyalty and a break in the ranks. Many a young man with loose affiliation to a group, identified as a gang under the controversial gang matrix, have found themselves caught up in this public policy net of criminal liability. The setting in any crown court is formal, as one would expect, but the Old Bailey with all its splendour and history is an imposing place. Just to think, Ruth Ellis was sent to the gallows from this very building only 64 years ago. Twelve strangers hold

a young man's future in their hands; the noise of the streets is replaced with the drama and intensity of the courtroom. On the street, this young man may prize his reputation, but when that notoriety in the form of a criminal past is used to punch another hole in his defence ('I was there but I didn't know my friend had a knife' or 'It wasn't me, I didn't see who did it') it doesn't seem so great. He quickly begins to wish he was not in that YouTube video where 'friends' were singing about 'shanks' and 'boring' someone.

The cells in the 'bowels' of this majestic building are a hive of activity. Young men, all facing murder charges, file off to various courtrooms, handcuffed to their respective guards. The unspoken fear is palpable as each contemplates how they are going to perform under the intense pressure of questions from a prosecution barrister determined to show joint enterprise at work. In the moments before giving evidence, I look at my client's hands. No, he's not suffering from early stage Parkinson's Disease. Fear has gripped him; the 'game' is now very real. In the witness box, struggling to say his full name in a voice loud enough to be heard across the courtroom by the jury, he is reminded by the judge to speak up. The questions from me are easy enough to navigate but the barrage of questions by the prosecution leave him bamboozled and tongue tied, like a boxer taking too many blows to the head, unsure about the account rehearsed so many times in the confines of his prison cell. (He tells me after: 'These lawyers have a way of talking and getting you to agree with them.' How he wished he had paid more attention in his English lessons and read more books from the reading list. Street language is definitely out of place here.)

Now the jury has to consider the role he played. Has the fresh approach in Jogee saved him? 'If D intended by associating with P or being present at the scene to assist/encourage/cause P to commit the crime (eg by contributing to the force of numbers in a hostile confrontation, or letting P know that D was there to provide back-up if needed) then D would be guilty ('Jogee loose ends', David Omerod and Karl Laird, Counsel May 2016). Every court announcement potentially brings the life-changing moment and eventually we hear the cue for us to return to court. For weeks, family members of the accused have sat in the public gallery listening to every word. The deceased's family have sat inside the courtroom, their raw pain visible but the need for justice the dominant emotion. As the jury shuffles into court, the atmosphere is thick with the anticipation of a verdict. None of the defendants can bear to look up. They take what comfort they can from the floor beneath their gaze. It dawns on them that the words about to be uttered by the foreperson could forever alter the course of their futures, and those of their real families. 'Guilty,' utters the foreperson who looks straight ahead, no desire to look at the face of the young man who stabbed the victim. A gut-wrenching cry from the public gallery; his mother, who will not see her son at home again until he is a middle-aged man – if he survives the prison experience.

My own client is relieved: his focus is on himself with not even an acknowledgement of his friend's plight. He has just been handed his life back. I tell him to hit the reset button; at the age of just 19, it's not too late to start being the person he might have been. He is one of the 'lucky' ones: not captured by his past indiscretions, joint enterprise and a poor performance in the witness box. For the deceased's family, it is not a victory. It might not even feel like justice from a system that promises a fair trial. The brutal fact is that there are no winners in these cases. The reality of a courtroom encounter on a charge of murder is a daunting one for a young person ill-equipped to deal with the emotional and legal complexities of a trial in an intimidating forum. Their exposure to this discreet element of youth culture may have been a gamble too far. Unfulfilled potential in a graveyard or behind prison bars are the realities of this choice. Meanwhile, the public's frustration and anger at this cycle of mindless killings mounts.

Domestic Abuse Victims Trying To Flee Partner Hit With 'Insidious' Technological Abuse

Three in four domestic abuse victims have been exposed to "controlling, humiliating or monitoring" behaviour by their former partners using technology, new figures show. Refuge, the UK's largest provider of shelters for domestic abuse victims, found 4,004 women seeking help last year – around three-quarters of the total – had faced abuse from their ex-partner perpetrated via technology. The tech abuse includes current or former partners using smartphones or their children's iPads and games consoles to track a woman's location, sharing so-called revenge porn on the internet or repeated phone calls and messages or harassment via social media. Refuge say they have seen a rise in tech abuse cases which involve abusers using smart locks, webcams and smart heating systems to "monitor, control and gaslight" victims in the past two years. Sandra Horley, chief executive of Refuge, thinks such cases were underreported because many women are simply unaware of what is happening to them. She said: "As technology becomes more advanced and more readily available, perpetrators will continue to find new ways of using it to facilitate abuse. Frontline staff at Refuge have recorded an alarming rate of tech abuse cases.

"Put simply, tech abuse is the misuse of everyday technologies and devices by perpetrators, for the purposes of controlling, humiliating or monitoring their victims. It almost always occurs alongside other forms of physical or sexual violence, psychological and economic abuse. Women frequently come to Refuge having suffered harassment online, account hacking, spoofing, online identity theft, and revenge pornography. Often, the devices and social media platforms that represent a woman's vital line of communication to the outside world will be the very same ones used by her perpetrator to isolate and abuse her." Jemima*, a 29-year-old teacher who was physically, sexually and emotionally abused by her 43-year-old partner, said he subjected her to tech abuse and stalked her for almost four years after they broke up. "It was relentless," she said. "He harassed me through Facebook. I blocked him and what he called his 'stalker profile' – a fake account to monitor other people on Facebook – so he would ask other people to check my account and screenshot who I was with and where I was. He would create fake profiles on Facebook and add me. He would email colleagues or career contacts. He was very insidious. I felt like every day I was looking over my shoulder."

She added: "He wanted to control me in the relationship. He controlled what I wore and ate, what friends I had, where I lived, where I worked and monitored my everyday movements – constantly ringing me or door-stepping me at work. But he carried on controlling me after we broke up. I think he wanted to scare me by knowing he still had control. I felt like I was never going to live a life he didn't know about. I felt very low. I got a diagnosis of PTSD." Jemima said he would also stalk her indirectly by contacting colleagues and friends and eventually moved into her local area in south London after learning where she was living from social media. She then moved into a refuge with an anonymous location provided by Solace Women's Aid.

Dr Leonie Tanczer, an academic based at UCL who specialises in tech abuse, said there are cases where abusive former partners buy smart toys such as dolls or teddy bears, on the internet or in high street shops which have a GPS location connected to them that abusers can exploit. She said abusive ex-partners may give such toys as presents to their child and are then able to trace their ex's movements via the item. Dr Tanczer added: "You can also get a normal teddy bear and put a GPS device in it or buy spy cameras to put in houses which secretly film. You can also install dedicated malicious spyware on smartphones, laptops and tablets that allows perpetrators to monitor victims. Tech abuse feeds the anxiety and worries that victims and survivors hold. It changes the nature of abuse. Previously you could remove and extract yourself from

the abuse. It is now harder. It is easy to feel like you have lost control. It is so overwhelming. You may get paranoid because you don't know what you can trust."

Elise*, a domestic abuse victim who is in her late thirties, was traced by her ex-partner while in one of Refuge's shelters last year. The abuse survivor, who came to the refuge with a young child, received a message from her abusive ex-partner saying: "I know where you are." Her support worker discovered her ex had access to her email account which had her location settings turned on after looking through her phone. "From that, he had been able to access her location in real-time, her calendar with the details of all of her appointments with solicitors, doctors, the jobcentre etc," Jane Keeper, Refuge's director of operations, said. "He could see the search history on her maps and also had access to her internet search history." She added: "Knowing her location in the refuge was a huge safety risk to her, other residents, and staff. She had to pack her bags and move to another refuge in the middle of the night. The support worker helped her to close her email account and secure her device. She was given a burner phone, and the support worker also helped her to change all the passwords and account settings for her online banking as he had also been withdrawing money from her account without her knowledge." The perpetrator continued to stalk her on social media and posted threats to her and the child on his account but was eventually taken to court, Ms Keeper added. Refuge, which has been running a specialist tech abuse service since 2017, has launched a chatbot, an easy-to-navigate platform that allows women to find out how to safeguard their everyday devices.

MS Patient Found Not Guilty of Cultivating Cannabis for Medical Use

Tom Wainwright, Garden Court Chambers: Carlisle Court acquitted an MS patient of cultivating cannabis, following the Crown Prosecution Service's decision not to offer evidence in court today on a public interest basis. Lesley Gibson, 55, along with her husband Mark Gibson, were acquitted by Carlisle Crown Court of possession and cultivation of cannabis and not guilty verdicts were entered by the judge on the court record. The case had been looming over the couple since January 2019 and at a court hearing in December 2019 the CPS decided to send the case to trial in January 2020. The defence submitted that the Gibsons had no option but to cultivate cannabis in their home to manage Lesley's MS as Lesley was unable to access an NHS prescription, while the cost of a private prescription was prohibitive. The Gibsons were acquitted today with the crown offering no evidence and deciding it was not in the public interest to prosecute as Lesley once again has a private prescription for medicinal cannabis, bought at full cost.

There is evidence of a postcode lottery across the country in patient prosecutions for growing cannabis for medical use. At a recent parliamentary meeting organised by MPs, patients gave powerful testimony of living in fear of 'the knock on the door from police' and possible prosecution for illegally accessing the cannabis that has transformed their health and quality of life. The Gibsons' home was raided in January 2019 with Carlisle Police confiscating 10 baby cannabis plants and three homemade cannabis chocolate bars. While across the country many Police Forces have moved away from a heavy-handed approach to patients growing for medical reasons, Carlisle CPS decided to prosecute. The court case has taken a heavy toll on the Gibsons, with Lesley developing a sarcoma and receiving treatment to remove cancerous cells in November.

Lesley was represented by leading human rights solicitor Tayab Ali, and counsel Tom Wainwright of Garden Court Chambers. The defence team intended to argue at trial that Lesley was forced to break the law in order to alleviate the symptoms of her Multiple Sclerosis, fibromyalgia and

hidradentis suppurativa. It was to be argued that this would be what any person in her situation could reasonably have been expected to do. This acquittal does not set a precedent which can be relied on by others in court and it remains an offence for people to use cannabis to treat their illnesses. Whilst Lesley's case does not alter the current law, the case highlights that it is not in the public interest to prosecute patients who have no option but to use medicinal cannabis to treat themselves. Lesley's legal team intends to ask the Director of Public Prosecutions to review their prosecution policy where people are found to be using cannabis to treat illnesses.

Lesley Gibson said: "I'm pleased to be acquitted but this case has been hanging over me for a year and the medicine that kept me well was taken by Police. I don't want other patients to suffer the same. I hope the CPS will see sense and stop prosecuting patients."

Lesley's solicitor Tayab Ali said: "It can't be right to prosecute a person who has no choice other than to use medicinal cannabis to alleviate serious symptoms of a condition such as Multiple Sclerosis. I cannot see a situation where it would be in the public interest to prosecute a person in such circumstances. As it remains a criminal offence to cultivate cannabis for medical use, the law needs to be reviewed so that we no longer put seriously ill people through the humiliation and trauma of a police raid, arrest and prosecution only for the prosecution to be later halted because it is, so obviously, not in the public interest to continue it. The law clearly needs to change."

Prison Officers Hurt in County Durham Young Offender Institution Riot

Nazia Parveen, Guardian: Four prison officers have been injured after 18 prisoners were involved in rioting at a young offender institution, where staff are said to have lost control of a wing. A "Tornado team" of specially trained riot officers was drafted in to quell the trouble at HM YOI Deerbolt near Barnard Castle, County Durham, when inmates took over C Wing. The disturbance was contained in the early hours of Thursday and the rioting prisoners were taken out of the jail to be held elsewhere. The incident comes amid claims that the government's "rehabilitation revolution" was failing, with prison warders and many prisoners living in fear.

Ian Carson, the north-east representative of the Prison Officers Association, said the incident was symptomatic of a crisis in a prison system that is "fighting a losing battle". He said that in the past two months three prison officers across the country had taken their own lives. Carson said: "We are seeing inexperienced staff brought in and handling situations they aren't yet equipped for, a lack of management support and the people who have been recruited leaving in droves because of the levels of violence. "We are receiving ministerial edicts demanding the service to regain control and reduce violence instead of trying to understand what is at the root of these problems. The rehabilitation revolution just isn't working."

A source, describing themselves as a concerned member of staff, contacted the Northern Echo newspaper revealing that the prison had been "on edge" all week, with experienced staff trying their hardest to keep things settled. A spokesman for Durham police said the force was called at 7.45pm on Wednesday night following reports of a riot at the prison and the incident was resolved shortly after midnight. The prison officers assaulted during the riot were not thought to have sustained any serious or life-threatening injuries, said the spokesman. Members of the Tornado team were previously summoned to help deal with a disturbance at the prison in 2015. A spokesman for the Ministry of Justice said: "Violence and disorder in our prisons is not tolerated and those responsible will be punished for their actions. We are investing £2.75bn to improve our jails and make them safer – creating 10,000 additional prison places and introducing tough airport-style security to clamp down on the illicit items which fuel violence."

CPS Still Plagued by Disclosure Failings, Watchdog Finds

Law Gazette: The Crown Prosecution Service's disclosure of evidence is still sub-standard despite 'early signs of improvement', inspectors report today. HM Crown Prosecution Service Inspectorate (HMCPSI), a watchdog for the CPS and the Serious Fraud Office, assessed how well the CPS is complying with its duty to disclose unused material (i.e evidence gathered but not replied upon by the prosecution). The watchdog found that, while aspects of the CPS's performance 'show continuous improvement', in some areas the baseline performance was 'very low, and although there was progress there is still a long way to go before an acceptable standard is reached'. The inspection found that the CPS has got better at advising the police about reasonable lines of enquiry and has improved its compliance with prosecutors' post-charge duty of initial disclosure.

However the report says that in more than half of the criminal cases that were sampled the CPS's charging advice did not properly deal with unused material. Meanwhile, in just 16% of cases where police performance was sub-standard did prosecutors identify the failing and feed this back at the charging stage. Caroline Goodwin QC, chair of the Criminal Bar Association, said there is still cause for 'serious concern'. 'If this report had given the equivalent of an Ofsted grading for a school it would still, tragically, not move out of the bottom ranked "failing",' Goodwin said. 'Criminal defence barristers are still not paid for the many hours spent examining unused material…It is this task, within what the inspectorate reveals as a still failing system due to starved and inadequately trained professionals at both police and CPS, that is often the difference between liberty and imprisonment.'

The report stressed the importance of resourcing, stating: 'Over the past few years HMCPSI has… found fault with the CPS and identified areas where it could improve. Almost without exception, those faults have been caused or exacerbated by the problem of too few legal staff being spread too thinly over a volume of work of ever increasing complexity.' Amanda Pinto QC, chair of the Bar Council, said the report was 'not reassuring'. 'Despite help from the bar and solicitors to improve disclosure in all cases from the smallest to the most complex, there is more to do. There still needs to be more investment in people, training and resources in the police, the CPS and the criminal justice system generally, to tackle the pervasive problems with disclosure,' she said.

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 post-mortem – 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 his defence lawyer, 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."

Coercive Control Post-Challen

Crucial perspective and points of alert for practitioners defending and prosecuting cases involving abused women who have killed R v Challen [2019] EWCA Crim 916 involved the appellant being subject to coercive control by her husband for over 30 years. She killed him and was convicted of murder in 2011 having relied, unsuccessfully, on the partial defence of diminished responsibility. In her out of time appeal against conviction, we sought to argue that the court should approach domestic abuse from a perspective of social and personal entrapment.

Traditional criminal jurisprudence has focused on the way discrete incidents of violence have impacted on the psychology of the victim and have led to practitioners and psychiatrists relying on battered woman syndrome and the diagnosis of post-traumatic stress disorder. These conditions have readily been seen as being consistent with diminished responsibility. Simultaneously, however, the main facets of domestic abuse – which are: systemic coercion, degradation and control – are undermined. It is only when we look at the factual matrix, which typically leads to domestic homicide, from the perspective of personal and social entrapment – leading to what Professor Evan Stark refers to as a 'loss of personhood' on the part of the abused partner – that we can truly understand domestic abuse.

Defining Control: a 'Bespoke' Abuse. Control involves a strategic disarming of a victim by denying her basic rights and liberties; isolating her, cutting off finances, monitoring her movements, micro-regulating domestic duties and so forth. Coercive control is often referred to as a 'bespoke' abuse in the sense that the perpetrator will tailor the control to his victim's specific vulnerabilities. In an intimate relationship, such vulnerabilities are obviously known to the perpetrator. Coercion in the form of violence or sexual violence is often used as a punishment to show the victim what will happen to her if she resists the control. Consequently, her fear will lead to her compliance.

In Challen, the evidence which went to coercive and controlling behaviour on the part of the deceased had been available at the time of the original trial but the level and extent of the

defendant's entrapment had not been appreciated because the focus was on episodic and discrete acts of violence. In a relationship which was not characterised by regular violence, it was not perceived that any woman in the defendant's situation would have acted as the defendant did in hitting the deceased 20 times with a hammer.

In summary, the two grounds of appeal which were advanced were as follows: had fresh evidence going to (a) the concept of coercive control and (b) undiagnosed psychiatric conditions, been available at the time of the trial, then the appellant would have been acquitted of murder and convicted of manslaughter on the basis of either diminished responsibility or provocation. The court declined to admit the fresh evidence of Professor Stark. This was not problematic as that evidence merely consisted of an exposition of his theory of coercive control which, the court made clear, it accepted. Realistically, it would be difficult not to accept it given that it is the basis for the offence of controlling and coercive behaviour provided by s 76 of the Serious Crime Act 2015.

The court admitted the fresh evidence of a psychiatrist who, like the court, understood the dynamic of coercive control. The court was influenced by the fact that the psychiatrist had an understanding of the concept of coercive control and, therefore, the interplay between the psychiatric conditions from which the appellant was said to be suffering and her susceptibility to coercive control because of those conditions. The appellant suffered from a personality disorder with dependent traits which made her particularly susceptible to being coerced and controlled by the deceased. She was also diagnosed as suffering from a serious mood disorder at the time of the killing which had been masked by the effect of the coercive control. The court did not decide whether the appellant had been the victim of coercive control but held that the conviction was unsafe because expert evidence had not been available to defence counsel at trial. Neither the mental disorder nor the impact of the abuse were explored in detail, and potentially, the evidence went to both partial defences.

Points for defence and prosecution: If coercive control is a bespoke form of abuse where the perpetrator will identify and exploit vulnerabilities which are peculiar to the victim, then it lends itself to the (abolished) partial defence of provocation where the personal characteristics of the defendant can go to the gravity of the provocation and the subjective question of whether the defendant was provoked to lose her self-control. The objective question of, whether a woman of the defendant's age in the same situation might have acted as the defendant did, is arguably satisfied given the personal and social entrapment caused by coercive control. There is no reason why coercive control cannot be classed as 'circumstances of an extremely grave character which would cause a defendant to have a justifiable sense of being seriously wronged' for the purpose of the partial defence of loss of control provided by ss 54-55 of the Coroners and Justice Act 2009. Criminal practitioners should be alert to this when defending and prosecuting cases involving abused women who have killed.

The paradigm of the abused woman who kills her abuser was central to the policy underlying the enactment of ss 54-55 of the 2009 Act. Yet, it seems that many such women are still being convicted of murder. Justice for Women and the Centre for Women's Justice have commissioned research aimed at ascertaining why this is. The project is due to report in 2020. Anecdotally, those cases – where convicted women have sought advice – disclose recurring themes. These include: a failure to take detailed instructions on the history of the relationship with the deceased; inability to talk about previous sexual violence; traumatic amnesia about the conduct of the killing; failure to obtain psychiatric reports; and reliance on the wrong defence. Proactivity (and new defence) required In the meantime, and more generally, practitioners need to adopt an holistic and proactive approach to addressing the effect of domestic abuse on women defendants.

Some relevant Crown Prosecution Service policies emanate from an international policy framework to which reference can be made in the context of considering whether to continue with a prosecution or to accept pleas of guilty. The United Kingdom ratified the United Nations Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women (CEDAW) in 1986 and is obliged to take steps to end discrimination against women in all forms. Signatories are required to have in force and to promote Anti-Violence Against Women and Girls strategies in all state activity including the criminal justice system. CEDAW policy derives, in part, from principles in the United Nations Rules for the Treatment of Women Prisoners and Non-Custodial Measures for Women Offenders also known as the 'Bangkok Rules'. These rules acknowledge amongst other things, that domestic abuse is a cause of offending by women and in particular, of women's violent offending against male partners. The rules mandate decision-makers within the criminal justice system to eliminate discrimination against women including by diverting women offenders from prosecution. Set against this background, recent calls for a new defence which would apply in circumstances where certain offending is a direct consequence of domestic abuse, make good sense.

UK Legal System Allowing Known Offenders To Sexually Abuse Children Abroad

The Independent Inquiry into Child Sexual Abuse (IICSA) has published its second report in its Protection of Children Outside the UK investigation, focusing on the legal measures designed to prevent British child sex abusers from offending overseas. The report finds that offenders from England and Wales are travelling to commit extensive abuse of children across the world, including in eastern Asia and Africa.

The Inquiry concluded that civil orders are not being used effectively to stop offenders visiting countries where poverty and corruption leaves children vulnerable to sexual exploitation. The Inquiry additionally found that the disclosure and barring system, including the International Child Protection Certificate which overseas institutions can request when recruiting British nationals, is confusing, inconsistent and in need of reform. The Inquiry has highlighted the need for increased awareness among police forces of section 72 of the Sexual Offences Act 2003 to ensure the prosecution of British nationals and residents for child sexual offences committed outside the UK. The Inquiry has made five recommendations to government, including measures aimed at restricting foreign travel of sex offenders more frequently, substantially extending the reach of the Disclosure and Barring Service overseas and the introduction of a national plan of action on child sexual abuse outside the UK.

Hundreds of Allegations of Abuse Against Child Prisoners Revealed

May Bulman, Independent: Hundreds of children are alleged to have been abused and neglected in prison over the last three years amid a dramatic rise in young offenders being injured.There were more than 550 allegations of child abuse or neglect made against staff in England's seven child prisons between 2016-17 and 2018-19, according to figures obtained through freedom of information (FoI) requests to local councils by charity Article 39. And the number of restraint incidents that have resulted in children suffering injuries or compromised breathing have more than tripled since 2014, from 54 to 193 last year, according to data obtained by charity Article 39. Young offenders are being failed by a system that is starved of resources and facing a "calamitous" turnover of staff, campaigners say.

The number of children being physically assaulted by prison officers is increasing despite

a considerable drop in the child prison population. Government statistics show there were 1,157 young offenders in custody in 2013-14 compared with 832 in 2018-19 – a decrease of 28 per cent. Experts speculated that the increase was in part due to improved reporting of serious incidents by prison staff, but said such a dramatic rise was also down to a lack of funding in the youth custody estate and failure to adopt a "child-focused" approach towards young offenders. It comes after scandal-hit youth jail Medway was judged by Ofsted to be placing children at "unacceptable risk", with a significant increase in use of force against children, despite efforts to improve conditions since a BBC Panorama investigation four years ago exposed widespread abuse at the facility. The report found that around 359 incidents involving force were reported in the last six months – of which approximately 115 incidents occurred in September alone – and that staff were still using techniques during physical-restraint incidents that inflicted pain on children, with seven such incidents recorded since January.

Carolyne Willow, director of Article 39, said the rise in serious restraint incidents was "deeply concerning" but the true number of abuses against incarcerated children would be far higher, as flaws in the recording of these incidents and fear of retribution among young people meant many went unreported. She pointed out that only half of the six councils with child prisons in their area provided information showing how many allegations referred to them were substantiated, indicating a lack of data and auditing that she said "obscures the true picture". Ms Willow added: "It is also down to the difficulty children face when reporting abuse within closed institutions – they're often scared of retribution and being treated less favourably by staff. It is often one child's word against several members of staff. They know that the odds are they won't be believed.

"They're kept in a state of subservience and powerlessness, where grown adults in uniform are allowed to inflict physical and psychological pain. And often they don't know when something is unlawful and abusive. They think if something is commonplace and is done in public and more than one member of staff is doing it, then that must be the official way." She said staff shortages were a "massive issue", with the institutions operating with the "least number of staff that the state can get away with", adding: "It creates the most appalling physical environments for children. The government has publicly acknowledged that they're not fit for purpose." Frances Crook, chief executive of the Howard League for Penal Reform, said the charity was "very worried" about child abuse in jails and that the figures "appeared to represent the tip of the iceberg". "We intend to do some further work ourselves in the coming months to explore what is going on, and to find out why children and young people are being placed in such dangerous prisons," she added.

The data on restraint, published in documents released by the Ministry of Justice under FoI laws, show the number of reports made by prison staff under the Serious Injury and Early Warning Signs process – used to record restraint that has resulted in a child having breathing difficulties or other injuries – has increased by 257 per cent in four years. Of these reports, 28 involved a child having breathing difficulties, 124 had complaints of such difficulties, seven had serious injuries, 11 had a loss of or reduced consciousness and 22 complained of feeling sick.

Responding to the findings, Anna Edmundson, NSPCC policy manager, said there should be clearer and more robust child protection procedures in place, adding: "Many of these children have already experienced abuse and neglect and that complex background is part of the reason they might be detained. "Despite a long list of recommendations about how these institutions need to change to better protect children, progress is painfully slow and safeguarding still doesn't appear to be the top priority."

John Drew, former chief executive of the Youth Justice Board (YJB), said the rise was "very concerning" and that while it was in part attributable to greater awareness of the importance of reporting abuse, it was also the result of a "demoralised prison service, starved of resources and facing a calamitous turnover of staff". He continued: "Almost all of the staff working in child prisons are good people doing a very difficult job in circumstances that very few of their critics would be able to do. But until we start spending a lot more money looking after children in custody, these figures will not fall. "More money for smaller units, which can be nearer to home, and more money for more staff are obvious places to start. A child-focused approach, based on children's rights, will also make a big difference. "Listening to children in custody can lead to big differences in attitude, as well as better support for staff, including clinical supervision so that they understand why the children in their custody behave the way they do and how they can be helped."

A Youth Custody Service spokesperson said: "Staff are trained to resolve conflict verbally and we are clear that restraint should only be used as a last resort, where there is a risk of harm to self or others, and no other form of intervention is possible or appropriate. "We asked the chair of the Youth Justice Board, Charlie Taylor, to undertake an independent review of pain-inducing restraint techniques and we are now carefully considering it before responding in the new year."

"Nothing Inherently Wrong" With Healthcare System for Vulnerable Detainees in Prison

The High Court has refused to extend key safeguards under the Adults at Risk policy to immigration detainees held in prisons. In MR (Pakistan) & Anor v Secretary of State for Justice & Ors [2019] EWHC 3567 (Admin), Mr Justice Supperstone decided that healthcare protections for vulnerable detainees on the UK prison estate need not be equivalent to those in place for detainees in immigration removal centres (IRCs). Supperstone J found that, even though the system for managing vulnerable detainees (in this case, victims of torture) in prisons "could be improved", it was not so unfair as to be unlawful. Agreeing with counsel for the defence that IRC detention is fundamentally different to detention in prison, he decided that: The claim… fails to have regard to a critical distinction between individuals who are entering immigration detention in IRCs and those who are entering immigration detention in prisons. The judge went on to say: The two regimes and the two cohorts are so different that either they are not properly comparable or the differential treatment is justified by the difference between the cohorts.

This judgment will come as a disappointment to practitioners advocating for change to the murky practice of detaining people in prisons at the end of their criminal sentences. Used in cases of serious criminality or where there is a high risk of harm to other detainees, detention in prisons is far more onerous than in IRCs. As any practitioner who has worked with detainees in prison will tell you, communication is extremely difficult and with no legal support available for immigration detainees in most prisons, accessing legal advice can be near impossible.

No Rule 35 system in prisons: Under challenge in this case was the lack of process for identifying vulnerable detainees held in prison similar to that available in IRCs under the Detention Centre Rules 2001 – commonly known as the "Rule 35" process. Rule 35 places a duty on medical practitioners to report any concerns about vulnerable detainees to the Home Office, who must consider the medical findings and review the person's detention accordingly. No such process is available to detainees held in prison. The most similar provisions are those for "special illnesses and conditions" under Rule 21 of the Prison Rules 1999. In the claimants' view, these did not cater for the unique healthcare needs of immigration detainees, such as potentially being a victim of torture.

In claimant AO's case, the absence of an equivalent Rule 35 process meant that the Home Office was only informed of his history of torture after he was transferred to an IRC – two and a half years after he had first communicated his trauma to prison healthcare. The lack of a requirement for the prison healthcare team to inform the Home Office meant the issue was overlooked, even when there was "evidence of frank psychosis" recorded on the prison healthcare records. Only after receiving AO's Rule 35 report did the Home Office accept that he was an adult at risk. This did not sway Supperstone J, who said: I reject the contention that the absence of equivalent rules to Rules 34 and 35 applying to the prison estate leads to inherent unfairness and unreasonableness, resulting in the scheme governing the detention of immigration detainees held in the prison estate being unlawful… The evidence before this court leads me to the conclusion that there is nothing inherently wrong with the system that applies in the prison estate, even if it could be improved.

This is likely not the end of the issue. In the meantime, practitioners should stay alert to the vulnerabilities of prison detainees. Where vulnerability of a prison detainee is suspected, medical records should be requested and where necessary, independent medical evidence be submitted to the Home Office. This may at the very least force the Home Office to transfer the person to an IRC, where the regime is (a little) less oppressive. No unreasonable delay in finding bail accommodation. Supperstone J also rejected a second challenge that there had been an unreasonable delay in identifying approved premises for AO to be released on bail. He rejected the argument that Ministry of Justice delays kept AO detained for an unreasonable amount of time, finding that it was justified because of how difficult it was to find bail accommodation for someone with AO's offending history and risk profile. Delays in finding approved premises for release are yet another obstacle faced by detainees with a criminal history and can often be the only thing standing in the way of release. While unsuccessful in this case, it is positive to see this issue of probation delays being brought to the attention of the courts.

Schrödinger's Appeal - **Simultaneously Both Alive and Dead**

Can an appeal be both finally determined and pending at the same time? This conundrum, akin to Erwin Schrödinger's famous thought experiment involving a cat in a box with a lethal substance, was tackled by the Upper Tribunal in Niaz (NIAA 2002 s. 104: pending appeal) [2019] UKUT 399 (IAC). Schrödinger's cat can be thought of as simultaneously both alive and dead, until the box is opened and the reality discovered. The outcome depends on an unknowable event: has the poison killed the cat yet? In Niaz the unknowable event was the outcome of a judicial review of an Upper Tribunal decision refusing permission to appeal against a decision of the First-tier Tribunal.

Normally an Upper Tribunal decision refusing permission to appeal brings the immigration appeal process to an end. The Home Office is then free to remove the person from the UK. However a successful judicial review results in the Upper Tribunal's decision being quashed. This means it is as if it never happened. So, it may transpire, the appeal was not at an end after all. On 13 July 2018 the Upper Tribunal refused permission to appeal in Mr Niaz's case. The Home Office removed Mr Niaz to Pakistan on 28 August 2018, despite the fact that a judicial review of the Upper Tribunal's decision was pending with the Court of Appeal. The Court of Appeal found in Mr Niaz's favour and on 12 April 2019 the Upper Tribunal's decision was quashed. The case then returned to the Upper Tribunal to figure out what all this meant. Between 13 July 2018 and 12 April 2019 the appeal can be thought of as both pending and finally determined. The status of the appeal depended on the outcome of the judicial

review, which was not known at the time. Had Mr Niaz's appeal been pending the whole time, in which case he was unlawfully removed? Or was the appeal pending, finally determined, and then pending again? Was the appeal pending? The Upper Tribunal decided the appeal was not pending whilst the judicial review was ongoing. It was finally determined on 13 July 2018 when the Upper Tribunal refused permission, then pending again from 12 April 2019 once that decision was quashed. The cat died, and then came back to life. The Upper Tribunal saw no issue with this: The fact that the refusal of permission to appeal was quashed, as a result of the proceedings in the Court of Appeal after the appellant had been removed, means the appellant's appeal must, from that point, be treated as again pending. There is nothing inherently problematic with the fact that an appeal may, under the statutory scheme, become pending after a period during which, compatibly with that scheme, the appeal has been treated as finally determined. This seems to stretch the definition of the word "finally" beyond its natural limits. But the alternative would be prolonged uncertainty regarding the legality of removal.

The Upper Tribunal somewhat glosses over the fact that the effect of the decision of 13 July 2018 being quashed on 12 April 2019 is retrospective. In the eyes of the law, it is as if the Upper Tribunal's decision refusing permission was never made. As such, with the benefit of hindsight, removal was unlawful as the appeal was pending at the time of removal (albeit this could not have been known when removal took place). However, to ensure legal certainty the Upper Tribunal gives preference to factual reality over legal fiction: an appeal which has been finally determined ceases to be pending. In the case of an application for permission to appeal to the Upper Tribunal under section 11 of the 2007 Act, the appeal is finally determined when it is no longer "awaiting determination", which will, of course, be the position once the application is, in fact, determined… Any other result would mean the respondent could never safely assume that the removal of an individual would not violate section 78 of the 2002 Act. In short, the Home Office is entitled to assume that the Upper Tribunal's decision is lawful and to rely on it to enforce removal. The factual reality that the application for permission was determined on 13 July 2018 takes priority over the legal fiction that the decision was never made (on account of being found to be unlawful in subsequent judicial review proceedings).

The road not taken: An alternative interpretation, which doesn't seem to suffer from the same conceptual difficulties outlined above, would be for the appeal to be treated as pending throughout. Once it is discovered that the cat is alive, the logical conclusion is that it has been alive all along. Not that it died and came back to life.This would have meant the removal of Mr Niaz being retrospectively rendered unlawful. Avoiding this in future would hardly be unduly burdensome for the Home Office. It would simply need to wait until the 16 day time limit for applying for judicial review had expired before enforcing removal (this is the time limit for England & Wales; the time limit is 3 months in Scotland). This would ensure that the appeal is actually "finally determined" when removal takes place i.e. there is no prospect of it becoming pending again (although admittedly the possibility of an out-of-time application for judicial review complicates matters).

Abandoned appeal: The other issue was whether Mr Niaz's departure from the UK led to his appeal being treated as abandoned. An in-country appeal must be treated as abandoned if the appellant leaves the UK before the appeal has been finally determined.The Upper Tribunal decided, on the basis of previous Court of Appeal authority, that the word "leaves" means voluntarily leaves and does not include enforced removal. As a result, Mr Niaz's removal from the UK before his appeal was finally determined did not require his appeal to be treated as abandoned.

The official headnote: (1) Section 104(2) of the Nationality, Immigration and Asylum Act

2002 contains an exhaustive list of the circumstances in which an appeal under section 82(1) is not finally determined. (2) Although section 104(2) is describing situations in which an appeal is not to be regarded as finally determined, the corollary is that, where none of the situations described in sub-paragraphs (a) to (c) apply (and the appeal has not lapsed or been withdrawn or abandoned), the appeal in question must be treated as having been finally determined. (3) An appeal which has ceased to be pending within the meaning of section 104 becomes pending again if the Upper Tribunal's decision refusing permission to appeal from the First-tier Tribunal is quashed on judicial review.

Home Office Overhauls Police Complaints and Discipline Process

The changes ensure that complaints can be dealt with quickly, effectively and proportionately. On Friday 10 January the Home Office is introducing legislation that will shake up how complaints made against the police are handled and improve the discipline system for officers. The changes, which will come into effect on 1 February, ensure that complaints can be dealt with quickly, effectively and proportionately, not just for the benefit of the public but also for the police. As well as simplifying the complaints system, the changes mean Police and Crime Commissioners will have a greater role to increase independence and improve complaints handling.

Policing and Crime Minister Kit Malthouse said: The vast majority of our brilliant police are extremely professional, and standards remain high. When police forces fall short of these standards, it is important to have a system that can quickly establish what has gone wrong, hold officers to account where necessary and ensure lessons are learned. These reforms will deliver this and ensure the public can maintain confidence in the integrity of our world-class police. The reforms will also deliver a more efficient system for dealing with police misconduct, making the investigation processes simpler and therefore quicker, including a requirement to provide an explanation where investigations take longer than 12 months. Importantly, the reforms aim to make the discipline system more proportionate and encourage a much greater emphasis on learning from mistakes.

National Police Chiefs' Council lead for complaints and misconduct, Chief Constable Craig Guildford, said: We have listened very carefully to the views of officers, the public and everyone involved in the complaints process throughout this work. This package addresses the valid concerns over timeliness, accountability and proportionality and puts the focus on learning, reflection and fairness. These reforms are aimed at all levels across the police service and have come together after work with the Home Office, Police Federation, the IOPC and the Superintendents Association. There will be greater involvement for local supervisors and a move away from punishment and blame for lower level misconduct to a focus on learning and development. The huge majority of police officers serve the public to the highest standard. Society rightly expects the service to act with honesty and integrity and any instance of gross misconduct falling below that standard will continue to be dealt with robustly.

The Home Office has worked closely with the National Police Chiefs' Council (NPCC), the Independent Office for Police Conduct (IOPC), the Association of Police and Crime Commissioners (APCC), staff associations and others to develop a comprehensive package of improvements. These include: • simplifying the complaints system, making it easier to navigate and putting a greater emphasis on handling complaints in a reasonable and proportionate manner. An enhanced role for Police and Crime Commissioners will strengthen independence • further measures to increase the IOPC's effectiveness and independence in investigating all serious and sensitive matters involving the police • focusing the formal discipline system on breaches of professional standards that would result in formal disciplinary action, enabling line managers to focus on improving individual learning and behaviours in response to lower level conduct matters – based on a new Reflective Practice Review Process • there are new provisions to improve the efficiency and transparency of misconduct investigations • increasing the transparency of appeals against misconduct findings by replacing the current retired police officer as a member of the panel with an independent layperson and introducing new provisions to improve the timeliness and efficiency of proceedings. The College of Policing, as the professional body for the police in England and Wales, has developed training for all officers, HR teams and professional standards departments to support the service in implementing the reforms.

Police Officer Jailed for Lying About Uxbridge Child Sex Assault

A police constable who falsely accused a council street cleaner of sexually assaulting a child after an argument about cleaning up his garden hedges has been jailed for three years. PC Hitesh Lakhani, 42, called the police stating he had witnessed a man beckon a child of around five years old into some bushes while her mother walked ahead on a residential street in Uxbridge on 5 September, 2018. He claimed to have seen the man pull his shorts down and place the little girl's hand on him, before her mother noticed she was missing and called out to her, allowing her to escape. Lakhani said he confronted the offender and took a photograph of him. He presented the photo to police when they arrived to take a statement from him. The image was circulated across Hillingdon police's social media feeds in order to identify the culprit of the alleged assault. It called on the public to contact Crimestoppers if they recognised the man. Upon further investigation by the police, CCTV evidence from a neighbouring house proved the sexual assault could not have happened.

On Friday, 10 January 2020, Lakhani was sentenced for perverting the course of justice at Kingston Crown Court to three years' imprisonment. He had been found guilty of the charge following a trial at the same court, which concluded in December 2019. David Davies, from the CPS, said: "This was a baseless accusation against a hard-working man by a serving police officer. "Hitesh Lakhani called 101 alleging he had witnessed a sexual assault that he knew did not happen. This was a spiteful act over a disagreement about hedge trimmings in his front garden spilling on to the street. A police investigation found no trace of sexual crimes being reported in the vicinity, various inaccuracies in Lakhani's account and CCTV evidence from a neighbouring house, which proved the sexual assault could not have happened. The most worrying aspect of this case was that Lakhani, as a police officer, presented as a credible witness to a serious allegation where there was an identified suspect. The implications for this victim could have been profound, but we were able to prove Lakhani's account was entirely fictional and unfounded. I hope this prosecution serves as a reminder that nobody is above the law."

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.