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 785 (18/03/2020) - Cost £1

Death of IPP Prisoner Charlotte Nokes Seven Years Over Original Tariff

INQUEST: The inquest into the death of Charlotte Nokes has today concluded with the jury finding her death was by 'natural causes'. Charlotte was 38 when she was found dead in her cell in HMP Peterborough on the morning of 23 July 2016. She was serving an indefinite Imprisonment for Public Protection (IPP) sentence and was over seven years over the minimum tariff when she died. The jury concluded the medical cause of Charlotte's death was "Sudden Arrhythmic Death Syndrome". The coroner's decision on whether to write a follow up report to Prevent Future Deaths is awaited. The family hope their concerns around the adequacy of cell observations, and the risk of suicide for IPP prisoners, will be highlighted.

Known to her family as Charlie or Lottie, they described her as funny, intelligent, charismatic and creative. She was an extremely talented artist whose work was exhibited by the Koestler Trust. She developed her passion for art whilst in prison and had been offered a scholarship to study at Central St Martins on release. Charlotte was given an IPP sentence on 4 January 2008. She was to serve a minimum term of 15 months imprisonment. However, at the time of her death, she had served 8½ years in custody. The jury heard that the indefinite nature of Charlotte's sentence, and her fear that she would never be released from prison, contributed to a sense of extreme hopelessness. She described her sentence to her family as a death sentence. The inquest heard that despite being seven years over tariff, Charlotte was only at the very early stages of being ready to engage with the therapeutic help she needed to begin the path to release.

The inquest heard that Charlotte had been diagnosed with a Personality Disorder and was prescribed a number of antipsychotic drugs to treat her symptoms. In the months leading up to her death, she often appeared over-sedated, drowsy and was slurring her speech. The jury heard that some of her depot medication was administered for unusually long periods.

At the time of her death, Charlotte was placed on suicide and self-harm monitoring procedures, known as Assessment, Care in Custody and Teamwork (ACCT) after she had attempted to take her life. Charlotte was on twice hourly observations as part of the ACCT process. Despite this, the inquest jury heard that she died a number of hours before she was found at 08:35, despite documented welfare checks throughout the night and concerns about her welfare.

On the morning of 23 July 2017, Charlotte was checked at 07:23, 07:53 and 08:12. She was noted to be asleep in an upright position. At 08:30 another officer looked through the observation panel to Charlotte's cell. She noted that Charlotte appeared to have been in the same strange sleeping position as the night before – she was sitting upright and slumped forward. She unlocked Charlotte's cell and called her name. There was no response. She called Charlotte's name and again there was no response. She then shook Charlotte's shoulder and noticed that she was cold to touch, her whole body was stiff and her face was "very red and dark purple, further than bruising". She raised the alarm. Paramedics arrived but by that time Charlotte could not be resuscitated. She was pronounced dead at 08:55. The evidence of the pathologist was that Charlotte had died some time before she was discovered, possibly 3-4 hours earlier.

On behalf of her family, Charlotte's father Steven Nokes said: "As a family, we remain concerned about the way Charlotte was treated in prison and do not believe the care she received was appropriate. She had many struggles in life, was beaten up for being 'different' and experienced mental ill health. Prison was never the best place for her. The indefinite sentence only made this worse. Charlotte lost hope and so did we. She told us the IPP sentence was really a life sentence, and despite her hopes and dreams of moving to London to study art, she knew she would die in prison. This cannot continue."

Deborah Coles, Director of INQUEST, said: "Charlotte was trapped in limbo, her ambitions and prospects indefinitely on pause. She was forced to wait for action to truly end IPP sentences, despite them having long been deemed unlawful and 'abolished'. Had she not died it is likely she would have still been in prison waiting for that action, as many others are. For far too many women, prison remains a disproportionate and inappropriate response to their behaviour and needs. Indefinite sentences continue to cause additional harm. To prevent further deaths and harm, Government must work across health, social care and justice departments to dismantle failing women's prisons and invest in specialist community led women's services."

Tara Mulcair of Birnberg Peirce who represents Charlotte's family said: "Charlotte's inquest has shone a light on the injustice faced by IPP prisoners. Charlotte was caught in a vicious cycle of indefinite incarceration, which created a strong sense of hopelessness and exacerbated her poor mental health, which in turn led to her continued detention. In Charlotte's mind, there was no prospect of release, as is the case for many still serving IPP sentences. There should now be an urgent review of all IPP prisoners who are over tariff and were sentenced before the Courts recognised that these sentences are unlawful. It is time to put right this injustice."

Requiem for Charlotte Nokes and All IPP Prisoners and Their Families

[Charlotte was 38 when she was found dead in her cell in HMP Peterborough on the morning of 23 July 2016. She was serving an indefinite Imprisonment for Public Protection (IPP) sentence and was over seven years over the minimum tariff when she died.]

As we rapidly approach the fifteenth Anniversary of the Indeterminate Sentence for Public Protection, more commonly known as IPP, launched on 4 April 2005. Sadly, our minds and attention are drawn to the 124 IPP prisoners who either by natural causes or suicide have lost their lives while serving the highly controversial and discredited prison sentence. Moreover, we learn, fifty-four of those self-inflicted deaths were recorded and investigated by the Prison and Probation Ombudsman between 2007 and 2018.1 One death in these tragic circumstances is unforgivable. Fifty-four deaths are inexcusable, and 124 deaths are downright criminal.

To give the reader a flavour of the injustice IPP prisoners suffered and endured during the formative years of IPP provisions. In correspondence from Lord McNally to Lord Lloyd of Berwick dated 24 August 2013, Lord Lloyd told the House of Lords: "Thirty-seven [IPP] offenders were given tariffs of six months or less. Of these, 11 are now more than four years over tariff. The remaining 26 of that group are five years over tariff, in other words, 10 times the tariff they were originally given. "One hundred and eight [IPPs] were given tariffs between 6 and 12 months; 46 are for years over tariff, and 59 are five years over tariff. "Two hundred and eighty [IPPs] were given tariffs between 12 and 18 months; 110 are four years over tariff and 98 are five years over tariff. "Three hundred and forty-eight [IPPs] were given tariffs of between 18 and 24 months. Of these, 124 are four years over tariff and 92 are five years over tariff." All in all; Lord Lloyd went on to say: " that these figures speak for themselves - something very serious has gone wrong". More scandalously, taken altogether, we learn, the IPPs were 2,539 years over tariff.

One can only imagine, the overwhelming sense of hopelessness and dread that some of

those I PP prisoners felt as they contemplated taking their own lives in a bleak and unfriendly prison cell within a harsh and draconian British prison system. One wonders what was going through their minds as they put their plan in motion to end their existence.

The most prominent thought must have been the all-pervading sense of injustice and unfairness at being sentenced to a de facto and de jure life prison sentence for an offence that would not otherwise attract an indefinite sentence. Unfortunately, some IPPs were young enough to be our sons and daughters when they tragically took their lives; the vulnerable and inexperienced prisoners who can barely get through an average day of incarceration, let alone a sentence with no perceivable end or determination in sight.

Without doubt, also at the forefront of their minds, would have been their instinctive thoughts and feelings for their partners and sweethearts, love ones and close friends, who after years and years of visiting often unpleasant prisons across the England and Wales, had unwittingly succumbed to either neglect or exhaustion or both. As a direct result, the regular fortnightly visits may have slipped into one a month and then segued into one every three months; the rest becomes history. The sense of abandonment and isolation is further exacerbated by the passing of elderly family members over the years. The grandparents are first, then parents and in-laws, followed by aunts and uncles and even favourite pet animals, all of whom have stood by the IPP like a Colossus of reliability and strength, but are no more.

As each precious member of IPP's family passes away, the sense of injustice and unfairness intensifies by the fact that the IPP will never see their beautiful and smiling faces again. The only consolation the IPP has is that he or she knows the love ones who have passed away are looking down and giving them the power and purposefulness to carry on in pursuit of that elusive release date on licence; to be reunited with their family once again. Arguably, one of the unseen and least addressed by-products of the IPP sentence is that it replicates an infectious virus in the way that it slowly, bit by bit, drains the IPP and the family of their natural strength and resistance. Not only is this seen in the way it renders the IPP helpless and hopeless, but also in the way it breaks down the family bond until the IPP is left vulnerable and isolated.

One of the symptoms of the IPP malaise is when IPP becomes a continuous strain on the scarce resources of the family. Then the IPP wants to hear the voice of his partner more than the partner wants to hear the voice of him or her. Prison phone calls with partners become tense and tetchy. Before the IPP knows it, the visits are drying up, birthdays are not celebrated, and inter-family correspondence becomes non-existent. The final coup de grace occurs when partners neglect or forget to wave goodbye at the conclusion of visits. Cut adrift on a tide of loneliness and isolation, the IPP has to dig deep into his or her resolve and climb out of that trough of despair and oblivion. In all honesty, who can blame the partners and family, as they are serving a sentence as well. Deprived of the all-important release date they too are floundering looking for something concrete to grasp. One such remedy to the IPP contagion, however, is the irreplaceable loyalty, support and companionship of the wider family and that is why "the family" has been formally identified and recognised as imperative to the successful survival, rehabilitation and release into the community. It is absurd that the IPP virus pervades and destroys the very sustenance he or she needs to survive. Consequently, that is why so many IPPs self-harm and take their own life as they ultimately feel discarded and abandoned, cast adrift on the high seas of the British penal system.

Rarely has there been a more disgraceful travesty of justice than the IPP sentence. Inasmuch as the IPP is serving a life sentence for a non-life sentence offence or crime. More than anything else, this is what aggrieves the IPP, the family, human rights activists and selected members

of the legal profession the most, as they cannot reconcile the fact that 154 Specified Offences worthy of a fixed and determinate prison sentence had been politically upgraded to the most punitive sentence in the courtroom; a sentence of life imprisonment and life licence on release through IPP. It is all well and good pointing to the human rights abuses of North Korea, Saudi Arabia and China when we echo the self-same human rights abuses on our doorstep. For let us not forget, by definition, IPP sentences are life sentences albeit by another name. The only difference being, IPPs have not killed or murdered anyone, otherwise, somewhat paradoxically, the IPP would face a life sentence which he or she is already serving?

Destiny forbid if the IPP is simultaneously fighting a substantial miscarriage of justice where the police have manufactured or hidden evidence that would irrefutably prove that the accused is a victim of gross police misconduct and malpractice. In some perverse way, however, in essence, that is what keeps some IPPs afloat. Not the fact that the Court of Appeal or the risible Criminal Cases Review Commission (CCRC) will investigate the case properly and come to the IPP's assistance, no chance! The IPP can forget about that train of thought immediately, as no matter what legal avenue he or she travels down; it will invariably lead to a carefully crafted legal cul-de-sac. What becomes most important is the fact that the IPP has secured the moral high ground and their conscience will not let them forget that they are serving a double whammy of ill-justice; the wrongful conviction and, indeed, the unacceptable and insupportable open-ended sentence.

More positively, however, by dint of the herculean efforts of great politicians, such as, the former Justice Secretary Kenneth Clarke QC, Lord David Ramsbottom, Lord Simon Brown, Lord McNally and even Lord Blunkett, who is genuinely contrite over the introduction of the indefinite sentence provisions. We learn, they were all instrumental in the abolishment of IPP in December 2012, but sadly not retrospectively. We learn, in October 2019, therefore, there were still 2,598 IPP prisoners languishing in the British Prison System, and that figure excludes the 600-plus recalled IPP prisoners in the last year. 3

What is more, disconcerting BBC News reported: "The rate of self-harm by inmates serving indefinite prison sentences in England and Wales has risen by almost 50% in four years" [2012-2016]. More disturbingly, "Last year [2015] there were more than 2,500 acts of self-harm by prisoners serving imprisonment for public protection ... at a higher rate than those serving fixed sentences". This is not surprising given the incidence of self-harm among IPPs had risen directly after IPP was abolished in 2012, but not retrospectively. No doubt what aggravated matters was the stark fact the Criminal Justice System was operating a two-tier justice system. One caught under the IPP regime and an alternative one under the fixed sentence provisions, but all ironically for the same offences. To compound this issue further in June 2019 the Justice Minister Robert Buckland QC proclaimed that he could not give a timescale for the release of I PP prisoners, "because not all would be released". Alas, we have now reached the absurd situation where an offender may be sentenced to (i) a fixed determinate sentence; (ii) an indefinite sentence and, indeed; (iii) a "natural life" prison sentence all for the same offence. And this all depends on whether or not the offender was unfortunate enough to have been convicted and sentenced within the IPP window of 2005-2012!

Quite clearly, not only does this type of sentencing tombola bring the Criminal Justice System into disrepute, it also questions the purpose and validity of public protection sentences which has been partially abolished in 2012 and can also be increased at will into "natural life" sentences by an Uber-Punitive executive.

To conclude, in normal circumstances, the death of prisoners in prison would not usually

deserve mention. In fact, in today's political climate, most of the politicians and public would no doubt celebrate and rejoice over such a loss. But it is only when we examine, evaluate and analyst the savage and cruel circumstances and context of the IPP deaths in custody and the concomitant loss of their family members while they were serving that sentence, that we can wholly appreciate and understand the demonstrable political scandal of indefinite sentences for public protection.

On that basis, and with all due respect, it is suggested, on the fifteenth Anniversary of IPP sentences, the 4 April 2020 that we should hold a Service of Remembrance. Or create a Garden of Remembrance, small tablet or token monument with the names of those that perished while serving a sentence thereon. So that the people of this nation will never allow such an ill-designed or ill-thought-out legislation to be passed by Parliament ever again.

Of equal importance, it is high time parliamentarians revisit the scourge of IPP, and it is abolished entirely as per the wishes of the former Justice Secretary Kenneth Clarke QC who has denounced the IPP legislation as "a disgraceful introduction into criminal law".

Lastly, when future social historians and criminologists put pen to paper or finger to laptop, to discuss and debate the Pythonesque absurdity of IPP, one hopes, in conclusion, they will pick up a Bible and turn to St Luke, chapter 23, verse 34 and print the following: "Father, forgive them, for they knew not what they did".

Terry Smith A8672AQ, HMP Highpoint, Stradishall, Newmarket, CB8 9YG

Clarke, R. v [2020] EWCA Crim 291

On 30 January 2018, following a trial in the Crown Court sitting at Woolwich, before Sir Peter Openshaw and a jury, the applicant (now age 64) was convicted of the murder of Paul Milburn (count 1), conspiracy to defraud (count 3) and offering to supply a Class B drug cannabis (count 4). The following day he was sentenced to life imprisonment for murder with a minimum term to be served of 25 years less 492 days on remand.

He renews his application for leave to appeal that conviction following refusal by the single judge. Since the grounds of appeal are based on the trial process it is convenient to focus on those complaints, but before doing so we should at least refer to the striking circumstances of what appears to have been a drug deal that went wrong.

The charges arose out of events that occurred on the afternoon of Monday 26 April 1993. Paul Milburn had been a builder, but had fallen on hard times and turned to dealing in cannabis. He told friends that he was about to do a drug deal which might turn his fortune around. He borrowed a black Saab vehicle from a friend and drove to Noke Lane near St Albans for a pre-arranged meeting in the afternoon. At around 4.30 a passerby noticed a black Saab blocking the road and the driver slumped at the wheel. He called the police. When officers arrived they found the car engine revving and the driver dead at the wheel, with his foot on the accelerator. The driver's window was smashed. There was £13,500 cash in the boot.

A post-mortem examination established that he had been shot once, at close range, in the right shoulder. The bullet had killed him. A ballistic expert established that the window had been broken before the shot was fired. The shot was fired from a revolver or self-loading pistol and such a weapon could not be fired accidentally.

The prosecution case was that the applicant, together with three associates, had arranged to meet Paul Milburn with a view to carrying out a fraudulent drug deal in a quiet country lane. The plan was to cheat him out of thousands of pounds by passing off bars of wax made up to give the appearance of blocks of cannabis resin. The four men had arrived in two cars to

meet Paul Milburn and his associate (a man known as "Ginger") who were in the black Saab, driven by Paul Milburn. As the transaction was in progress the applicant, who had been hiding in nearby bushes, ran towards the Saab pointing a gun. Ginger made off across the fields, and the applicant broke the driver's window and shot him. They all then fled the scene.

At trial two of the applicant's associates gave evidence for the Crown describing the sudden and inexplicable conduct of the applicant in shooting Paul Milburn. A statement was read from the third of these associates. All three had been convicted of participation in the fraud, and the judge warned the jury to treat their evidence with caution since they may have had their own reasons for giving evidence for the prosecution.

The applicant disappeared before he could be arrested. Eventually he was traced in Germany where he was arrested nearly 13 years later, in February 2016. He was extradited to the United Kingdom and charged on 26 September 2016. He made his first appearance in the Crown Court on 29 September.

Although it is broken down into a number of separate complaints, the focus of the grounds of appeal is that the applicant was tried while unrepresented and in his absence that this was unfair and throws substantial doubts on the safety of his convictions.

It is necessary now to consider what happened between the first appearance in the Crown Court in September 2016 and the trial that began on 15 January 2018. During this time he was represented by three firms of solicitors at various times. The trial was initially set for 17 March 2017 but was adjourned because he said he was not ready. A further trial was set for a date at the beginning of October 2017. The applicant was not represented and did not appear at the hearing. The prosecution applied for the trial to take place in his absence. That application was heard by Holroyde LJ on 5 October. The applicant said that Messrs Imran Khan Solicitors had been prepared to represent him at this stage, with Mr Khan QC acting as trial advocate; and that when he had become unavailable he was unable to find anyone else. The judge heard evidence from Mr Patel of Imran Khan Solicitors that their services had in fact been dispensed with in August 2017.

Holroyde LJ granted an adjournment and making various orders designed to ensure that the applicant could obtain suitable representation and that the trial would go ahead on the next occasion. However, he warned the applicant that this should be regarded as his last opportunity to arrange representation and that if he did not engage with the process the trial might proceed in his absence.

The applicant failed to attend his trial on 15 January 2018 and the judge, having set out the history, ruled that the trial should proceed in his absence. The applicant provided no evidence of any steps taken to obtain representation and the judge decided that there were compelling reasons for the trial to proceed in his absence, including the fact that he was in custody in HMP Belmarsh, closely adjacent to the Crown Court and refusing to engage with the trial process, the public interest in pursuing the prosecution without further delay and the position of witnesses including vulnerable witnesses.

In our view, no properly arguable criticism can be made of this decision. Furthermore, the judge was careful to ensure the fairness of the trial in both directing the jury on the issue of the applicant's absence; in summing-up the case fairly, directing the jury to consider the motives for accomplices in giving incriminating evidence; and taking all reasonable points that might be taken on the applicant's behalf.

The applicant complains that by proceeding in his absence the judge failed to take into account his mental health. However, there is no suggestion, let alone supporting evidence, that he was unfit to participate in a trial or to attend court. He had been represented by counsel and solicitors on 27 March 2017, 19 May (the date of arraignment), 9 June and 30 June

2017 and no suggestion had been made as to his unfitness to participate in the trial.

We note that on 24 January 2018, following enquiries, the court had been informed that no mental health concerns had been raised by the mental health team responsible for the applicant. It is clear that the applicant made a conscious decision not to attend his trial.

A further point is taken that the trial was unfair or unlawful because the custody time limits were relied on so as to "coerce" the applicant into a trial for which he did not have adequate time to prepare, and that the trial was listed for 15 January 2018 to "punish him" for his previous non-attendance at court.

Both these contentions are wholly without merit. As the single judge noted, the custody time limits were repeatedly extended to allow him to obtain representation and the trial was listed on 15 January 2018 after further adjournments had been allowed for the same reason.

Finally, there is a complaint that the applicant was not served with all the prosecution material. That complaint is also baseless. All used and unused material was served by the Crown and the judge was satisfied that the applicant had the documents.

The impression that the applicant was engaged in "playing the system" is not dispelled by the course of his renewed application for leave to appeal.

The application was lodged by the applicant at the beginning of October 2018 (208 days out of time). From the start he asked for further time to instruct new lawyers and perfect his grounds. He was allowed some time for this purpose administratively, but nothing further was received and so the application was considered and was then refused by the single judge in May 2019.

The application was renewed and listed for hearing on 30 July 2019. Shortly before that date the applicant made a request to vacate the hearing and indicated that he might wish to abandon the application. The request to vacate was granted by Males LJ who directed that the applicant must now confirm whether he wished to pursue or abandon the application. He was given until 30 September 2019 either to abandon the application or to lodge further grounds, and confirm or otherwise that counsel had been instructed. He was also told that if he failed to do so the case would be re-listed and that no further adjournment would be given. Nothing further was heard from him.

All letters to him from the Registrar's office have been returned with a letter from the applicant stating that he was refusing to accept any further correspondence from the Registrar whom he felt was persecuting him.

We should add that yesterday afternoon the court received two communications: the first from the applicant and addressed to the Registrar beginning: "I hereby formally and unequivocally demand the de-listing of my application for permission for leave to appeal". The letter continues in the same tone with entirely unjustified complaints of bad faith against the Court of Appeal office. The second is a short email from counsel's clerk saying that subject to the "appellant" organising a third party contact and signing a client care agreement, a named leading counsel was happy to accept instructions by way of Public Access.

In the light of all the previous warnings, we declined to adjourn this hearing. Even with the assistance of leading counsel, this application has no prospect of success.

This is a case in which a defendant has taken a conscious decision not to engage in the Criminal Justice System. It was his right to do so, but it was a choice made in the knowledge that it would have consequences because he was repeatedly warned that this would be so. There was no breach of his Article 6 rights. The trial was fair, despite the difficulties caused by the approach adopted by the applicant for reasons known only to himself. In the event the prosecution case was overwhelming. We are quite satisfied that the convictions are safe. The renewed application is dismissed.

Shrewsbury 24 Pickets Case Referred to the Court of Appeal

Bindmans Solicitors: Criminal Cases Review Commission has at long last after a fight with the CCRC, referred the convictions of eight of the Shrewsbury 24 to the Criminal Division of the Court of Appeal to consider the lawfulness of their convictions in 1973/4. Members of the Shrewsbury 24, supported by the Shrewsbury 24 Campaign, had asked the CCRC to refer their 1973/74 convictions to the Court of Appeal on the basis of a number of grounds, including: (i) recently discovered evidence that original witness statements had been destroyed and that this fact had not been disclosed to the defence counsel; and (ii) the broadcast of a highly prejudicial documentary during the first trial, the content of which was contributed to by a covert agency within the Foreign Office known as the Information Research Department. The original application was made in 2012 and the CCRC originally refused to make that referral in 2017.

Following that first refusal, four of those applicants pursued a judicial review on behalf of the wider group. Permission to proceed to a full hearing was originally refused on the papers, but was subsequently granted by Mr Justice Jay in November 2018. The CCRC continued to defend the proceedings until the day of the hearing before Lord Justice Flaux and Mrs Justice Carr DBE; unusually conceding part way through the submissions of Danny Friedman QC that the CCRC would withdraw its decisions and reconsider them. The CCRC has now confirmed it will refer those convictions to the Court of Appeal in respect of the two grounds identified above “because it now considers that the new evidence and argument outlined above create a real possibility the Court of Appeal will quash the convictions."

Terry Renshaw, speaking on behalf of the pickets, said, “We are absolutely delighted with the decision and look forward to our day in court to show that we were victims of a miscarriage of justice. Without the Shrewsbury 24 Campaign we would not be where we are today. We owe a great debt of thanks to them for the tireless work that they have carried out”.

Jamie Potter, Partner in the Public Law and Human Rights Department at Bindmans LLP and lead solicitor for the pickets supported by the Shrewsbury 24 Campaign, said: “The decision of the CCRC to refer the convictions of the Shrewsbury 24 is welcome. It can only be hoped that this matter will now be resolved quickly with justice being achieved for the Shrewsbury 24 pickets. It has been a long and arduous battle for the pickets and the Campaign Committee that has supported them: it could never have reached this stage without the pain-staking research of the Committee, and in particular its Secretary Eileen Turnbull, who uncovered key evidence more than four decades after the relevant events took place”.

Judge Attacks S&G for “Wholly Unacceptable” Failure

Nick Hilborne: A High Court judge has strongly criticised Slater & Gordon (S&G) for a “wholly unacceptable” failure to give him a crucial letter when applying for an urgent injunction in a police misconduct case. Mr Justice Saini said that, if he had seen the letter from the Independent Office for Police Conduct (IOPC) when he was considering S&G’s without-notice application, he would have been “highly unlikely” to have granted the stay of misconduct proceedings that he did. S&G – which has admitted making a mistake – represented six Bedfordshire police officers who were involved in the detention and restraint of a man under the Mental Health Act in 2013. The man died in a police cell. The claimants argued that, “because of prejudice arising from the content of certain documents” read by the chair of the tribunal, a non-practising solicitor, either the chair or the whole three-person panel should have recused themselves from hearing the misconduct allegations. The panel’s decision to dismiss the recusal application triggered the urgent application for judicial review, as the tribunal was due to start the following Monday.

However, Saini J said that on Thursday 30 January, the day before he heard the application, the IOPC sent S&G a detailed pre-action response, but "for reasons which are not clear to me", it was not put before him when he considered the application the following evening. He was given four bundles of evidence and two bundles of authorities, as well as the pleadings. The judge said he had "no knowledge" of the position of the defendants and IOPC as an interested party. Saini J said that he was left to do the best he could on a Friday evening, and work out "what, if anything, would be the response of the interested party and the defendants". He went on: "In my view, it was wholly unacceptable for the claimants' solicitors not to put that letter before the court. "When one seeks an urgent injunction, on paper or orally, and particularly when one invokes the urgent application process in the Administrative Court, as a basic and well-established rule, it is incumbent upon the applicant to put all material before the judge, including any material which has been supplied by the potential respondent to the application."

Had the letter from the IOPC had been put before him, he was "highly likely to have refused a stay". This was because the points made on behalf of the IOPC reflected "in substance" the reasons he subsequently gave for dismissing the application and removing the stay. Saini J awarded costs orders in favour of the IOPC and the Chief Constable of Bedfordshire, to be assessed on the standard basis.

However, he said the IOPC had applied for indemnity costs because of the failure to disclose the letter, and if this was pursued, S&G "will need to provide a full explanation to the court as to how this situation arose and how the failure was consistent with well-established rules governing without notice applications." Saini J drew the firm's attention to sections 14 and 16 of the Administrative Court Judicial Review Guide 2019, setting out the 'duty of candour' in disclosing information to the court and its particular importance in urgent cases. An S&G spokesman said: "There was no intention to mislead the court with the omission of this document. It was a genuine error and we accept the court's criticism."

UK Freed 42 Terrorists in Year Before Law to Detain Extremists For Longer

JamieGrierson, Guardian: More than 40 convicted terrorists were released from prison in the year before emergency legislation was introduced to keep jailed extremists locked up for longer, figures reveal, while the number of far-right detainees has surged. After a non-fatal terror attack in south-west London last month, the government fast-tracked laws to prevent the automatic release of terrorist offenders without Parole Board assessment. The new laws, which came into force a week ago, were applied retrospectively, meaning serving prisoners will stay in prison longer than expected. But according to the latest figures on use of the Terrorism Act, in the year to September 2019, 42 convicted terrorists were released from custody after serving prison sentences, some of whom would have been released automatically at the halfway point of their sentence with no Parole Board assessment.

Meanwhile, the figures reveal that the number of prisoners classed as rightwing extremists who are behind bars for terrorism offences has almost doubled in two years. In the year to the end of December, there were 41 people in custody categorised as holding extreme rightwing ideology, up from just a handful of cases five years ago –four in 2014 – to 21 for the same period in 2017 and 28 in 2018.

Last month, a proscription order was issued, making membership of the neo-nazi group Sonnenkrieg Division illegal in the UK. It also recognised System Resistance Network as an alias of the already banned neo-Nazi group National Action. Anyone found to be a member of, or offering support to, the groups could now face up to 10 years in jail. Overall, as of 31 December, there were 231 people in custody for terrorism-related offences, the "vast majority", or 77%, branded as holding Islamist-extremist views.

Longer Jail Time For Terrorists Could Backfire, Says Watchdog

The convicted terrorist Sudesh Amman, who was shot dead by plain-clothes officers after he stabbed two people on 2 February, was released about 10 days before he launched the assault on a busy Streatham High Road. He had been released automatically at the midway point of his sentence despite authorities having serious concerns about the risk he posed to the public. Under the emergency laws, all terrorist offenders will now have to serve two thirds of their sentence before being eligible for a Parole Board assessment and will not be automatically released. The proposals were in addition to a broad package of counter-terrorism measures announced by the Home Office and the Ministry of Justice, which included plans to introduce lie-detector tests for terrorist offenders as well as the recruitment of specialist counter-terrorism probation officers.

The number of arrests for terrorism-related activity has dropped to the lowest number in six years – 280 to 31 December – but rose in the last quarter and remains higher than the annual average of 260. Of these, 110 (39%) people were released on bail or released under investigation – meaning they were not subjected to any restrictions while inquiries into the offences continued. There were 87 (31%) charged and 65 of these were for terrorism-related offences. A further 19 (7%) received a caution, were recalled to prison or handed over to immigration authorities and 63 suspects or 23% were released without charge. Commonly, sentences are consistently less than four years and were handed down for more than half of the convictions, 24 out of 46. Three offenders in the last year were handed a life sentence, down from six in the previous year, but the number of long-term sentences of more than 10 years rose slightly.

Police Officer Arrested for Murder Accused of Framing 69

Louise Hall, Independent: A disgraced former Houston Police Officer facing murder charges is suspected of having exploited his position to ensure the wrongful conviction of 69 people. Gerald Goines was dismissed after he led a botched drug raid resulting in the death of a married couple in January 2019, ABC News reported. Not only is the former officer facing murder charges as a result of the two deaths, but is now facing allegations that he has been framing individuals for more than a decade.

Houston District Attorney Kim Ogg said on Wednesday that a review of cases Mr Goines played a substantial role in, between 2008 and 2019, found 69 people who may have been convicted on false evidence presented by the then police officer, the report said. Defence attorney Monique Sparks told ABC News she had maintained suspicions against the officer for a long time and alleged that she has received numerous complaints about Mr Goines' behaviour. "I would say that at least for 10 years that I know of, he's kind of been terrorising the community," Ms Sparks said on Thursday. "So they would tell me this and I'm like, 'OK, what you have to do is make a report and they wouldn't do it. "We would tell the prosecution 'this is what this cop did' and it was just very hard to catch him or for people to want to take it up the chain." Ms Sparks alleged defendants were too scared to file official grievances, claiming most of the people Mr Goines targeted were low-income African Americans. The 69 cases that Ms Ogg has called for a review of are those that rested solely on Mr Goines' casework, according to Texas newspaper The Houston Chronicle.

The District Attorney filed a motion requesting judges appoint lawyers for the 69 individuals so they can begin the process of possibly having their convictions overturned. "We need to clear people convicted solely on the word of a police officer whom we can no longer trust," Ogg said in a statement, according to ABC News. After Mr Goines' was relieved of duty, prosecutors dismissed dozens of the cases he had worked on, and the investigation into Mr Goines' casework has been ongoing.

The Houston Chronicle's report said Mr Goines' defence attorney hit out at Ogg's move to have Mr Goines' convictions overturned. "She could care less about these defendants," Nicole DeBorde told the Chronicle. "They're absolutely treating this differently [from other post-conviction writ cases], and there's only one reason — they are hard on their push to get people to the polls because she has some worthy opponents." Mr Goines is understood to have been a Houston police officer for 25 years and was wounded in the line of duty three times, including on the night of the drug raid that left three other police drug-team members wounded.

The chief of Houston Police, Art Acevedo, speaking at a February 2019 news conference reported by KTRK, alleged Mr Goines lied in an affidavit that allowed him to carry out a no-knock raid of the couple's home. Authorities said Mr Goines is suspected to have falsely written in the sworn document that a confidential informant conducted two drug purchases of black tar heroin at the couple's residence according to documents filed in Harris County District Court, ABC News said. One of the former police officers colleagues, Steven Bryant, was also charged with tampering with a government document. Mr Goines and Mr Bryant have both pleaded not guilty to the state and federal charges filed against them.

Your Man in the Public Gallery – Assange Hearing Day

Craig Murray, Human Rights Activist: *Woolwich Crown Court* (WCC) is designed to impose the power of the state. Normal courts in this country are public buildings, deliberately placed by our ancestors right in the centre of towns, almost always just up a few steps from a main street. The major purpose of their positioning and of their architecture was to facilitate public access in the belief that it is vital that justice can be seen by the public. WCC, which hosts Belmarsh Magistrates Court, is built on totally the opposite principle. It is designed with no other purpose than to exclude the public. Attached to a prison on a windswept marsh far from any normal social centre, an island accessible only through navigating a maze of dual carriageways, the entire location and architecture of the building is predicated on preventing public access. It is surrounded by a continuation of the same extremely heavy duty steel paling barrier that surrounds the prison. It is the most extraordinary thing, a courthouse which is a part of the prison system itself, a place where you are already considered guilty and in jail on arrival. WCC is nothing but the physical negation of the presumption of innocence, the very incarnation of injustice in unyielding steel, concrete and armoured glass. It has precisely the same relationship to the administration of justice as Guantanamo Bay or the Lubyanka. It is in truth just the sentencing wing of Belmarsh prison.

When enquiring about facilities for the public to attend the hearing, an Assange activist was told by a member of court staff that we should realise that Woolwich is a "counter-terrorism court". That is true de facto, but in truth a "counter-terrorism court" is an institution unknown to the UK constitution. Indeed, if a single day at WCC does not convince you the existence of liberal democracy is now a lie, then your mind must be very closed indeed.

Extradition hearings are not held at Belmarsh Magistrates Court inside WCC. They are always held at Westminster Magistrates Court as the application is deemed to be delivered to the government at Westminster. Now get your head around this. This hearing is at Westminster Magistrates Court. It is being held by the Westminster magistrates and Westminster court staff, but located at Belmarsh Magistrates Court inside WCC. All of which weird convolution is precisely so they can use the "counter-terrorist court" to limit public access and to impose the fear of the power of the state.

One consequence is that, in the courtroom itself, Julian Assange is confined at the back of the court behind a bulletproof glass screen. He made the point several times during proceedings that this makes it very difficult for him to see and hear the proceedings. The magistrate, Vanessa Baraitser, chose to interpret this with studied dishonesty as a problem caused by the very faint noise of demonstrators outside, as opposed to a problem caused by Assange being locked away from the court in a massive bulletproof glass box.

Now there is no reason at all for Assange to be in that box, designed to restrain extremely physically violent terrorists. He could sit, as a defendant at a hearing normally would, in the body of the court with his lawyers. But the cowardly and vicious Baraitser has refused repeated and persistent requests from the defence for Assange to be allowed to sit with his lawyers. Baraitser of course is but a puppet, being supervised by Chief Magistrate Lady Arbuthnot, a woman so enmeshed in the defence and security service establishment I can conceive of no way in which her involvement in this case could be more corrupt.

It does not matter to Baraitser or Arbuthnot if there is any genuine need for Assange to be incarcerated in a bulletproof box, or whether it stops him from following proceedings in court. Baraitser's intention is to humiliate Assange, and to instill in the rest of us horror at the vast crushing power of the state. The inexorable strength of the sentencing wing of the nightmarish Belmarsh Prison must be maintained. If you are here, you are guilty.

It's the Lubyanka. You may only be a remand prisoner. This may only be a hearing not a trial. You may have no history of violence and not be accused of any violence. You may have three of the country's most eminent psychiatrists submitting reports of your history of severe clinical depression and warning of suicide. But I, Vanessa Baraitser, am still going to lock you up in a box designed for the most violent of terrorists. To show what we can do to dissidents. And if you can't then follow court proceedings, all the better.

You will perhaps better accept what I say about the Court when I tell you that, for a hearing being followed all round the world, they have brought it to a courtroom which had a total number of sixteen seats available to members of the public. 16. To make sure I got one of those 16 and could be your man in the gallery, I was outside that great locked iron fence queuing in the cold, wet and wind from 6am. At 8am the gate was unlocked, and I was able to walk inside the fence to another queue before the doors of the courtroom, where despite the fact notices clearly state the court opens to the public at 8am, I had to queue outside the building again for another hour and forty minutes. Then I was processed through armoured airlock doors, through airport type security, and had to queue behind two further locked doors, before finally getting to my seat just as the court started at 10am. By which stage the intention was we should have been thoroughly cowed and intimidated, not to mention drenched and potentially hypothermic.

There was a separate media entrance and a media room with live transmission from the courtroom, and there were so many scores of media I thought I could relax and not worry as the basic facts would be widely reported. In fact, I could not have been more wrong. I followed the arguments very clearly every minute of the day, and not a single one of the most important facts and arguments today has been reported anywhere in the mainstream media. That is a bold claim, but I fear it is perfectly true. So I have much work to do to let the world know what actually happened. The mere act of being an honest witness is suddenly extremely important, when the entire media has abandoned that role.

James Lewis QC made the opening statement for the prosecution. It consisted of two parts, both equally extraordinary. The first and longest part was truly remarkable for containing no legal argument, and for being addressed not to the magistrate but to the media. It is not just that it was obvious that is where his remarks were aimed, he actually stated on two occasions during his opening statement that he was addressing the media, once repeating a sentence and saying

specifically that he was repeating it again because it was important that the media got it.

I am frankly astonished that Baraitser allowed this. It is completely out of order for a counsel to address remarks not to the court but to the media, and there simply could not be any clearer evidence that this is a political show trial and that Baraitser is complicit in that. I have not the slightest doubt that the defence would have been pulled up extremely quickly had they started addressing remarks to the media. Baraitser makes zero pretence of being anything other than in thrall to the Crown, and by extension to the US Government.

The points which Lewis wished the media to know were these: it is not true that mainstream outlets like the Guardian and New York Times are also threatened by the charges against Assange, because Assange was not charged with publishing the cables but only with publishing the names of informants, and with cultivating Manning and assisting him to attempt computer hacking. Only Assange had done these things, not mainstream outlets.

Lewis then proceeded to read out a series of articles from the mainstream media attacking Assange, as evidence that the media and Assange were not in the same boat. The entire opening hour consisted of the prosecution addressing the media, attempting to drive a clear wedge between the media and Wikileaks and thus aimed at reducing media support for Assange. It was a political address, not remotely a legal submission. At the same time, the prosecution had prepared reams of copies of this section of Lewis' address, which were handed out to the media and given them electronically so they could cut and paste.

Following an adjournment, magistrate Baraitser questioned the prosecution on the veracity of some of these claims. In particular, the claim that newspapers were not in the same position because Assange was charged not with publication, but with "aiding and abetting" Chelsea Manning in getting the material, did not seem consistent with Lewis' reading of the 1989 Official Secrets Act, which said that merely obtaining and publishing any government secret was an offence. Surely, Baraitser suggested, that meant that newspapers just publishing the Manning leaks would be guilty of an offence?

This appeared to catch Lewis entirely off guard. The last thing he had expected was any perspicacity from Baraitser, whose job was just to do what he said. Lewis hummed and hawed, put his glasses on and off several times, adjusted his microphone repeatedly and picked up a succession of pieces of paper from his brief, each of which appeared to surprise him by its contents, as he waved them haplessly in the air and said he really should have cited the Shayler case but couldn't find it. It was liking watching Columbo with none of the charm and without the killer question at the end of the process.

Suddenly Lewis appeared to come to a decision. Yes, he said much more firmly. The 1989 Official Secrets Act had been introduced by the Thatcher Government after the Ponting Case, specifically to remove the public interest defence and to make unauthorised possession of an official secret a crime of strict liability – meaning no matter how you got it, publishing and even possessing made you guilty. Therefore, under the principle of dual criminality, Assange was liable for extradition whether or not he had aided and abetted Manning. Lewis then went on to add that any journalist and any publication that printed the official secret would therefore also be committing an offence, no matter how they had obtained it, and no matter if it did or did not name informants.

Lewis had thus just flat out contradicted his entire opening statement to the media stating that they need not worry as the Assange charges could never be applied to them. And he did so straight after the adjournment, immediately after his team had handed out copies of the argument he had now just completely contradicted. I cannot think it has often happened in court that a senior lawyer has proven himself so absolutely and so immediately to be an unmitigated and

ill-motivated liar. This was undoubtedly the most breathtaking moment in today's court hearing.

Yet remarkably I cannot find any mention anywhere in the mainstream media that this happened at all. What I can find, everywhere, is the mainstream media reporting, via cut and paste, Lewis's first part of his statement on why the prosecution of Assange is not a threat to press freedom; but nobody seems to have reported that he totally abandoned his own argument five minutes later. Were the journalists too stupid to understand the exchanges?

The explanation is very simple. The clarification coming from a question Baraitser asked Lewis, there is no printed or electronic record of Lewis' reply. His original statement was provided in cut and paste format to the media. His contradiction of it would require a journalist to listen to what was said in court, understand it and write it down. There is no significant percentage of mainstream media journalists who command that elementary ability nowadays. "Journalism" consists of cut and paste of approved sources only. Lewis could have stabbed Assange to death in the courtroom, and it would not be reported unless contained in a government press release.

I was left uncertain of Baraitser's purpose in this. Plainly she discomfited Lewis very badly on this point, and appeared rather to enjoy doing so. On the other hand the point she made is not necessarily helpful to the defence. What she was saying was essentially that Julian could be extradited under dual criminality, from the UK point of view, just for publishing, whether or not he conspired with Chelsea Manning, and that all the journalists who published could be charged too. But surely this is a point so extreme that it would be bound to be invalid under the Human Rights Act? Was she pushing Lewis to articulate a position so extreme as to be untenable – giving him enough rope to hang himself – or was she slavering at the prospect of not just extraditing Assange, but of mass prosecutions of journalists?

The reaction of one group was very interesting. The four US government lawyers seated immediately behind Lewis had the grace to look very uncomfortable indeed as Lewis baldly declared that any journalist and any newspaper or broadcast media publishing or even possessing any government secret was committing a serious offence. Their entire strategy had been to pretend not to be saying that. Lewis then moved on to conclude the prosecution's arguments. The court had no decision to make, he stated. Assange must be extradited. The offence met the test of dual criminality as it was an offence both in the USA and UK. UK extradition law specifically barred the court from testing whether there was any evidence to back up the charges. If there had been, as the defence argued, abuse of process, the court must still extradite and then the court must pursue the abuse of process as a separate matter against the abusers. (This is a particularly specious argument as it is not possible for the court to take action against the US government due to sovereign immunity, as Lewis well knows). Finally, Lewis stated that the Human Rights Act and freedom of speech were completely irrelevant in extradition proceedings.

Edward Fitzgerald then arose to make the opening statement for the defence. He started by stating that the motive for the prosecution was entirely political, and that political offences were specifically excluded under article 4.1 of the UK/US extradition treaty. He pointed out that at the time of the Chelsea Manning Trial and again in 2013 the Obama administration had taken specific decisions not to prosecute Assange for the Manning leaks. This had been reversed by the Trump administration for reasons that were entirely political. On abuse of process, Fitzgerald referred to evidence presented to the Spanish criminal courts that the CIA had commissioned a Spanish security company to spy on Julian Assange in the Embassy, and that this spying specifically included surveillance of Assange's privileged meetings with his lawyers to discuss extradition. For the state trying to extradite to spy on the defendant's client-lawyer consultations is in itself grounds to dismiss the case. (This point is

undoubtedly true. Any decent judge would throw the case out summarily for the outrageous spying on the defence lawyers). Fitzgerald went on to say the defence would produce evidence the CIA not only spied on Assange and his lawyers, but actively considered kidnapping or poisoning him, and that this showed there was no commitment to proper rule of law in this case.

Fitzgerald said that the prosecution's framing of the case contained deliberate misrepresentation of the facts that also amounted to abuse of process. It was not true that there was any evidence of harm to informants, and the US government had confirmed this in other fora, eg in Chelsea Manning's trial. There had been no conspiracy to hack computers, and Chelsea Manning had been acquitted on that charge at court martial. Lastly it was untrue that Wikileaks had initiated publication of unredacted names of informants, as other media organisations had been responsible for this first.

Again, so far as I can see, while the US allegation of harm to informants is widely reported, the defence's total refutation on the facts and claim that the fabrication of facts amounts to abuse of process is not much reported at all. Fitzgerald finally referred to US prison conditions, the impossibility of a fair trial in the US, and the fact the Trump Administration has stated foreign nationals will not receive First Amendment protections, as reasons that extradition must be barred. You can read the whole defence statement, but in my view the strongest passage was on why this is a political prosecution, and thus precluded from extradition.

Sending Money to Someone in Prison

Sending money to prisoners by Postal Order is a rip off: Post Office surcharge for Postal Orders: £5 + 50p - £10 + £1: anything over £10 12.5% of face value.- Plus cost of envelope and stamp- second class stamp goes up to 65p in April. Sending money by cheque can take up to ten days, to reach a prisoners account.

Gov.uk, now have a free service for sending money to prisoners, it is secure and usually takes less than 3 working days to reach a prisoner's account. You'll get email confirmation of payment sent and further email when the prisoner's account has been credited to confirm your money has arrived. You will need the prisoners full name, prison number and date of birth.

'Send money to someone in prison https://www.gov.uk/send-prisoner-money

Police Jail Woman Who Paid Bail With Marijuana-Scented Cash

A Louisiana woman was arrested on drug charges after police determined the $5,000 cash she used to post an inmate's bail had a "strong odor of marijuana." Authorities began investigating Stormy Lynn Parfait, 33, on Friday, shortly after she showed up at the Ashland jail to pay the bond fee for an inmate being held there on drug charges, the Terrebonne Parish Sheriff's Office said in a statement obtained by news outlets. After catching a whiff of the cash, a detective searched her car while she was still at the jail and found nearly $40,000 more inside, along with about 100 Klonopin pills and a food stamp card that wasn't registered to Parfait, according to the sheriff's statement. Investigators found hundreds of additional pills and cash as well as marijuana, cocaine and paraphernalia, during a search of Parfait's home later, news outlets reported. Four unattended children there were turned over to a relative. Parfait was charged with multiple counts of possession with intent to distribute drugs, four counts of illegal use of a controlled drug in the presence of persons under 17, taking contraband to or into a correctional institution and other related charges, authorities said. It's unclear whether she has an attorney who can comment on her behalf.

Lockerbie Bombing: Megrahi Appeal Bid Allowed

A review has ruled the conviction of Abdelbaset al-Megrahi over the Lockerbie bombing which claimed 270 lives can be taken to a fresh appeal. The request for a posthumous appeal against the conviction was submitted by his family almost three years ago. The Scottish Criminal Case Review Commission (SCCRC) has referred the case to the High Court of Justiciary. It said that Megrahi's family was now entitled to seek an appeal against his conviction for the 1988 bombing. Mr Megrahi was convicted on 31 January 2001and sentenced to life imprisonment. He was released on compassionate grounds by the Scottish Government on 20 August 2009. Doctors reported on 10 August 2009 that he had terminal prostate cancer. On his return to Libya, al-Megrahi was initially hospitalized then allowed to leave on 2 November 2009, taking up residence in a villa in Tripoli. He died on 20 May 2012, two years and 9 months after his release.

SCCRC spokesperson said: 'When we referred this case in 2007 I never expected that, over 10 years later, we would be asked not only to revisit our original decision, applying the law as currently stated, but also consider a whole new set of materials which had become available in the intervening years. I'm pleased to report that, after another lengthy investigation and review, we are now in a position to issue our decision in this unique case.

It seems important to note that, this month, an entirely new Board of the Commission from that which considered the matter in 2007 has again decided to refer this case. The 419-page decision issued today, with voluminous appendices, is a testament to the hard work and diligence of our investigating team over the last 3 years, involving us in novel and challenging court procedures along the way, and I pay tribute to them.

The Commission's involvement in the case is, once again, at an end. It is now a matter for those representing the Crown and the defence to decide how to proceed at any future appeal. Thereafter, it will be for the appeal court to decide whether there has been a miscarriage of justice in this case.'

Several legal experts as well as the UN observer at the Lockerbie trial vehemently challenged the verdict that convicted Megrahi. While Ulrich Lumpert, the Mebo AG engineer who testified to the validity of a key piece of evidence, admitted in an affidavit to lying in court and stealing the object from his employer, after which he gave it to one of the crime investigators. A Magarha, Abdelbaset al-Megrahi was born in Tripoli on 1 April 1952 to a poor family. Although little is known of his early life, in 1971, he spent nine months studying in Cardiff, Wales and in the late 1970s, he made multiple visits to the United States and the United Kingdom. Later, he was the head of security for Libyan Arab Airlines (LAA), and director of the Centre for Strategic Studies in Tripoli. It was alleged by the FBI and the prosecution in the Lockerbie case that he was also an officer of the Libyan intelligence service, Jamahiriya el-Mukhabarat.

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.