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 783 (04/03/2020) - Cost £1

Jeremy Bamber Lawyers Say New Evidence Undermines Conviction

Simon Hattenstone, Guardian: Lawyers for Jeremy Bamber, who is serving a whole life sentence for murdering his family, have unearthed evidence that they say undermines the claim that it was "inconceivable" for his adoptive sister to have shot herself. Sheila Caffell, who died alongside her twin sons and Bamber's adoptive parents in 1985, was initially the prime suspect in the White House Farm case, with police working on the hypothesis of a murder/suicide. But after suspicion later turned to Bamber, the prosecution said she could not have taken her own life because she received two bullet wounds to the neck at an interval. Lawyers for Bamber – whose case is currently the subject of a six-part ITV dramatisation – have found in archives a series of statements by senior officers and the police surgeon that they say contradict that claim. They say the documents were never seen by the trial jury, and suggest that Caffell appeared to have only one gunshot wound when the police entered the crime scene.

The claim that Caffell was shot twice was significant at Bamber's trial, alongside evidence that a silencer was used and then removed from the murder weapon. The judge Mr Justice Drake told the jury: "If she [Caffell] had killed everyone and was about to commit suicide and put the gun to her neck and found she could not reach it, is it seriously to be suggested that anyone, whether mentally upset or not, would then unscrew the silencer, go back to the cupboard, put it in the box and then return upstairs to the bedroom before taking her life by two shots – one with some interval between the other? The prosecution on that evidence alone say it is inconceivable that she killed herself." In the ITV series, the turning point in the police investigation comes when they realise Caffell has been shot twice in the neck, the investigating officer stating: "Well it can't be bloody suicide then." Bamber's lawyers asked ITV bosses to postpone the dramatisation, which concludes on Wednesday, because they believe the new evidence could clear Bamber's name.

During the night of 6 August 1985, Nevill and June Bamber were shot and killed inside their Essex farmhouse along with their adoptive daughter, Caffell, and Caffell's six-year-old twin sons, Daniel and Nicholas. Initially, police believed that Caffell, diagnosed with schizophrenia, had fired the shots and then turned the gun on herself. But on 10 August, after the police ended their examination of the crime scene, a silencer was found in a gun cupboard at the farmhouse. It was later said to contain blood belonging to Caffell. In 2018 a forensics report cast doubt on the validity of evidence relating to the silencer. On 7 September 1985, Jeremy Bamber's ex-girlfriend told police Bamber had discussed killing his family with her and that he was involved. On 29 September, Bamber was charged with the murders. He was convicted in October 1986.

The newly discovered statements show that before the Essex police photographer began taking crime scene photographs at the scene at 10.20am on 7 August, illustrating that Caffell had sustained two gunshot wounds, five senior officers and the police surgeon had seen Caffell and suggested there was only one wound. At 8.13am a Ch Supt Harris and Ch Insp Gibbons saw Caffell's body in the main bedroom. In their witness statements written that morning, they described how she appeared. Harris stated: "A .22 rifle was lying along Mrs Caffell's body, the barrel of which was resting just below an entry wound beneath her chin." Gibbons said he saw "a younger female with a wound to her throat". At 8.25am a police surgeon, Dr Ian Craig, entered the house. He recorded in his witness statement, also written on the morning of 7 August, that "there was what appeared to be an entry wound in the throat".

In 1986 during the Dickinson inquiry into Essex police's handling of the case, ordered by the trial judge after Bamber's conviction, Craig said: "I only saw one gunshot wound at that stage." Two Essex police officers, DS Jones and DI Miller, entered the house together at 9.15am. Miller recorded in a report dated 15 August: "The wound appeared to have been made by her own hand." Jones made no reference to any wounds in his witness statements until 1991 when he informed a City of London police inquiry that he attended the house the following day with a pathologist, Peter Vanezis, and was surprised to be told Caffell had suffered two gunshot wounds. He told the City of London police: "Up to that point I thought there had been only one."

PC Wright , the coroner's officer who provided information for the official coroner's report dated 9 August, stated: "The appearance suggested in the case of Sheila Caffell the wound had been inflicted by her own hand." Controversially, the scene of crime officers, tasked with gathering forensic evidence, were unable to gain access to the house for 45 minutes and did not conduct their examination until approximately 10am. While Bamber's lawyers do not dispute that Caffell had two gunshot wounds by the time official police photographs were taken, they believe the failure to inform the jury of these statements prejudiced the case. One theory is that a gun went off accidentally in the chaos that followed after numerous police officers entered the farmhouse. It is accepted that the scene of crime was contaminated as officers attempted to reconstruct what had happened. In evidence given to the Dickinson inquiry in 1988, Vanezis, the pathologist, said that while it was possible for people to kill themselves using two shots, it was uncommon.

Mark Newby, a solicitor advocate at Quality Solicitors Jordans, which represents Bamber, told the Guardian: "The jury only heard of the two shots, which was relied upon by the crown to support their case, but this wasn't the whole picture. It represents yet another significant aspect to this case which supports Jeremy Bamber and undermines this conviction."

Murder Conviction Quashed After Amended Charge Resulted In 'Contradictory' Verdict

Scottish Legal News; A man found guilty of murdering his friend after causing him to fall down a flight of stairs and repeatedly kicking and stamping on his head and body has successfully appealed against his conviction. Ralph Goldie was convicted of killing Jeremy Paradine following a drunken fight in a flat he shared with the deceased and his wife, but the High Court of Justiciary Appeal Court ruled that the jury's deletion from the charge of the word "push", which was what caused the death, resulted in a "miscarriage of justice".

'Jury's verdict': The Lord Justice Clerk, Lady Dorrian, sitting with Lord Brodie and Lord Turnbull, heard that the appellant was charged (charge 2) with the murder of the deceased by pushing him on the body, causing him to fall down the stairs, and repeatedly kicking, stamping and jumping on his head and body, but after trial the jury deleted the word "push". The appellant was also convicted of an assault on Martin McQueenie, by repeatedly punching and kicking him on the head and body, all to his severe injury. That charge (3) had originally contained an averment that he "did push, kick or otherwise strike [the complainer], cause him to fall down a flight of stairs", but the jury deleted these, and other averments.

After the jury announced their verdict, but before it was recorded, senior counsel addressed the court submitting that the jury's deletion of the word "push" rendered their verdict inconsistent with the directions given, and self-contradictory. He submitted that the trial judge's directions had been to the effect that the jury had to be satisfied that the now appellant propelled,

in some way, the deceased down the stairs whereas in terms of their verdict the jury had deleted the only method of propulsion which had been suggested; “cause him to fall down a flight of stairs” did not, in itself, amount to an assault. Senior counsel submitted that the trial judge should decline to accept the verdict, remind the jury of the relevant directions and ask them to retire and reconsider their verdict. After retiring to consider the matter, the trial judge concluded that the jury had returned a lawful and competent verdict which should be recorded.

‘Judge’s Directions’: Goldie appealed against his conviction, arguing that, by their verdict, the jury had deleted the only specification by which a murderous assault was said to have been committed. The court was told that the trial judge gave the jury directions as to what, in law, constitutes murder and culpable homicide, before reminding the jury of the evidence of the forensic pathologist, which was that the cause of death was the head injury occasioned by Mr Paradine coming down the stairs at the flat. Accordingly, evidence that the appellant repeatedly kicked, stamped and jumped on the deceased’s body when he was at the bottom of the stairs, while very obviously relevant to assault, as libelled in charge 2, was of no relevance to the “actus reus” of murder or culpable homicide.

On behalf of the appellant it was submitted that the trial judge ought to have declined to accept the verdict, reminded the jury of the relevant directions and asked them to retire and reconsider their verdict, all as submitted to him by senior counsel for the appellant. The trial judge’s refusal to adopt the suggestion of senior counsel for the appellant meant that the basis upon which the appellant was convicted of murder was not made clear, it was argued. Allowing the appeal, the judges held that the deletion of the word “push” from the charge rendered their verdict “self-contradictory”.

‘Miscarriage of Justice’: Delivering the opinion of the court, the Lord Justice Clerk said: “Given the evidence of the forensic pathologist, what was required from the trial judge was a clear direction to the jury that in order for them to convict of either murder or culpable homicide they had to be satisfied that the appellant had committed an assault on the deceased which had caused him to fall down the stairs. “Because the only form of assault which had been suggested in the evidence was a deliberate push, as spoken to by Maryanne Paradine as having been admitted by the appellant, to convict of either murder or culpable homicide the jury therefore had to be satisfied that the appellant had deliberately pushed the deceased and that deliberate push had caused the deceased to fall down the stairs. Only if the jury were so satisfied did the further question arise, whether it had been established that the appellant had the necessary mens rea for murder in the form of a wicked intention to kill or wicked recklessness. For all his quotations from the jury manual, the trial judge did not give such a direction. It may well be that this failure to emphasise the critical importance of the allegation of a push contributed to confusion on the part of the jury as to precisely what required to be proved. At all events, they returned a verdict which we consider is both self-contradictory and inconsistent with the directions that the judge did give. That was apparent at the time the verdict was returned and called for clarification. The trial judge should have taken the course of action urged upon him by senior counsel for the appellant. His failure to do so leaves a verdict from which, taking into account both the evidence and the judge’s charge, the basis of the appellant’s conviction for murder cannot reasonably be discerned. We are satisfied that the result is a miscarriage of justice and the appeal must succeed.”

The court granted authority to bring a new prosecution, following which, at the High Court in Glasgow last month, Goldie was sentenced to six years and nine months’ imprisonment after pleading guilty to the culpable homicide of the deceased.

Freedom of Expression

1) "If liberty means anything at all, it means the right to tell people what they do not want to hear." George Orwell, Animal Farm

2) In R v Central Independent Television plc [1994] Fam 192, 202-203, Hoffmann LJ said that: "A freedom which is restricted to what judges think to be responsible or in the public interest is no freedom. Freedom means the right to publish things which government and judges, however well motivated, think should not be published. It means the right to say things which 'right-thinking people' regard as dangerous or irresponsible. This freedom is subject only to clearly defined exceptions laid down by common law or statute."

3) Sedley LJ in Redmond-Bate v Director of Public Prosecutions (1999) 7 BHRC 375, [20]: "Free speech includes not only the inoffensive but the irritating, the contentious, the eccentric, the heretical, the unwelcome and the provocative. Freedom only to speak inoffensively is not worth having "

4) In R v Shayler [2003] 1 AC 247, [21], Lord Bingham emphasised the connection between freedom of expression and democracy. He observed that 'The fundamental right of free expression has been recognised at common law for very many years' and explained: "The reasons why the right to free expression is regarded as fundamental are familiar, but merit brief restatement in the present context. Modern democratic government means government of the people by the people for the people. But there can be no government by the people if they are ignorant of the issues to be resolved, the arguments for and against different solutions and the facts underlying those arguments. The business of government is not an activity about which only those professionally engaged are entitled to receive information and express opinions. It is, or should be, a participatory process. But there can be no assurance that government is carried out for the people unless the facts are made known, the issues publicly ventilated."

5) Article 10 of the European Convention on Human Rights, also protects freedom of expression. It provides: 1. 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. 2. 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."

6) In Handyside v United Kingdom (1979-80) 1 EHRR 737 the European Court of Human Rights considered an Article 10 challenge by Mr Handyside following his conviction for obscenity. The Court said at [49]: "Freedom of expression constitutes one of the essential foundations of such a society, one of the basic conditions for its progress and for the development of every man. Subject to paragraph 2 of Article 10, it is applicable not only to 'information' or 'ideas' that are favourably received or regarded as inoffensive or as a matter of indifference, but also to those that offend, shock or disturb the State or any sector of the population. Such are the demands of that pluralism, tolerance and broadmindedness without which there is no 'democratic society'. This means, amongst other things, that every 'formality', 'condition', 'restriction' or 'penalty' imposed in this sphere must be proportionate to the legitimate aim pursued."

Indefinite Retention of DNA, Fingerprints/Photo of Convicted Male Breached Article 8

The case Gaughran v. the United Kingdom (application no. 45245/15) concerned a complaint about the indefinite retention of personal data (DNA profile, fingerprints and photograph) of a man who had a spent conviction for driving with excess alcohol in Northern Ireland. In Chamber judgment in the case the European Court of Human Rights held, unanimously, that there had been: a violation of Article 8 (right to respect for private and family life) of the European Convention on Human Rights. The Court underlined that it was not the duration of the retention of data that had been decisive, but the absence of certain safeguards. In the applicant's case his personal data had been retained indefinitely without consideration of the seriousness of his offence, the need for indefinite retention and without any real possibility of review. Noting that the technology being used had been shown to be more sophisticated than that considered by the domestic courts in this case, particularly regarding storage and analysis of photographs, the Court considered that the retention of the applicant's data had failed to strike a fair balance between the competing public and private interests.

Psychoactive Drugs Linked to 95% of Jail's Ambulance Callouts

Jamie Grierson, Guardian: Paramedics were called 200 times in six months to a prison in West Yorkshire to deal with medical incidents linked to drugs like spice, an inspection has revealed. Of 211 ambulance callouts to HMP Wealstun in the six months prior to the October 2019 inspection, about 95% were related to psychoactive substances, Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Prisons (HMIP) found. Nearly 25% of inmates told inspectors they had developed a drug habit since entering the jail, which is a training and resettlement prison designed to prepare prisoners for life after their release. Wealstun prison was one of 10 on which the former prisons minister Rory Stewart staked his future before he was moved to another government department and later stood down as an MP.

The chief inspector of prisons, Peter Clarke, said the widespread availability of drugs at Wealstun – 69% of inmates said it was easy to obtain them – was undermining good work elsewhere in the prison. "The ready availability of illicit drugs undermined much of what the prison was trying to achieve," Clarke said. "Sixty-nine per cent of prisoners told us it was easy to obtain drugs, and nearly a quarter of all prisoners said they had acquired a drug habit since entering the jail – a remarkable figure given the short time that many prisoners stayed there." Wealstun, which holds 820 men, including many short-stay prisoners and a third under the age of 30, was part of the "10 Prisons Project" set up in August 2018 by Stewart, who is running for London mayor as an independent candidate.

The prison was supplied with a body scanner and other technology to help keep drugs out but Clarke said the positive impact of technology and physical security improvements was being compromised by the lack of an effective drugs strategy. "Until such time as there is a comprehensive action plan in place, that not only requires an effective response to intelligence but is also proactive in seeking out incoming supply routes, the harms caused by the ready availability of drugs will not be reduced," Clarke said.

Levels of self-harm have increased six-fold since the last inspection, which Clarke said could be linked to the "excessive" amount of time prisoners spent locked in their cells. Clarke said relationships between staff and prisoners were good, healthcare was good, and living conditions had improved since the last inspection in 2015. He added: "I have little doubt that if the key areas of illicit drug supply and failure to assess risks were to be addressed, Wealstun could recover from the decline in grades since the last inspection, and indeed move on to better serve the needs of its prisoners." Phil Copple, the HM Prison and Probation Service (HMPPS) director general for prisons, said: "The governor and her team are working hard to address the issue of drugs at HMP Wealstun. The new X-ray scanner is bolstering security, and the prison is working closely with the police to catch those responsible. "Since piloting Pava [an incapacitant spray similar to pepper spray], we have improved procedures for its use and improved staff training both locally and as part of the national rollout. More staff have enabled a fuller regime, giving prisoners greater access to work and education programmes."

Imposing Curfew on a Person Subject To Deportation - Unlawful

Imprisonment: The essence of imprisonment is being made to stay in a particular place by another person. The methods which might be used to keep a person there are many and various. They include physical barriers, guards or threats of force or of legal process [24].

In this case there is no doubt that the Secretary of State defined the place where the claimant was to stay between the hours of 11.00 pm and 7.00 am. There was no suggestion that he could go somewhere else during those hours without the Secretary of State's permission [25]. Although the claimant broke his curfew from time to time, this made no difference to his situation while he was obeying it. Like a prisoner who goes absent from an open prison, or a tunneller who successfully escapes from a prison camp, the claimant was not imprisoned while he was away, but he was imprisoned as long as he stayed at home [26].

Although it was physically possible for the claimant to leave, his compliance was enforced and not voluntary. He was wearing an electronic tag which meant that leaving his address would be detected. The monitoring company would then telephone him to find out where he was. He was warned in the clearest possible terms that breaking the curfew could lead to a £5,000 fine or imprisonment for up to six months or both. He was well aware that it could also lead to his being detained again under the 1971 Act. All of this was backed up by the full authority of the State, which was claiming to have the power to do this [27]. This is a case of "classic detention or confinement" [28].

Deprivation of liberty: The ECHR distinguishes between deprivation and mere restriction of physical liberty. Whether there has been a deprivation of liberty depends on a number of factors including the type, duration and effects of the confinement [29]-[30]. In Secretary of State for the Home Department v JJ [2007] UKHL 45, Lord Brown expressed the view that an eight-hour curfew would not amount to a deprivation of liberty for these purposes [32]. Consequently, the Secretary of State argued the curfew in this case would not amount to a deprivation of liberty, and suggested the time had come to align the domestic law of false imprisonment with the concept of deprivation of liberty under the ECHR.

The Supreme Court unanimously declines to do so. Although the common law may develop to meet the changing needs of society, this proposal would not develop the law but make it take a retrograde step. It would restrict the classic understanding of imprisonment at common law to the very different and much more nuanced concept of deprivation of liberty under the ECHR. This approach derives from the need to distinguish under the ECHR between the deprivation and the restriction of physical liberty. There is no need for the common law to draw such a distinction and every reason for the common law to continue to protect those whom is has protected for centuries against unlawful imprisonment, whether by the state or private persons [33]. Accordingly, it is possible for there to be imprisonment at common law without a deprivation of liberty under article 5. It is not necessary to decide whether the converse is true [34].

Obligation of the Prison Service to Allow Access To Computers

Giovanni Di Stefano, A9460CW, HMP Highpoint: The Human Rights Act 1998 Art,6(3)(b) guarantees the right to adequate time and facilities for the preparation of a case. That requirement is much more than a negative obligation to refrain from interference especially when in custody, There remains a Statutory positive obligation on the State to create the appropriate measures to place an accused in custody in a position of parity, In the United Kingdom of Great Britain and N. Ireland but more specifically in England and Wales, the Prison Service are in perpetual violation of their Statutory Duties. Sadly, not many are in a position to take the appropriate steps to rectify such and as a consequence, place themselves in a prejudicial position creating potentially severe miscarriages of justice. Statistically, it is said some 10% of the prison population are subjects of a miscarriage of justice. Taken statistically, it is not much. However, with a prison population of some 85,000, it is frightening to think that 8,500 prisoners are subject to a miscarriage of justice. At an average cost of prisoners at £35,000 per annum, the already overburdened taxpayer contributes some £350,000,000 towards supporting this. With the advent of limited Lega Aid to remedy such that the only manner upon which this anomaly can be addressed is via the Prison and Probation Ombudsman, Decisions made by the said Ombudsman are "binding" on the Prison Service.

One of the most significant controversies in the Prison Service are the use of computers while in prison. There is a paranoia from the Prison Service surrounding access to computers, notwithstanding the fact that for many years we live in a digital age. Gone are the days of yesteryear when the likes of Lord Green then Master of the Rolls rebuked the Governor of Brixton for seizing and suppressing a letter a prisoner had sent to him on toilet paper. Leslie Morro wrote to Lord Green excusing himself for writing on toilet paper, but it was the "only paper available." The Governor seized and suppressed the letter, but in the old fashioned way Mr Morro sent it out as a "stiff", and the Governor was rebuked. Of more importance for today a critical case adjudicated by the Prison and Probation Ombudsman has re-activated the live wire debate on the use of computers. Case N0:82365/2018 a certain Mr T complained about the prison refusing to provide him with stationery and more importantly access to a computer. As a consequence, it was challenging to prepare ongoing litigation. The Prison and Probation Ombudsman found that. under Rule 39 the prison ls obliged to provide writing materials to correspond with his legal advisors and any court. Further, and more importantly, the Prison Service National Security Framework was crystal clear that the prison must provide access to IT for legal work. Anyone having Issue; from Prisons that are not compliant should write to the Prison and Probation Ombudsman citing the above case and requesting intervention. The decision In Case No: 82365/2018 is binding on all prisons and should have been made widely available in all libraries within the prison estate. No doubt a poster could be made and exhibited in all prisons without interference.

British Woman Repeatedly Trafficked for Sex After Home Office Failures

Annie Kelly, Guardian: A young and highly vulnerable British sex trafficking victim was re-trafficked by county lines drug gangs on multiple occasions after the Home Office repeatedly refused to fulfil its legal obligation to provide her with safe accommodation. A high court judge was forced to intervene to compel the Home Office to house the woman, who was about to become street homeless. The 22-year-old has a history of sexual and drug abuse and exploitation and grew up in the care system; she was allegedly sexually abused while in foster care. She has complex physical and mental health issues and has attempted suicide on multiple occasions. As a teenager she fell under the control of county lines gangs who advertised her for sex on escort websites and used her as a drugs mule. She was also forced to commit petty crimes and her social media account was used to advertise sexual services.

In June 2019, she was identified as a potential victim of trafficking by the Home Office. At this point she should have been provided with safe accommodation and mental health support, yet the Home Office failed to find her somewhere safe to stay. Shortly after this she was re-trafficked by criminal gangs and was again forced into prostitution in various locations in London. One month later, the woman was found walking along a motorway in distress by police and was admitted to a mental health facility as an in-patient. When she was deemed fit enough to be discharged, the hospital and her lawyers wrote to the Home Office asking for safe housing to be sourced. Yet despite repeated appeals, she was left at the hospital for a further two months.

On 2 January this year, the Home Office replied to the hospital, saying the woman's complex mental health needs made her a danger to herself and others and that there were no appropriate safe-house places available. Hours before she was due to be discharged on to the street, a high court judge forced the Home Office to act, and 24-hour support was found. "The failure to provide our client with the specialist support and accommodation to which she was legally entitled has had devastating consequences, including her having been repeatedly re-trafficked, sexually assaulted and financially exploited," said Rachael Davis, a solicitor at Duncan Lewis. Our client was recognised as a victim of modern slavery as long ago as June 2019, yet she was not provided with a safe place to live until January 2020 – and only once we had obtained a court order compelling the secretary of state for the home department to do so. It is wholly unacceptable to refuse to provide specialist support and accommodation to a victim of modern slavery because their needs are too complex. Ultimately these are the people who need it the most."

A Home Office spokesperson said: "We do not routinely comment on individual cases. "Modern slavery and human trafficking are barbaric crimes and we remain committed to stamping them out. Our world-leading Modern Slavery Act has given law enforcement the tools they need to tackle this and introduced a maximum life sentence for perpetrators. Our significant reforms to the National Referral Mechanism (NRM) for victims of modern slavery, such as the introduction of new Single Competent Authority and the launch of a digital referral form, ensure victims get the support they need more quickly."

The government has faced persistent criticism that its rhetoric on ending modern slavery in the UK does not match the levels of funding and support offered to victims. Although in 2019 more than 2,000 people were given housing and specialist support through the Victim Care Contract (VCC) – specifically intended to support survivors of modern day slavery – campaigners warn that delays in support and a lack of specialist and safe accommodation is leaving many traumatised victims isolated and vulnerable to re-trafficking.

Other trafficking survivors told the Guardian of serious problems they had encountered in safe house accommodation provided by the government. One woman, who had experienced domestic servitude and sexual violence at the hands of her employer, said she had been placed in a B&B in Dover, where she and other survivors were propositioned by male lorry drivers who believed they were prostitutes. Another woman, who had been forced to be a drugs mule by a criminal gang, said she was placed in a hostel with male victims of forced labour, where she was harassed and had money and possessions stolen. "I was so scared that I stayed in my room all day," she said. "It was like being back in detention."

Brother of Man Who Suffered Notorious Miscarriage of Justice Reiterates Inquiry Call

Scottish Legal News: The brother of a man who spent over a year behind bars in one of Ireland's most notorious miscarriages of justice has called for a new inquiry and a review into the Special Criminal Court. Cormac Breatnach, whose brother Osgur Breatnach was arrested in 1976 in connection with the infamous Sallins train robbery, said special courts "do not enjoy any place in a democracy". Osgur Breatnach is one of three men who were convicted in the Special Criminal Court and sentenced to up to 12 years in prison based on no other evidence than confessions obtained during interrogations where they were allegedly beaten by gardaí. Mr Breatnach and his co-accused Brian McNally were acquitted on appeal in 1980. A third co-accused, Nicky Kelly, had fled after the trial and returned to Ireland only to be jailed until 1984. Sallins case and Special Criminal Court

Sir, – In his letter on the Special Criminal Court (February 14th), the Irish Council for Civil Liberties director Liam Herrick's called for a review of this court. This is in line with Ireland's international legal obligations. The continued use of this non-jury court has been the subject of national and international criticism, including Amnesty International and the UN Human Rights Committee.

The Sallins mail train robbery case, conducted by the Special Criminal Court in 1978, has long been accepted as Ireland's greatest miscarriage of justice of recent times. It remains "unresolved" and the injuries in Garda custody were never satisfactorily explained even by the Court of Criminal Appeal, which overturned the men's convictions. How did it come to pass that three innocent men (including my brother Osgur Breatnach) admitted to a crime they did not commit, ending up with prison sentences totalling 33 years?

The case "involved serious ill-treatment, potentially amounting to torture, of those men while in custody" (ICCL/Amnesty International joint-statement of July 2019). In 2007, nearly 30 years later, Supreme Court judge Adrian Hardiman delivered a paper to the Judicial Studies Institute Journal, entitled "Weasel Words and Doubtful Meanings". (The JSI is a body established pursuant to section 19 of the Court and Court Officers Act, 1995 to organise training, seminars and study visits for the judiciary). In it, he criticised our justice system's failure to learn from the lessons of the past: "Twenty years ago . . . Irish society was gripped by the fate of the Birmingham Six, the Guildford Four and the Maguire Seven . . . the fact is that, during much the same time as these miscarriages of justice were unfolding, so too, in Ireland, was the Sallins mail train robbery case which led to massive settlements and grave damage to the reputation of our policing and criminal justice systems. But we have never, as a country or as a community, internalised the lessons of that event or of the other declared miscarriages of justice which have taken place since . . . wrongful convictions, of which we have had our fair share in modern times, inflict appalling damage on individuals and their families. They also debase the entire criminal justice system".

Patrick McCartan, now a retired judge, was the solicitor who defended the accused in the District and Special Criminal Courts. He described the trial in the non-jury court as "the most serious miscarriage of justice that has occurred in my lifetime" in RTÉ's Documentary On One "The Whistleblower", first broadcast in July 2019. Both the ICCL and Amnesty International reiterated their calls in July 2019 for an independent public inquiry into the Sallins case and the State remains obligated under international human rights treaties it has ratified to guarantee the disclosure of truth, justice and reparations for victims of past human rights violations. Sadly, the Government refuses to act in this case and has ignored the victims' and their families' calls for an apology. Special courts and special powers do not enjoy any place in a democracy. If not abolished, at the very least we need a comprehensive review of the Special Criminal Court, and a commitment to hold an inquiry into the Sallins case. – Yours, etc, Cormac Breatnach, Ashford, Co Wicklow.

Kungurov v. Russia - Refusal of Family Visits Breached Article 13/8

The applicant, Timofey Kungurov, is a Russian national who was born in 1978 and lives in St Petersburg (Russia). The case concerned the authorities' refusal to allow his wife and children to visit him in prison. Mr Kungurov was convicted in November 2016 of conspiracy to commit fraud, sentenced to 18 months in jail and taken to the SIZO-1 remand prison. The following month he asked the trial judge to allow visits from his wife and children, but the judge refused. In a letter to the applicant the judge referred to section 18 of the Defendants' Detention Act, the fact that the applicant's wife was a witness in a criminal case, and that the judgment against him had not yet become final. Nor was there a provision in law for visits to jails by minors. Relying on Article 8 (right to respect for private and family life), the applicant complained about the refusal of the prison visits. Under Article 13 (right to an effective remedy) taken in conjunction with Article 8, he complained that there had been no way to have that refusal reviewed. Violation of Article, Violation of Article 13 taken in conjunction with Article 8. Just satisfaction: EUR 5,000 (non-pecuniary damage) and EUR 250 (costs and expenses).

Pavlova v. Russia Wife Refused Visits to Husband Breached Article 13/8

The applicant, Dina Pavlova, is a Russian national who was born in 1974 and lives in Naberezhnyye Chelny (Russia). The case concerned a ban on her visiting her husband in prison while he was on trial for armed robbery and organised crime. Ms Pavlova made a series of requests to see her husband in a remand prison in Kazan where he had been transferred just before the opening of his trial in October 2010. However, the trial court judge, who, as the authority in charge of the case against her husband, had the discretion under domestic law to grant or refuse prison visits, replied that they would only be granted after judgment in his case. These decisions were upheld by the President of the Supreme Court of Tatarstan, with reference to the particular circumstances of the case, such as the nature of the charges against her husband and the need to ensure safety. Ms Pavlova was allowed to see her husband again in March 2013. Relying on Article 8 (right to respect for private and family life) and Article 13 (right to an effective remedy), Ms Pavlova complained about the restriction on visiting her husband in prison for the entire three and a half years of his trial and the lack of judicial review of the decisions rejecting her applications for prison visits. Violation of Article 8 Violation of Article 13 taken in conjunction with Article 8. Just satisfaction: EUR 5,000 (non-pecuniary damage) and EUR 250 (costs and expenses)

Further Delay to Overdue Review Into Care of Vulnerable Prisoners 'Unacceptable'

Connor Beaton, Scottish Legal News: A further delay to a long-awaited review into the care of vulnerable people in Northern Ireland's prisons has been condemned as "unacceptable". Justice Minister Naomi Long admitted that the Regulation and Quality Improvement Authority (RQIA) had been "unable" to complete the review by March "due to other pressures". The review was first announced in 2016 after a series of deaths in custody and was subsequently passed in December 2018 to the RQIA, which said in September that it expected to report back in March 2020.

Speaking to Irish Legal News, prisons expert Professor Phil Scraton, professor emeritus at Queen's University Belfast School of Law, said the latest delay to the "long-overdue" review raised serious questions for the well-being of prisoners. He highlighted the "damning jury verdict" handed down in Belfast Coroner's Court last Friday in the case of 20-year-old Joseph Rainey, who died in hospital after attempting to take his own life in Hydebank Wood Young Offenders Centre ten days

earlier. Professor Scraton said: "While the causes of death were listed as pneumonia, cerebral hypoxia and hanging, the jury listed six major failures regarding his transfer to prison, reception and committal at Hydebank; three substantial failures in his healthcare interview; six further failures in his care once allocated to his cell; and the institutional failure to respond to matters of concern raised previously by the Prison Ombudsman. While the Northern Ireland Prison Service gave reassurances to the court that the system for processing and monitoring vulnerable prisoners has been significantly overhauled, the evidence of progress presented by NIPS to the court in the absence of the jury was unconvincing." The review is long overdue and its delay raises serious questions regarding the institutional failure in the duty of care necessary for the mental well-being and physical health of all prisoners, but particularly those made vulnerable by their circumstances outside and inside prison."

Ms Long, in a written answer to a question from Gerry Kelly MLA, said she intended to "urgently" discuss the review with Health Minister Robin Swann "with a view to ensuring this work is completed urgently. The Northern Ireland Prison Service and the South Eastern Health and Social Care Trust have "undertaken significant work to keep those who are placed in custody safe". A joint Suicide and Self-Harm Risk Management Strategy and a joint Management of Substance Misuse Strategy are now in place and a new approach to supporting people at risk of Suicide and Self-harm has been introduced. This work has led to an 18 per cent reduction in instances of self-harm across the Prison Service and a 53 per cent reduction among the young men at Hydebank Wood Secure College. Both organisations have also adopted the towards zero suicide approach and a psychiatrist specialising in mental health and addictions issues has been appointed at Maghaberry Prison."

Demonstartion Free Kevan Thakrar - End Solitary Confinement

Monday, March 9, 2020 at 12 Noon – 2.00 Pm Royal College of Psychiatrists, 21 Prescot Street, London, E1 8BB. Demonstrate to mark Kevan Thakrar's 10th year in Close Supervision Centres within the British prison system. Close Supervisions Centres (CSCs) are the most extreme form of imprisonment in the UK, modelled on the 'supermax' prisons in the United States. People held in CSCs are often kept apart from others, allowed out of their cells for only a short time each day and denied basic human contact. Kevan is regularly held in his cell for 23 hours per day and is prevented from speaking with other prisoners. Numerous studies and papers have pointed out the severe damage solitary confinement can cause for those placed in it. As a 2006 paper in Washington University Journal of Law & Policy put it, it has 'long been known that severe restriction of environmental and social stimulation has a profoundly deleterious effect on mental functioning'. To quote from a paper in the Journal of the American Academy of Psychiatry and the Law, 'psychological stressors such as isolation can be as clinically distressing as physical torture'. Enabling Repression: Despite all of this the Royal College of Psychiatrists has accredited some Close Supervision Centres as "Enabling Environments", providing legitimacy to these violent units. Kevan's indefinite isolation clearly contravenes the position of the UN Special Rapporteur on torture. Join us to demand that he is immediately released from the CSC system and that the Royal College of Psychiatrists stops providing a cover for human rights abuses in the prison system.

What You Can Do: If you can't attend the demonstration, please write to the Royal College of Psychiatrists, 21 Prescot Street, London, E1 8BB to object to their accrediation of CSCs as 'Enabling Environments'.Please also write to the Prisons and Probation Ombudsman to express your concern about Kevan's solitary confinement within the CSC and to urge them to respond to his letters. PO Box 70769, London SE1P 4XY (Industrial Workers of the World)

Clean Energy Subsidy Scam - Out of Order

A polygamist with three wives and ten children has told a court that he helped to defraud the US government of nearly $470 million (€434m). The huge sum obtained through a clean energy subsidy scam was allegedly spent on real estate in the US and Turkey and expensive cars including a $1.7 million Bugatti and a golden Ferrari. Jacob Kingston, a member of a breakaway Mormon sect called "The Order", has pleaded guilty in Salt Lake City, Utah to tax fraud, money laundering and conspiracy. However, his co-accused, businessman Lev Dermen, denies all allegations including Mr Kingston's testimony that Mr Dermen masterminded the plot. Lawyers for Mr Dermen said Mr Kingston was entirely to blame because defrauding the government is "what The Order does", The Times reports. Attorney Mark Geragos told the court: "The Order has a term that's called bleeding the beast. Bleeding the beast is defrauding the government. That's the model, that's the ethos, that's the mantra."

Judge Flushes Inmate Complaint About Lack of Toilet Paper

A prisoner who was denied toilet paper for nearly three days apparently suffered no violation of his rights. Three inmates at a prison in the US state of Delaware brought a lawsuit after being forced to use newspaper for two-and-a-half days last August. However, a federal judge dismissed the case, concluding that a lack of toilet paper is unpleasant but not a matter of human rights or the constitution. The lawsuit, brought by Isaac Pierce and two cellmates who subsequently withdrew, was ruled to be frivolous, NBC reports.

Leon Briggs Death: Gross Misconduct Proceedings Against Police Dropped

INQUEST: The Director General of the Independent Office for Police Conduct (IOPC), Michael Lockwood, has given written reasons dated 20 February 2020 for his decision to rescind the IOPC direction for five police officers to face disciplinary action for gross misconduct following the death of Leon Briggs. Bedfordshire Police Force (the Appropriate Authority, AA) asked the IOPC to review and rescind their decision earlier this week. As a result of this turn around, the misconduct hearings will no longer proceed and the officers face no further action.

Leon, a 39 year old father of two from Luton, was detained under the Mental Health Act (section 136) and restrained on the street by police officers. He was then transported to Luton Police Station and placed in a cell where he was further restrained. Leon became unresponsive and an ambulance was called. He was taken to hospital where he was pronounced dead on 4 November 2013. The misconduct hearings had been due to consider allegations against three officers for breaching the standards of professional behaviour in relation to the use of force, and allegations against all five officers for breaching standards relating to 'duties and responsibilities'.

The hearings were listed to start on 3 February but were delayed due to a last minute legal challenge brought by the officers claiming unfairness in the proceedings. This legal challenge was unsuccessful and drew criticism from the court because the officers' representatives withheld vital information. They faced further criticism from the misconduct Chair and Panel for raising additional legal arguments at what should have been the start of the hearings. It was noted by the Chair that such matters should have been addressed beforehand and could be seen to obstruct the hearings which had already lost significant time. In his decision of 20 February, the Director General of the IOPC described these proceedings as 'wholly unmeritorious' and a contributory factor in the inability to complete the misconduct hearing.

On 17 February, two weeks after the hearings were due to commence, the AA requested the IOPC to rescind their decision to direct proceedings. Whilst the IOPC were responsible for

investigating and identifying if officers should face disciplinary action, the AA are responsible for presenting the evidence against the officers. The AA had already indicated that whatever the decision by the IOPC it would offer no evidence against the officers thus rendering the IOPC's decision academic. However, the IOPC's decision was not based on this factor. In the IOPC Director's written decision of 20 February there appears to be an underlying criticism of the approach of the AA to these disciplinary proceedings and a wider concern raised about a lack of clarity between the roles of the AA and IOPC in relation to disclosure.

Another significant factor was delay, the fact that any reconvened hearing could not take place until 2021, eight years after the death. The Director General of the IOPC expressed himself to be 'disturbed by the exclusion of the family from the process' and made a 'finely balanced' decision to rescind its directions to bring disciplinary proceedings against the officers. He said the decision 'weighs heavily on my mind' and it is clear that he felt compelled to do so by the circumstances. The Director General also noted that the decision would have a 'profoundly negative effect upon public confidence in the police complaints system'.

Margaret Briggs, mother of Leon Briggs said: "As a family we are devastated and outraged at this decision. We have spent the last three weeks in a state of limbo waiting for the hearing to start. We cannot understand why the issues raised at this stage were not dealt with earlier. It is over six years since my son's death and to be told that the officers will not face any public scrutiny is further denial of justice and accountability for Leon. It is important not just for us as Leon's family to have answers about what happened that day, but to make sure others don't die in similar circumstances. We have lost all faith in the IOPC and systems that are meant to ensure officer's wrongdoing will not go unchecked especially when it results in the loss of life of a vulnerable man. This decision sends a wider message that officers can act with impunity, a message that should be a cause for concern for everyone."

Jocelyn Cockburn and Gimhani Eriyagolla of Hodge Jones and Allen solicitors said: "One cannot escape the feeling that this disciplinary process was designed to fail. These misconduct hearings were not brought in good faith – the Bedfordshire Police acting as the Appropriate Authority (AA) is not independent of the officers subject to disciplinary proceedings. The conflict of interest is clear. There has been delay at every stage of the investigation and it has been contributed to most recently by the police officers and their representatives raising a legal challenge to prevent the hearings going ahead and thereby to frustrate justice. The conclusion that there has been a failure to ensure the integrity and independence of the misconduct process is inescapable. Yet again this family has been seriously let down by a system which appears to be weighted in favour of protecting the police rather than serving the interests of justice. The impact of this dysfunctional system on a bereaved family should not be underestimated and the disciplinary system, particularly as it relates to death in custody, should be urgently reviewed."

Anita Sharma, Head of Casework at INQUEST said: "It is deplorable that this disciplinary hearing has been stopped before it even started. The fact that no officer will be held to account for potential wrongdoing demonstrates the inadequacy of the police complaints process and ineffectiveness of the IOPC. The lack of independence is startling in a flawed system which allows a force to decide whether or not to present a case against its own officers. The obstructive actions of the police and their representatives from the outset significantly contributed to the excessive delays and creates a culture of impunity. Through no fault of their own, bereaved families are being consistently failed and traumatised by this faux system of 'accountability'. There must now be a radical overhaul of the complaint process to ensure no officer is beyond reproach." The inquest into the death of Leon Briggs is to be held in January 2021.

Inquest Into Death of IPP Prisoner Charlotte Nokes at HMP Peterborough Opens

INQUEST: Charlotte Nokes was 38 when she died at HMP Peterborough, a private prison run by Sodexo. In the morning of 23 July 2016 she was found unresponsive in her cell and was pronounced dead at 8.55am. The inquest into her death opens on Monday 24 February at Huntingdon Town Hall. Despite being sentenced to a minimum term of 15 months, Charlotte had been in prison for over eight and a half years at the time of her death on an indefinite 'Imprisonment for Public Protection' (IPP) sentence. IPP sentences were abolished by the Government in 2012 for new prisoners but remain in place for those sentenced prior to this date. Her family say she felt she would never be released from prison and she described the IPP sentence as a death sentence. It is understood that Charlotte is one of four women to have died in a women's prison whilst serving an IPP sentence.

Charlotte was born in Hayling Island in Hampshire. Known to her family as Charlie or Lottie, they described her as funny, intelligent, charismatic and creative. Charlotte was also an incredibly talented artist. Her artwork was supported by charities such as the Michael Varah Memorial Fund and the charity Women in Prison. Her art was exhibited by the Koestler Trust, a charity which helps people who have spent time in prison, immigration detention and mental health settings to express themselves creatively. Charlotte's dream was to live in London and study art. Charlotte had mental and physical health diagnoses including borderline personality disorder and Premenstrual Dysphoric Disorder (PMDD, a severe form of premenstrual syndrome). In the months leading up to her death, Charlotte was prescribed heavy doses of medication to treat her mental and physical health that left often appearing heavily sedated. She was under suicide and self-harm monitoring procedures (known as ACCT) at the time of her death. Her family hope the inquest will explore the following issues: the cause of Charlotte's death; the treatment of Charlotte's mental health in HMP Peterborough, including the monitoring of the impact of the drugs she was prescribed on her physical health; the use of segregation in HMP Peterborough.

Krebs v. Germany - Found Guilty of a Crime Without a Trial Breach of Article 6

The applicant, Reiner Krebs, is a German national who was born in 1979. The case concerned his complaint that a court hearing his appeal against sentence in one case declared him guilty of crimes in further pending criminal proceedings. Mr Krebs was found guilty in August 2010 of fraud and forgery after ordering documents and services through the Internet under a false name and using someone else's bank account details for payment. He was given a prison sentence of 10 months, with no suspension on probation. On appeal against the sentence, the Weiden Regional Court held hearings. In one of them, the court heard testimony from a police officer who was investigating new charges of fraud against the applicant, allegedly committed after his first sentence. The appeal court upheld the 10-month sentence with no probation, stating in particular that it was convinced of Mr Krebs's guilt of the further offences the police were investigating. Mr Krebs appealed on points of law, arguing that the Regional Court had breached his right to be presumed innocent. His appeal was unsuccessful, as was a complaint about being denied the right to be heard. He was convicted in August 2012 on further counts of fraud and forgery and given a global sentence of one year and six months' imprisonment for both sets of crimes. In July 2013 the Federal Constitutional Court declined to consider a complaint by the applicant about his initial 10-month sentence. Relying in particular on Article 6 § 2 (presumption of innocence), the applicant complained about the Regional Court's statements on his being guilty of further offences of fraud. Violation of Article 6 § 2

Just satisfaction: EUR 5,000 non-pecuniary damage and EUR 3,750 costs/expenses

Y v. Bulgaria - Rape Investigation Dragged - Violation of Article 3 & 8

The applicant, Ms Y, is a Bulgarian national who was born in 1964 and lives in Haskovo (Bulgaria). The case concerns the authorities' efforts to investigate the applicant's allegations of rape and, in particular, whether they had failed to follow an obvious line of inquiry revealed by DNA evidence. Ms Y alleges that she was raped on the outskirts of Sofia on 10 July 2013 when on a trip to see a friend. She called the police and an investigation was opened straight away. The police collected physical evidence from both the scene of the rape and the applicant (clothes and swabs). She was rapidly given a medical examination, which confirmed non-consensual vaginal penetration. She was formally interviewed the next morning and gave a description of her alleged assailant, which enabled the police to identify a potential suspect, Mr X, a man who lived in lodgings a few hundred metres from the scene of the rape. She then picked him out in an identity parade. Mr X denied being the assailant however, maintaining that he had been at home in his lodgings at the time of the assault.Five months later the results of the DNA tests threw up a second potential suspect, Mr Z, a construction worker who also lived near the rape scene. The investigator questioned Mr Z who denied having any sexual contact with the applicant. The prosecuting authorities decided to suspend the investigation in 2016 and then again in 2018, finding that although the applicant's allegations of rape were credible, it was impossible to identify the assailant or to establish with any degree of certainty that an offence had been committed. They cast doubt in particular over her identification of Mr X as she had eyesight problems and found that, in any case, he had an alibi which had been corroborated by his partner, a friend and his lodging's caretaker. Nor was there any physical evidence putting him at the scene of the rape. DNA traces from the applicant's briefs had, on the other hand, been recovered which belonged to Mr Z, but that was not sufficient evidence to implicate him as the applicant had not named him as her assailant. In 2019 the applicant sought judicial review of the decision to suspend the investigation, without success. The applicant complained that the investigation into the rape had been dragging on since July 2013 without the authorities identifying or bringing to justice her assailant. The Court examined the case under Article 3 (prohibition of inhuman or degrading treatment) and Article 8 (right to respect for private life). Violation of Article 3 Violation of Article 8. Just satisfaction: EUR 7,000 for non-pecuniary damage

HMYOI Cookham Wood - Not Safe for Children - Serious Levels of Violence

The prison holds up to 188 boys aged between 15 and 18, was found to be insufficiently good in all four of HM Inspectorate's healthy prison tests. These assessments in September 2019 included a deterioration in the 'care' test, from reasonably good in December 2018. The assessments for safety, purposeful activity and resettlement remained the same year on year. However, Peter Clarke, HMCIP, said: "Despite these disappointing verdicts, local managers sought to provide some context in terms of their frustration at being unable to recruit and retain sufficient staff. New recruitment initiatives were underway and there was some hope that the impending closure of the adjacent Medway Secure Training Centre (STC) would lead to an influx of transferred staff in the new year. Staff shortages, however, could not have come at a worse time as the institution was running near capacity as children were diverted away from Feltham A YOI, as that institution responded to the Urgent Notification we issued to it earlier in 2019."

Cookham Wood was still not safe enough. Children were received into the institution reasonably well and levels of self-harm were lower than at comparable prisons. However, levels of violence, some of which was serious, remained high. "Work was in place to resolve conflict, supported by a comprehensive behaviour management strategy, but much of this was impeded by the shortage or regular re-deployment of staff. In addition, too much low-level poor behaviour went unchallenged and too little was done to encourage fuller engagement among children." Safety was further undermined by overreliance on 'keep apart' lists, which hindered a full and smoothly-run daily regime, and by significant amounts of lock-up.

Use of force by staff had increased and was high, and more than half of incidents required the full deployment of restraint techniques. Children could also find themselves segregated on at least two units, Bridge and Phoenix, or on normal location. "The purpose of these units required clarification and the regime for children on them was too limited, despite the attention of caring and supportive staff," Mr Clarke said. The YOI was modern but the upkeep was poor. Relationships between staff and children generally were not good enough. Barely two-thirds of children felt respected and staff rarely had sufficient time to engage meaningfully with them.

Inspectors found 28% of children locked in cell during the school day, with most accessing just five hours a day out of cell during the week and two hours at weekends. Access to the gym and library was restricted. Despite some improvements in provision, punctuality and attendance at education and vocational training were poor. Oversight of resettlement work was similarly disappointing, lacking focus and coordination. Release on temporary licence (ROTL) assessments and public protection work were not sufficiently robust and just a quarter of children said they thought someone was helping them with their release. "The lack of suitable accommodation for children being released was very concerning," Mr Clarke added. However, a "family therapist" project to support children's family ties was identified good practice.

Life Imprisonment: Where a life sentence prisoner receives a further sentence for offences committed having been released on life licence, they must serve the custodial part of any new sentence that is imposed by the courts. Where the offender is assessed to be a risk to the public, they will also be recalled to custody on their life sentence and will remain in prison for as long as the independent Parole Board considers their detention necessary for the protection of the public. The Board will take into account any further offending that was committed in their determination. Where an offender receives a second murder conviction, Schedule 21 to the Criminal Justice Act 2003 provides for a starting point of a 'Whole-life Order'. That is the most severe punishment available to the courts and means the offender will never be released on licence. It is also open to the courts to impose a whole-life order in other circumstances if they decide that it is warranted by the seriousness of the offence.The Government has brought forward measures to make sure that serious and dangerous offenders, including terrorists, will serve longer in prison to help keep the public safe. We intend to publish a White Paper on sentencing reform that will include further measures to ensure that the most serious violent and sexual offenders spend the time in prison that matches the severity of their crimes. Lucy Frazer Minister of Justice

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.