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 784 (11/03/2020) - Cost £1

50% of Suspects in Police Custody Don't Request Free Legal Advice

Penelope Gibbs, Justice Gap: Anyone arrested by the police is entitled to free legal advice at and before interview. The access to free advice is not means-tested, though people can privately pay for a lawyer if they want. The stakes for the suspect are high. After they are arrested and detained they will be interviewed under caution and a decision will be made as to charge, as to whether to grant bail or whether to release under investigation. Some suspects walk free, though there is nothing to stop the police asking them back for a voluntary interview. Some people go straight from police custody to prison without even going to court – they can be remanded by the police then convicted or remanded in custody via a video link to a magistrates' court. All these outcomes could be influenced by whether you have legal advice in police custody.

But new research from Dr Vicky Kemp (Criminal Law Review 2020.2) suggests that too few people are taking up the offer of free legal advice and suggests why not. There is no routinely collated and published data on how many suspects get legal advice but extensive FOI requests by Dr Kemp suggest that only 56% of those detained requested legal advice. Previous research suggests that a much lower percentage of people actually receive advice since people change their minds. Dr Kemp has designed an app to increase awareness of people's legal rights on arrest. In testing this, she has discovered much more about why people look the gift horse of free legal advice in the mouth.

The most important reason is that people think they don't need legal advice – that it won't make any difference to their outcome. Its pretty alarming to read how unaware people are about the complexity of the law and the challenge of defending your legal rights. Understanding of the basics is woeful. Some people thought you only needed a lawyer if you were guilty, others only if you were innocent. 'I haven't had a solicitor because I don't need one, I haven't done anything wrong. I can see why someone would want a solicitor if they were guilty, but not if they haven't done anything.' (G.14) 'I don't want a solicitor because I'm guilty. If I wasn't guilty I'd have one.' (K.44)

Unfortunately both are wrong. You need a lawyer to help prove your innocence and, even if you did whatever you are accused of, you may have a viable legal defence which means you are not guilty. Few non lawyers understand what a viable legal defence might be. Some suspects said they would get legal advice if it was a serious offence, or for the court hearing if they ended up being prosecuted. Again the suspects were acting against their own interests. A lawyer or representative in a custody suite can sometimes persuade the police to use an out of court disposal or to divert altogether – meaning the accused avoids court and/or a criminal record.

If those detained in policy custody turn down the offer of a lawyer to come to the station in person, they should automatically be offered the opportunity to speak to a lawyer on the phone. This is so that the suspect can get some, rather than no, legal advice. If they speak to a lawyer on the phone they can then change their mind about getting legal advice in person. But Dr Kemp found this just didn't happen – that suspects were not offered this crucial phone call. A minority of those who said they didn't want legal advice said they feared it would lead to more time in custody. Suspects do indeed spend a really long time in custody – in the two custody suites analysed by Dr Kemp the average wait was 17 hours, up from just over nine hours in 2009. No-one likes the experience of waiting in a custody cell. It is uncomfortable and there is nothing to do. It is not surprising so many suspects try to self harm, or get angry or, in desperation to get out, turn down or give up on legal advice.

It is questionable whether getting legal advice does add much to the considerable time suspects spend in custody. But that is the strong perception: 'The last time I was here for 20 hours and it was all because the solicitor was delayed. If I hadn't asked for one I'd have been out the same day. I don't need a solicitor because I know what's happening.' (G.14). Dr Vicky Kemp heard from some suspects that the police themselves dissuade suspects from seeking legal advice because of potential delay some respondents said they were told by the police that they would be dealt with more quickly if they declined legal advice. This respondent said, 'they brought me in at 2am and I was told I'd be dealt with by 8am, so I didn't bother having a solicitor. It's now 12 hours later and I still haven't been interviewed' (K.66).

The delays in getting a lawyer to the custody suite have been exacerbated by the introduction of a standalone call centre to deal with duty lawyer requests. In the past the police would have a list of duty solicitors and would call them direct. Now they are forced to put the request though the Duty Solicitor Call Centre, which is run by a private provider. The whole system has gone into meltdown more than once recently, meaning that no calls have got through and suspects who wanted legal advice have been interviewed without any. Even on a good day the DSCC has few fans. Police and solicitors' firms say it was more straightforward and quicker using the old system.

Those giving legal advice in the police station are poorly paid and this means they need to focus their efforts on turning up for the police interview. They cannot afford to hang around outside or in the police station waiting for the police interviewing team to be ready (though they do sometimes ending up doing this). So the police call when they are ready and then the lawyer sets off from home/the office. Lawyers don't want to keep clients waiting but the scheduling seldom seems to work smoothly. No wonder suspects don't bother.People complain about cuts to legal aid but good lawyers are available to give legal advice free to anyone arrested by the police. So its such a pity that so many eschew legal advice. We need to eliminate the actual and perceived delays in getting a lawyer to turn up, to use 'nudge' strategy to get people to accept the gift horse and we need better public legal education so everyone understands the important of legal advice.

UN Warns of Rise of 'Cybertorture' To Bypass Physical Ban

Owen Bowcott, Guardian: Psychological torture is being exploited by states to circumvent the more widely understood ban on physically inflicting pain and may open the way to a future of "cybertorture", the UN torture rapporteur has said. Nils Melzer, professor of international law at the University of Glasgow and the UN's special rapporteur on torture and other cruel, inhumane or degrading treatment or punishment, is cautioning that the internet could be used systematically to target individuals remotely – through "intimidation, harassment, surveillance, public shaming and defamation". A trenchant critic of the UK government's failure to hold an inquiry into the rendition of jihadi suspects post-9/11, Melzer has also voiced concerns over Britain's treatment of the WikiLeaks founder Julian Assange in Belmarsh prison.

Later this month the professor, who is Swiss, will present a report to the UN human rights council in Geneva highlighting his concern over "continuing development of psychological tortures and legal misconceptions about what conduct is prohibited by international treaty". His comments coincide with the UK release of a documentary, Eminent Monsters: A Manual for Modern Torture, which investigates covert CIA funding in the 1950s of techniques developed

by the Scottish-born psychiatrist Dr Ewen Cameron. The documentary, directed by the Bafta-winning film-maker Stephen Bennett, shows how patients were subjected to sensory deprivation, forced comas, LSD injections, and extreme physical and mental torture at a Canadian research establishment run by Cameron. Those techniques, the documentary claims, were forerunners of methods used on the so-called "hooded men" who were subjected to white noise, put in stress positions, threatened and deprived of sleep, food and water, and beaten after being arrested during internment in Northern Ireland in 1971. Similar techniques were later inflicted by US forces on jihadi suspects detained in Guantánamo Bay.

In a 2018 judgment after the hooded men case was reopened, the European court of human rights reaffirmed that abuse of the 14 men almost 50 years before amounted to inhumane and degrading treatment, but did not constitute torture. That distinction, Melzer argues, is wrong. "Judges think that physical torture is more serious than cruel, inhumane or degrading treatment," he told the Guardian. "Torture is simply the deliberate instrumentalisation of pain and suffering." Consequently psychological torture methods are often used "to circumvent the ban on torture because they don't leave any visible marks".

In his UN report, Melzer points out that many countries "deny, neglect, misinterpret or trivialise psychological torture as what could be euphemistically described as 'torture light', whereas 'real torture' is still predominantly understood to require the infliction of physical pain or suffering. "Some states have even adopted national definitions of torture excluding mental pain or suffering, or interpretations requiring that in order to constitute torture, mental pain or suffering must be caused by the threat or infliction of physical pain or suffering, threats of imminent death, or profound mental disruption."

Many countries have invested "significant resources towards developing methods of torture which can achieve purposes of coercion, intimidation, punishment, humiliation or discrimination without causing readily identifiable physical harm or traces", Melzer states. "Some of these approaches have resurfaced most prominently in connection with interrogational torture in the context of counter-terrorism, 'deterrence'-based detention of irregular migrants, alleged mass-internment for purposes of political 're-education', and the abuse of individual prisoners of conscience." An alarming development that Melzer contemplates is "cybertorture". States, corporate actors and organised criminals, he says, "not only have the capacity to conduct cyber-operations inflicting severe suffering on countless individuals, but may well decide to do so for any of the purposes of torture.

"Cybertechnology can also be used to inflict, or contribute to, severe mental suffering while avoiding the conduit of the physical body, most notably through intimidation, harassment, surveillance, public shaming and defamation, as well as appropriation, deletion or manipulation of information. Already harassment in comparatively limited environments can expose targeted individuals to extremely elevated and prolonged levels of anxiety, stress, social isolation and depression, and significantly increases the risk of suicide. Arguably, therefore, much more systematic, government-sponsored threats and harassment delivered through cybertechnologies not only entail a situation of effective powerlessness, but may well inflict levels of anxiety, stress, shame and guilt amounting to 'severe mental suffering' as required for a finding of torture." In his UN report Melzer pays tribute to Eminent Monsters for showing "the origins and devastating effects of contemporary psychological torture". Such experiments, he added, should be prevented in future. Of the UK government's decision last year not to hold a judicial inquiry into post-9/11 rendition, Melzer told the Guardian: "I'm very worried. The convention against torture requires it. That refusal sets an example that we don't really have to investigate and prosecute."

'Misconceived': ECtHR Chief Hits Back At Lord Sumption Over Rights

[In a lecture delivered on the 20th of November, Lord Sumption, the United Kingdom Supreme Court judge, mounted a direct attack on the legitimacy of the European Court of Human Rights. The Strasbourg Court, he claimed, makes new law by continuously expanding the scope of the rights protected under the European Convention on Human Rights (ECHR).]

Now is a dangerous time to roll back judicial power, the vice president of the European Court of Human Rights has said in a public rebuff to Lord Sumption's high profile criticism of 'law's expanding empire'. Robert Spano, vice president of the Strasbourg court, inaugurated the Bonavero Institute's annual human rights lecture last week with a challenge to what he called the 'more-politics-less law' thesis set out in Lord Sumption's BBC Reith Lectures and book Trials of the State - Law and the Decline of Politics. Such a view 'seems to me an overly idealised view of politics' Spano said. Meanwhile, Sumption's description of judicial processes in human rights cases 'is to some extent misconceived'. Spano rebutted Lord Sumption's assertion that the Strasbourg court had 'invented rights' and 'interfered with national political processes in a manner which undermines democracy'. Sumption's criticism of the creeping scope of the Article 8 right to family and private life was itself a process of extrapolation, Spano said.

The Icelandic judge stressed that he was not equipped to comment on the UK political or legal system. But, with 'nationalism, tribalism, dislocation, fears of social change and the distrust of outsiders' on the rise, he asked: 'Is this really the time in European history to place our bet on more politics and less law? To entrust our destiny to the existence of good faith in the political process and argue in favour of limiting the review powers of independent and impartial judges?' 'With respect. Lord Sumption's more politics-less-law thesis manifests it seems to me an overly idealised view of politics, a view removed from the realities of every day hardships which, when they engender disputes, require resolution by independent and impartial courts, applying methods of principle,' he said. Overall, Lord Sumption underestimates the value of human rights law in legitimising public outcomes in a democracy,' he said. 'Together law and politics should seek to work hand in hand in creating stability and a humane society which respects rights and human dignity.' *Law Gazette:*

Police Breached Rights of Derry Man Stopped and Searched 150 Times

Irish News: Police breached the rights of a Derry man repeatedly stopped and searched under anti-terrorism legislation, the Court of Appeal has ruled. Senior judges identified failures in recording the basis for the actions taken against Steven Ramsey. The former member of the 32 County Sovereignty Movement may now sue the Chief Constable for damages, his lawyer said. Mr Ramsey (41) went to court claiming his right to privacy was breached by powers used to detain him without justification by any suspected dissident republican associations. He has stated that he does not belong to any illegal organisation or political party and has no convictions for paramilitary activity.

His challenge centred on stop and search actions carried out under the Justice and Security (NI) Act 2007. According to Mr Ramsey's lawyers there were more than 150 incidents between 2009 and 2013. Notes from some of the searches indicated that he was stopped due to "suspected dissident republican links" or "as a result of confidential briefings". But proceedings issued against the Chief Constable and Secretary of State only focused on seven incidents after a code of practice was introduced in 2013. The applicant, from Derry's Creggan area, argued that the power to detain him contravened Article 8 of the European Convention on Human Rights.

In 2018 the High Court found that PSNI failures to record the grounds for searches under scrutiny were inconsistent with a code of practice. But a judge dismissed the challenge after deciding the

evidence established there had been a basis for each incident. Appealing that ruling, counsel for Mr Ramsey insisted the stop and search authority is not subject to adequate legal protections and amounted to harassment. She submitted that it amounted to an arbitrary power used more than necessary.

The court heard that being categorised as a dissident republican, through not supporting the Good Friday Agreement, was not enough reason for the action taken against him. Concerns must relate to any suspected munitions or wireless apparatus, it was contended. Appeal judges concluded that the scheme as a whole contains sufficient safeguards to protect the individual against arbitrary interference.

Police are required, however, to identify the basis for exercising the power. There was a breach of Article 8 in the searches carried out on Mr Ramsey due to the failure to record the basis for the action at the time or shortly afterwards, the court confirmed. Following the ruling Mr Ramsey's solicitor, Fearghal Shiels of Madden & Finucane, said the recording requirement was regarded as critical for monitoring and supervision of the powers. "In Mr Ramsey's case, the PSNI effectively ceased subjecting him to stop and search once he brought these proceedings in the High Court and officers were required to submit sworn evidence to the court," Mr Shiels said. "His position in bringing these proceedings has been totally vindicated by today's decision, and he will now be advised in relation to an action for damages against the Chief Constable."

Life Imprisonment: 'Whole-life Order'

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.

Serco: Rewarding Failure?

Alice Troy-Donovan, Justice Gap: Serco has been awarded a £200 million contract by the Home Office to manage two immigration removal centres despite years of abuse and fraud-related scandals associated with the company. Bail for Immigration Detainees considers the pervasiveness of the profit motive in the operation of detention centres deeply troubling. Vast portions of the UK's immigration enforcement system have become big business, outsourced to unaccountable institutions that seek to drive down costs to the detriment of those subject to immigration control, and in particular our clients in immigration detention. The private firm Mitie secured its largest contract ever in 2017 from the Home Office, worth an eye-watering £525 million, for 'escorting' services (code for forcibly removing detainees to detention centres

and onto deportation flights). There is a lack of public scrutiny regarding how these contracts operate, as private companies are not open to Freedom of Information Requests and their contracts with government are subject to 'commercial confidentiality'.

Serco, which works for 20 governments worldwide but receives 40% of its business from contracts running UK public services, was awarded the contract after its fellow outsourcing company G4S announced in late 2019 that it would not be bidding; G4S has come under serious criticism from MPs and campaigning groups for its mismanagement of the two centres, Tinsley House and Brook House, after a 2017 Panorama documentary revealed a culture of abuse amongst staff there. The Home Office says the Serco contract 'includes ambitious plans to improve the two centres in Gatwick' and represents 'further steps to modernise the immigration detention estate'. However, Serco's existing track-record running Yarl's Wood, a detention centre located in Bedfordshire, has been rife with controversy: numerous allegations of sexual abuse by guards have been lodged by detainees over the past decade; a report by the charity Women for Refugee Women in 2014 found that 38 women interviewed had been seen by male guards while they were naked. The issue is not limited to contracts agreed with the UK government: Serco's running of Australia's offshore processing centre for migrants since 2009 has attracted numerous reports of staff brutality, including beatings, as well as instances of suicide and self-harm by detainees.

Allegations of abuse by Serco staff at Yarl's Wood culminated in a highly critical report by HM Inspectorate of Prisons in 2015. Concerns over the vulnerability of detainees persist and allegations of ill-treatment by detainees have not abated: in February 2018, over 100 migrant women detained at Yarl's Wood went on hunger strike in protest against their detention and treatment by staff. Serco denied that the strike was happening. Moreover, just this month, a Yarl's Wood detainee was cleared of charges of assault against Serco staff who were using force to put her on a chartered flight (it was later established that her removal directions had already been cancelled). During the court hearing witnesses described how the woman was thrown onto the ground 'like a bag of cement' during the incident, which involved 11 guards employed by Serco.

The company's management of other public services contracts has attracted controversy. Serco was fined £6.8 million for various failings in housing asylum-seekers (though the Home Office still decided to renew its contract for this work in June 2019); in 2013, Serco was investigated along with G4S by the Serious Fraud Office for over-billing the Ministry of Justice on its electronic tagging contracts. It was found that some of the tags they charged for did not exist – but the company got away without any convictions after agreeing to repay £68 million to the government. An additional financial penalty of £19.2 million was paid by Serco for fraud and false accounting. Outsourcing throws up additional barriers to ensuring accountability. It is the Home Office that is ultimately responsible as the detaining authority, but when mistreatment or abuse is alleged it becomes unclear whether it is the state or the sub-contractor that is responsible. A series of scandals, most notably BBC Panorama's revelations in 2017, raise the question of whether the Home Office has the capacity to effectively monitor the operation of these contracts.

A report by the United Nations working group on the use of private military and security companies examined the use of private security providers in places of deprivation of liberty, including immigration-related detention facilities. The report found that 'the profit motives of private security operators often override human rights considerations' and that outsourcing leads to situations 'in which human rights violations are likely to be committed with impunity against those deprived of their liberty, with little or no recourse to effective remedies for the victims'. However, none of this is to say that immigration detention presided over by a different body would be acceptable. There are specific problems with the outsourcing of incarceration but fundamentally all immigration detention must be ended.

Automatic Early Release of Terrorists Ends

Ministry of Justice : The automatic early release of terrorist offenders has ended as emergency legislation to ensure the public is protected received Royal Assent. Terrorist offenders must serve at least two-thirds of their sentence behind bars before being considered by the Parole Board The urgent measures – introduced by Justice Secretary Robert Buckland QC MP, following the Streatham attack – received substantial support across Parliament, making sure the new law is on the statute book as quickly as possible. The move will mean terrorist offenders cannot be released before the end of their sentence without a risk assessment by the Parole Board. It will end the current automatic half-way release for terrorist offenders who receive standard determinate sentences, forcing them to spend a minimum of two-thirds of their term behind bars. It will apply to offenders sentenced for crimes such as training for terrorism, membership of a proscribed organisation, and the dissemination of terrorist publications. It will mean around 50 terrorist prisoners already serving sentences will see their automatic early release blocked.

Justice Secretary and Lord Chancellor Robert Buckland said: No terrorist should be released early only to kill and maim on our streets. Protecting the public is Government's first duty and our message is clear – enough is enough. Terrorist offenders will only be released before the end of their sentence if the independent Parole Board is satisfied they no longer pose a threat, and they will face the strictest possible conditions and monitoring upon release. In addition all terrorist offenders will be subject to robust safeguards upon release, which could include notification requirements, restrictions on travel and communications, and imposed curfews.

The new legislation follows a package of measures announced following the horrific attack at Fishmonger's Hall in November, which included: Tougher sentences for the most serious terrorist offenders, keeping terrorists locked up for longer and ending early release. Major overhaul of prisons and probation includes tougher monitoring conditions and doubling of counter-terrorism probation officers. Counter-Terrorism Police funding to be increased by £90 million for 2020 to 2021. Review of support for victims of terrorism, including immediate £500,000 to the Victims of Terrorism Unit. In addition, the Government is reviewing the current maximum penalties and sentencing framework for terrorist offences, on the underlying principle that terrorist offenders should no longer be released until the Parole Board is satisfied that they are no longer a risk to the public. [Ends]

Note this legislation does not apply to Northern Ireland, where there are a large number of people serving prison sentences for acts of 'Terrorism'. Viscount Younger of Leckie: Made a statement in Parliament on the 26th February 2020, he said: The threat from dissident republican terrorism continues to be Severe in Northern Ireland. This Government's first priority is to keep peoplesafe and secure right across the United Kingdom.Vigilance against this continuing threat is essential and we remain determined to ensure that terrorism never succeeds.[Ends]

Northern Ireland: Since 1968, there have been over 3,000 deaths attributed to 'Terrorism'. Many of these acts of 'Terrorism' were committed by members of the British Army, and the Police Service of Northern Ireland, often in collusion with each other. The Ulster Defence Army (UDA) and Ulster Defence Regiment (UDR), both Protestant supremacist organisations, are believed to have been the main perpetrators of these acts of 'Terrorism' and again well documented there was repeated collusion with the Police Service of Northern Ireland Acts of 'Terrorism' are a daily occurrence in Northern Ireland; people burned out of there homes, shots fired into homes, severe beatings and Kneecappings. Viable explosive devices placed outside homes and under police and army vehicles. Since the 'Good Friday' agreement, Since the 'Good Friday' agreement, which was supposed to have stopped there have been over 200, 'Terrorist' killings. Does anyone know why, this new legislation, does not apply to Northern Ireland?

Bad Law: Consequences & Recommendations by Terry G.M. Smith

As we enter a New Year of a New Decade of 2020, it is incumbent upon us to look back over the last decade and beyond to explore and examine the most prevailing and momentous flaws to emerge from the illustrious portals of the Houses of Parliament and, indeed, the Criminal Justice System. For instance, our aim is to identify, consider and drill-down into how these contentious laws and "doctrines" come into existence and what effect it has had upon the public weal.

There is little doubt that the Crown Prosecution Service has had more than its fair share of legal problems and headaches laid at its door. But it must be emphasised, most of these have been of their own making in their relentless push to maintain and sustain high conviction rates in the courts. But, by far, the most deplorable and disturbing examples over the last decade and beyond are the twin towers in the judicial and legislative world, the legal concepts of Joint Enterprise and the Indeterminate Sentence for Public Protection, otherwise known as IPP.

It is not fanciful to suggest that both Joint Enterprise and the sentencing policy of IPP have become an untreated boil on the face of the British criminal justice system and in order to lance and disinfect that boil we have-to travel back in time and consider another legal landmark decision in the 12th century, where on the 15 June 1215, rebel barons forced King John to meet them at Runnymede. The barons did not trust the king, so he was not allowed to leave Runnymede until his seal was attached to the legal document in front of him, famously known as the Magna Carta. We learn out of 63 Clauses given royal assent; one clause stands out as key to the legal concept of Joint Enterprise today. Inasmuch as Clause 39, states: "No free man shall be seized or imprisoned or stripped of his rights or possessions ... except by the lawful judgement of his equals or by the law of the land ". [emphasis added].

Fast forward to the present day, and we learn from the eminent jurist, Giovanni Di Stefano that the legal concept of Joint Enterprise has not been formally endorsed or validated by legislators at Parliament, where it is patently clear, laws and "doctrines" of this significance and calibre are compiled, checked and ratified. Di Stefano emphatically posits that Joint Enterprise is no more than a judge-made "doctrine" or "principle" that has been elevated to the status of binding precedent over the centuries and sadly, used to terrible effect on the populace, usually black and mixed-race youths.

In fact for the record history tells us that Joint Enterprise was initially designed and created by judges over 300 years ago in the 171h century to deter those from duelling over matters of pride and principle on the luscious green commons of England and elsewhere, as the so-called, well-to-do were losing their fathers, uncles and sons in droves. Something had to be done to stop this senseless slaughter of the blue-bloodied aristocracy. A rudimentary form of Joint Enterprise was rapidly introduced as there was no time to run it past the parliamentarians so that the authorities were able to arrest and prosecute the spectators to these events as well as the participants.

Perhaps the best-known case of Joint Enterprise was that of Derek Bentley where the "doctrine" was used to convict and hang Bentley for the shooting of a police officer in 1952. Bentley did not pull the trigger but was convicted on the disputed words: "Let him have it". The Court of Appeal in 1998 quashed the conviction of Derek Bentley, but it was 46, years too late to save his life. As Di Stefano proclaims: "The quashing of the Derek Bentley conviction in 1998 should have sent warning signals to the judiciary on the dangers of joint enterprise".

More recently, in 2010, under the Joint Enterprise "doctrine", 17 youths were convicted on various charges relating to the murder of 15-year-old Sofyen Belamouadden at Victoria Station in central London. You would think one of the counsels defending the 17 youths would have researched the "statutory criteria" of Joint Enterprise before the trial and raised objec-

tions as to the correctness of the law? But still, Joint Enterprise trundled on and on and convicted all those that stood in its way.

What is more, it is advanced, judges over time had developed the common sense doctrinal set of beliefs into what can only be described as feral law. This is plainly observed by Tom Bingham the former Lord Chief Justice in his book: "The Rule of Law" where he clearly · defines the role of the judiciary and law: "The judges may not develop the law to create new criminal offences or widening existing offences to make punishable conduct of the type hitherto not subject to punishment, for that would infringe the fundamental principle that a person should not be criminally punishable for an act which was not criminal when it was done".

It is often argued that the legal concept of Joint Enterprise took a "wrong turn" over 50 years ago where anyone with the "foresight" that a person may be about to commit a serious crime or murder were also guilty of the offence as they were in a position to prevent the offence. Hence they were, in legalese terms, de facto and de jure, guilty by association.

There is an even more shocking postscript to this legal exposition as despite there being many challenges to the legality of Joint Enterprise --- the most prominent being R ·-v- Jogee (2016) UKSC 8 and R -v- Ruddock (2016) UKPC 7. It is noted, there has been only one successful challenge and that was when leading counsel in R -v- Nicholas Van Hoogstraten (2002) convinced Lord Justice Rose that Joint Enterprise was not a law passed by Parliament and his sentence of manslaughter was quashed. Despite the successful Appeal by Van Hooqstraten being the best-kept secret in the legal world, the Joint Enterprise genie is now well and truly out of the legal bottle, and the law has a duty to resolve this grave matter once and for all.

In a similar vein to Joint Enterprise, the sentencing policy of IPP has come in for massive opprobrium and censure. Historically, we learn Imprisonment for Public Protection. was introduced by Labour Justice Minister David Blunkett, given royal assent in section 225 of the Criminal Justice Act 2003 and became law on the 4 April 2005.

Right from the outset, there were grave problems with the IPP sentencing policy in relation to the contemporary Sentencing Guidelines when it posed a pivotal question to the judiciary. The question was, would you --- the sentencing judge --- having regard to all the facts of the case, impose a life sentence on the index offence? If the answer is in the negative, then you must impose a determinate fixed sentence. As there is no point imposing a life sentence by a different name and formula as it fails the purpose of sentencing in section 142 of the Criminal Justice Act 2003. And more importantly, section 153(2) of the same Act, requires any sentence imposed to be the shortest, so why seek to by-pass a determinate fixed sentence with a much more longer and punitive IPP sentence?

Conversely, we learn the overall aim and purpose of the new legislation was to give the judiciary sufficient power and influence to lock-up serious and repeat offenders for an indefinite period, whose crimes did not merit a life sentence. Those sentenced to IPP, however, were set a minimum tariff which represented the punitive and deterrent part of the sentence. After IPP prisoners had served their minimum tariff, they could apply to the Parole Board for release. The central concern for the Parole Board is to protect the public from "serious harm" and providing the Parole Board are satisfied a prisoner is no longer a risk to the public, the chances of release are increased exponentially.

According to New Labour in 2003, they expected to imprison no more than about 800 IPP offenders. Unfortunately, though, the judiciary took to the new sentencing provisions with great gusto --- like a new toy --- and before they had time to take stock of the "serious harm" they were doing to both the Criminal Justice System and the community, the prison system had

swelled by over 8,000 IPP prisoners where the punitive nature and content of the sentence by far outweighed the rehabilitative promise it was supposed to ensure.

With the benefit of hindsight, we learn the legislation of IPP was seriously misconceived; in the sense, the penal and rehabilitative infrastructure required to make the legislation work was severely under-resourced and left wanting. Whereby offenders were unable to enrol upon the appropriate Offender Behaviour Courses as there were not enough places on the courses to cater for the massive influx of prisoners. As a direct consequence, these dictated offenders were unable to complete their Sentence Plan as set by the Offender Management Unit (OMU), Probation and Psychology departments.

Can you imagine the inherent hopelessness and helplessness that occurred amongst the IPP demographic who had a maximum tariff of 999-months or 83.25 years? Can you imagine those IPP offenders with chronic mental health problems, ADHD, Asperger's Syndrome, Trigeminal Neuralgia and sometimes a combination of those who wanted to numb the manifold uncertainties of the sentence with powerful psycho-active drugs? Can you imagine those who were illiterate and were the focus of intense bullying and violence on a daily basis? Small wonder, 124 IPP prisoners died in prison. Many as a direct result of "self-harm" and suicide and some by natural causes. The latest official figures state between 2017-2018 alone, the Prison and Probation Ombudsman investigated 54 self-inflicted deaths of prisoners serving IPP sentences.

Sham on the New Labour Government of 2003 for introducing such an unfair, demoralising and death-inducing prison sentence. Sham on the legislators who enacted the IPP provisions; the parliamentarians who voted through the Bill and, of course, the judiciary who implemented the legislation in such high numbers. They say the best way to gauge and assess a democracy is to look at how the State treats their minority groups, such as asylumseekers, immigrants and indeed the prisoners in custody. Although it does not qualify as a democracy, look at how China are treating those of the Muslim faith in their country? It is ironic how the controversial sentence of IPP was inaugurated to prevent "serious harm" to the public, but in return, it has been responsible for the death of scores and scores of prisoners who were not convicted for taking the life of one member of the public. How can that be right?

One remarkable man, however, Kenneth Clark MP QC, had enough of the IPP imbroglio and argued vehemently for its abolition. In personal correspondence to the author dated 8 January 2019, he said: "I was Secretary of State for Justice in 2012, and I was responsible for the abolition of the Indeterminate Sentence for Public Protection, which I always thought was g disgraceful introduction into criminal law. Unfortunately, I was not able to persuade the Cabinet that we should change the situation of those already serving such sentences, whose ultimate release depends on the decision of the Parole Board". 10 [Emphasis added]

In an act of desperation and dismay, further carefully considered legal challenges by IPP prisoners were made to overturn the now abolished /PP sentence, especially for those who were still serving the contentious sentence. Insofar as on 16 March 2016, in a landmark ruling by Lord Chief Justice Thomas, Mr Justice Openshaw and William Davis in R -vRoberts and others [2016] EWCA Crim 71, the judiciary made it perfectly understandable what they thought about the IPP sentencing regime. Whereby the Court of Appeal refused leave to appeal out of time to 13 prisoners serving /PP sentences. At this time, the court heard that there were still over 4,000 /PP prisoners in custody which represented about 5% of the prison population.

We are told, "The applicants sought an extension of time to challenge the correctness of the sentences imposed upon them. They argued because of the position in which they find

themselves, they [the court] should look again at the sentence, even if at the time no-one would have thought they were wrong in principle and manifestly excessive".

We learn the applicants advanced three compelling arguments: Firstly, "Whatever may have been the position at the time of the sentences of /PP were passed, the court now had the power to pass sentences that in the light of the intervening years, now would be the proper sentence." The court dismissed this argument by saying that despite the passage of time; it was not prepared to re-sentence the IPP prisoners "because of what happened in the penal system." Secondly, "The applicants argued that the court should examine with particular care where proper reasons were not given and where young offenders were sentenced." The court dismissed this argument also by saying: " ... it was satisfied that each of the sentences was passed in accordance with the statutory criteria" [Emphasis added]. Lastly, "The applicants argued a time had been reached when the length of imprisonment was now so excessive and disproportionate compared to the offence that it amounted to inhumane treatment under Article 3 or arbitrary detention under Article 5 of the European Court of Human Rights because the detention no longer had any meaningful link to the offence" [Emphasis added].

Similarly, this was also given short shrift and dismissed by the court on the basis: " that there was nothing to suggest than an IPP sentence or IPP itself is a violation of Articles 3 and 5". The Lord Chief Justice added; "if there was a "remedy" for such cases it was not a matter of the courts, but for Parliament". There we have it a Grade-A knockback.

Reading between the lines, the leading judges at the purported justice factory in the Strand were, in fact, saying and not without due cause either if you want justice and fairness in this matter go back to the parliamentarians whence it came and ask them to sort it out.

And so it was, in the Summer of 2016, 200 or more protesters families, friends and loved ones of those in prison up and down the country marched on Parliament to lobby their MPs about the lamentable injustice of IPP sentences. Bearing banners and T-shirts proclaiming: "IPPs; The Forgotten Prisoners" and "Major Time for Petty Crime; Free my IPP 2007-2016" they were led into the lobby of the Houses of Parliament to see their MPs eight at a time. While they waited inside and outside Parliament, the protesters swopped tales of woe about the nightmare IPP experience. One partner said: "My man was the third in the country to get IPP and 13-years on he is still in prison". Another added: "I am worried about my partner's mental state; he needs to have some idea when he will get out; it's like mental torture." One female protester exclaimed: "My man was told he had to do certain courses then they moved him to a prison that didn't do them". Finally, another stated: "People don't realise, even when they get out, it's a life sentence".

Perhaps the most poignant case in the IPP archive belongs to that of James Ward (33) who was arrested for having a row with his father (ABH) and setting fire to a mattress (arson) in 2006 and sentenced to a minimum IPP tariff of ten-months and; lo and behold, by October 2017 he was ten-years over tariff. In 2016 James found enough resolve to write to the BBC Radio 4's "Today" programme and said: "Prison is not fit to accommodate people like me with mental problems. It's made me worse. How can I change in a place like this? I wake up every morning scared of what the day may hold."

James was fortunate, however, as due to the tenacity of his sister April Ward, she could see if she did not help him raise his public profile and the circumstances of his plight, she might never see her beloved brother again. April's principal argument for release was that James wasn't a risk to the public, he was only a risk to himself, and he could, therefore, receive the appropriate mental health care and treatment in the community. In any event, a sister's

love for her brother was. played out in the media and James was duly released."

One of the salient enigmas of the IPP sentencing policy was that it imprisoned offenders continually not for what they did, but for what they might do. And once the offender is in prison, they have to prove to the nth degree that they are worthy of release and no longer a risk to the public. Evidence of achieving the almost unreachable targets of the Offender Behaviour Courses can be seen in 2017 when there were still 3,353 people in prison serving IPP. "552 of whom despite being given a tariff of fewer than two years, more than half of these (278 prisoners) have served eight-years or more beyond their original tariff'.

Mark Day of the Prison Reform Trust reiterated these traumatic concerns and anxieties over the plight of IPP prisoners when he said: "The IPP continues to cast a long shadow over our justice system years after its abolition ... without legislative action, there will still be 2,000 people caught in indefinite detention by 2020".

In January 2019, the author wrote to the Right, Hon. David Blunkett, the brainchild of the IPP sentences who replied: "I have been campaigning very hard with fellow parliamentarians and with campaign groups on behalf of individuals and families affected, to try and sort out the aftermath of the implementation of the Indeterminate Sentence. The original legislation was intended to ensure that people who had committed heinous crimes would not be released until cleared by the Parole Board but with one significant proviso."

It was the proviso, the author believes, that was the underlying cause of the severe problems that plagued the legal concept of IPP. For Lord Blunkett wanted to design and implement an indeterminate sentencing policy that would circumvent the customary fixed-term sentences for extremely dangerous offenders and " ... give the individual the opportunity and the right to demonstrate that they were no longer a risk". The plan was to introduce Offender Behaviour Courses and therapies where prisoners could demonstrate they were no longer a risk to the public before being released by the Parole Board.

Lord Blunkett concedes that: "Two things went wrong". Firstly, judges started to impose IPP sentences on those offenders who would otherwise receive "a relatively short term penalty". "Secondly, that when released on Parole, minor offences would result in the courts sending the individual back to prison, where they have to start all over again in terms of demonstrating their fitness for release". Lord Blunkett accepts the first was his error as he had no control over how the judges would interpret and implement the sentencing policy, but the second point was absolutely nothing to do with him.

Paradoxically, it appears Lord Blunkett wanted to somehow replace the traditional test for release by being released in the community with an unworkable test for release in closed conditions which were both impractical and irrational. As unquestionably, the only test for release must be in the community; otherwise, the test is not a test at all and will produce false data. All in all, it is abundantly clear the legal concept of IPP had not been thought through sufficiently or adequately by legislators, and it was both the prisoners and their families who had to pay for this ginormous legislative gaffe.

Lord Blunkett for the last decade states he has been trying to resolve what has clearly been "a blot on our justice system". To his credit though, Lord Blunkett exclaimed: "I am deeply sorry that this has happened, and have said so on a number of occasions. I hope with a bit of common sense we might be able to resolve this matter to the satisfaction of those affected and campaigning, and the reassurance of the public".

The reassuring sentiments and endeavours of Lord Blunkett to earnestly try and resolve the IPP conundrum in January 2019 were shot down in flames five months later when another new Justice Minister Robert Buckland QC told MPs: " ... he could not give a timescale for the release of

the remaining 2,400 prisoners serving sentences of IPP because not all would be released." Not only was this counter to the progressive endeavours of Lord Blunkett, but Mr Buckland added at the tougher end of the IPP spectrum "there will be a cohort of IPP prisoners who may never be released because of the seriousness of the offences and indeed the risk that they still pose."

Bizarrely, we learn the sentencing policy of IPP prisoners has gone from being inappropriate and disproportionate at one end of the sentencing spectrum to one of a "natural life sentence" at the other end of the spectrum for not breaching the most severe offences? This open-ended and politically sensitive sentencing policy is precisely what makes IPP one of the most egregious miscarriages of justice in modern British criminal justice history, insofar as the goalposts are interchangeable with each and every new Justice Minister who takes up the position.

Alternatively, in the fall of 2019, the eminent criminologists Doctor Harry Annison and Senior Researcher Christine Straub produced a groundbreaking report entitled: "A Helping Hand" in collaboration with the Prison Reform Trust which "would examine in detail the specific issues faced by families of IPP and what relevant organizations can do to address them."· The main findings in the report were that: Firstly, "The indeterminate IPP sentence has been rightly described as one of the "least carefully planned and implemented pieces of legislation in the history of British sentencing," with its long-term, damaging effects now widely accepted." Secondly, "an HMPPS "IPP Action Group" has been seeking to improve rates of release and progression by people serving IPP and the release rates have indeed increased. However, our findings suggest that, to date, the pain and barriers faced by families of people serving IPP have not been sufficiently addressed."18 [emphasis added].

Arguably, one of the most significant barriers to release for the IPP prisoner is the supervisory and management role of the Probation Service who have jettisoned their motto of "to assist and befriend" of yesteryear for the more restrictive role of policing their charges before consideration for release and recalling them by the hundreds. For instance, 400 IPP prisoners were released from June 2018 to 2019, but amazingly 600 were recalled in the same period.

Taken altogether, both the legal concepts of Joint Enterprise and IPP have their political, structural and administrative problems. More specifically, we learn IPP has the parliamentary stamp of "statutory criteria", whereas Joint Enterprise does not. Therefore, because Joint Enterprise was predicated on a set of beliefs over 300 years ago and has been allowed to calcify and flourish in British law courts over the subsequent centuries. It is respectfully argued, the legal doctrine Joint Enterprise should be removed from all judicial proceedings forthwith, save, of course, for those _serving the sentence who should have their sentences automatically reviewed and quashed by the Court of Appeal. Regarding the legal monstrosity known as IPP, it should be abolished retrospectively as per the wishes of the Father of the House, Kenneth Clarke QC MP and/or the IPP prisoners should have their sentences commuted to the fixed term penalties considered by the sentencing judge at the time. For it is unreasonable, unfair and irrational to keep a person in prison for what they may do rather than what they have done.

HMYOI Aylesbury - All Tests Outcomes Not Sufficiently Good

In April 2017, safety was assessed as poor while other healthy prison assessments were not sufficiently good. In 2019, safety had risen one grade and in all the tests outcomes were now not sufficiently good. However, Mr Clarke added, “it would be quite wrong to infer that there had been no progress made in the time since the last inspection. What we found was that there had been some distinct movement and indeed some improvements within the gradings.”

The overall rate of violence had increased, but the seriousness of most of it had declined, possibly a consequence of introducing some ‘freeflow’ (allowing prisoners to move about and potentially mix in parts of the prison). “This has made it easier for prisoners to gain access to one another and fight, but at the same time more likely to be in the sight of officers who are able to intervene and de-escalate situations before they become very serious.” Inspectors have seen this phenomenon elsewhere.

The daily regime had been inadequate at Aylesbury for many years, and it remained the case that, for much of the week, there was no evening association, time out of cell was poor and often unpredictable and there was no opportunity at all for prisoners to eat together. Mr Clarke commented: “For these very basic socialisation processes to be absent or poor in a prison holding young adults was clearly unacceptable and needed to be addressed. The fact that the population had halved while staff levels had remained the same should have enabled more positive changes to have been made.”

HM Inspectorate of Prisons has frequently reported that the nationally mandated process for assessing the risks presented by, and the needs of, prisoners (OASys) is “showing worrying signs of systemic failure, in some places verging on collapse.” At Aylesbury in 2017, inspectors made a main recommendation that concerted action should be taken to reduce the OASys backlog but, Mr Clarke said, in 2019 “inexplicably, considering the risks presented by the population at Aylesbury, this had not been acted upon. We found that over a quarter of the prisoners did not have an OASys at all, and too few of the remainder had received proper or timely reviews.”

Overall, Mr Clarke said: “It was clear that Aylesbury was an institution in transition. It was reassuring that in this instance I was able to see some positive impact from the prison being in ‘special measures’. The halving of the roll, closure of wings pending refurbishment and attempts to relax the regime had had a positive impact. It was easy for me to see a real sense of ownership and teamwork in support of the measures that were being taken to improve performance. However, I was concerned by suggestions that there might be plans to return the roll to its previous number of around 400, but without increasing staff numbers. If this were to happen – and I hope it does not, at least in the short term – I would be very worried about the potential impact on the treatment of and conditions experienced by the prisoners. There were some positive signs of progress at Aylesbury, an establishment that has experienced some very challenging times. It would be a pity if that progress were to be put in jeopardy.”

HMP/YOI Norwich - Prison Has Deteriorated Significantly Since 2016

A complex multi-functional prison serving East Anglia, was found to have deteriorated over three years in HM Inspectorate of Prison’s healthy prison tests. In 2016, the prison was assessed as reasonably good for safety, respect, purposeful activity and rehabilitation and release planning. In an inspection in October and November 2019 all four grades had slipped to not sufficiently good. The prison, holding just under 700 male prisoners, comprises a local reception site, a training facility and an open resettlement facility. Peter Clarke, HM Chief Inspector of Prisons, said while the complexity of the prison brought “not insignificant management challenges, the combination of facilities ought, if managed effectively, to offer real opportunities to help prisoners progress through their sentence to the point of resettlement into the local community.” “Our findings suggested that the prison still had some way to go before such a vision could be fully realised. They had faced considerable difficulties and that the prison had deteriorated significantly. They were also keen to tell us that the deterioration had been reduced with some recent improvement over the last year.”

Levels of recorded violence at Norwich had increased and were relatively high, although there were comparably fewer serious incidents (around 5% of assaults). About a fifth of prisoners

said they felt unsafe. Use of force by staff had also increased and it was too soon to assess the effectiveness of procedures aimed at improving supervision of the use of force. There had been six self-inflicted deaths since 2016 but inspectors were assured of progress in learning from those deaths. Work to review the activity allocation and time out of cell of those identified as being in crisis was very positive and the prison had begun piloting new case management (ACCT) arrangements. Mr Clarke added: "We found many weaknesses in case management practice, although the prisoners themselves told us they felt well cared for." Many staff were very inexperienced, a source of considerable frustration for prisoners, though three-quarters said they felt respected by staff. Much low level poor behaviour went unchallenged.

Promotion of equality and diversity in the prison had deteriorated markedly since 2016 and required immediate attention to ensure the needs of minority groups were understood and met. There was sufficient activity to engage about 80% of the population, but inspectors found between 30 and 35% of prisoners locked up during the working day. Demanding commercial standards were achieved in the prison workshops, influenced by the prison's productive external commercial links, with some "hard-to-reach" individuals supported by educational outreach. Overall, however, teaching standards were inconsistent and punctuality and attendance were poor. The prison lacked an overarching offender needs analysis, strategy or action plan to ensure it became a place of meaningful and effective rehabilitation. Finding suitable accommodation for those being released remained a challenge.

Overall, Mr Clarke said: "The findings indicated that local managers were right that there were improvements to be seen at Norwich. Much of this improvement was, however, recent, inconsistent and not particularly well coordinated. It was also hard to discern a coherent and considered plan for the prison, a plan consistent with the development of a rehabilitative culture. In addition, there remained a number of safety risks that needed to be addressed, prisoners needed to be supported and incentivised to engage purposefully with the regime and there was much to do in ensuring that an inexperienced staff group received the support they needed."

Removal From the Sex Offenders Register.

SAFARI: Anyone convicted of alleged sex offences and receiving a sentence of two and a half years or more is placed on the Sex Offenders Register 'indefinitely'. Technically that means for life. Following a European ruling from some years ago, the UK government was forced to give those subject to indefinite notification requirements an opportunity after 15 years of the first time they had to register to apply to be removed. As more and more people have now reached the 15+ year stage we thought it was time to clarify this.

Firstly, don't get excited by this; you only have the right to apply to be removed. There is no guarantee it will be allowed, and those who were innocent in the first place will always find it difficult to achieve removal because you need to be able to demonstrate why you are no longer a 'risk' to the public. Ironically, those who were guilty in the first place have a better chance of removal because they were able to take specific actions (such as attending offence-related courses or discussing their offences and working with staff to address their offending behaviour).

So, what can innocent people do to increase their chances of being removed from the list? Well, the first thing would be to agree (and specifically ask) to attend the Horizon or Kaizen course whilst in prison. These courses address the issues surrounding sexual misconduct without discussing the alleged offences you were convicted of. Secondly, we would recommend asking your personal officer (if you are in prison) or your probation officer and the officers who visit you at home (if released) for their advice on what you can do to lower your perceived risk. Ideally do this at least two years before your 15 years have passed.

When you eventually apply for removal, you want to be able to demonstrate why your risk is now low enough to be safely removed from the notification requirements. You also want to be able to show how your circumstances have changed since the offences were allegedly committed. For example, if you used to live with children but now you don't. Furthermore, it can help if you can show that you have a stable life; such as a partner, a good job, etc. It's generally considered that people in stable relationships are less likely to offend.

Prisons - Only 206 New Places the Target was 10,000

Lord Birt To ask Her Majesty's Government why only 206 new prison places have so far been created to help meet their 2016 commitment to produce 10,000 new places.[HL1553]Lord Keen of Elie: In 2016, the then Secretary of State for Justice announced the creation of up to 10,000 new for old prison places. As part of this, a new 206 place houseblock at HMP Stocken was opened in June 2019. Work to construct a modern, uncrowded, decent, safe and secure prison at Wellingborough, providing 1,680 places, is progressing on schedule and we will commence work to build a 1,680 place prison at Glen Parva in the Summer, bringing the total places delivered to 3,566. The Prime Minister has committed to invest up to £2.5 billion to transform the prison estate by building 10,000 additional places –in addition to the 3,566 already being delivered. The first of these new prisons will be at Full Sutton. All future new prison developments are subject to receiving planning permission and will be announced in We acknowledge the National Audit Office's review, 'Ministry of Justice, HM Prison and Probation Service: Improving the prison estate', undertaken in 2019 and we will be carefully considering the report to ensure that we are able to effectively deliver the additional 10,000 places whilst ensuring value for money for taxpayers.due course.

NI: Lawyers for Man Shot by British Army Condemn 'Attempted Political Intervention'

Source Irish Legal New: Lawyers representing the family of a man shot dead by the British Army in 1974 have condemned an "attempted political intervention" by the prime minister. Former soldier Dennis Hutchings will go on trial this month in connection with the shooting of 27-year-old John Patrick Cunningham in Co Tyrone on 15 June 1974. Mr Hutchings was charged with attempted murder and attempted grievous bodily harm with intent in 2015 after prosecutors reviewed the case and concluded there was "a reasonable prospect of conviction". The prosecution was raised in Westminster during Prime Minister's Questions by Conservative MP Jack Lopresti, who suggested the trial should not go ahead because Mr Hutchings was previously told in 1974 and 2011 that he would not be prosecuted. In his response, Prime Minister Boris Johnson said: "It is to rectify matters such as the one to which my honourable friend draws the House's attention that this government are finally bringing in a law to prevent the vexatious prosecution of our hard-working, hard-serving veterans when no new evidence has been produced."

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.