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 798 (17/06/2020) - Cost £1

Race, Injustice, And Innocence On Death Row: Interview With Ndume Olatushani

Oskar Butcher, Justice Gap: Some 28 states in the US still have the death penalty allowing them the authority to end the lives of those it finds guilty by means of lethal injection, electrocution, lethal gas, hanging, or firing squad. Oskar Butcher recently spoke with Ndume Olatushani, who spent 28 years in prison – 20 on death row – for a crime that he did not commit: the 1983 murder of Joe Belenchia It should come as no surprise that institutional racism extends to the ultimate punishment, with evidence showing that death sentences are more common both where the victim is white, and where the defendant is from a minority. Moreover, the practice of executions in the US is historically traceable to the era of lynching and racial terror that lasted into the early 20th century.

The white supremacy evidenced when police officers extra-judicially killed George Floyd – or Trayvon Martin, Tamir Rice, and countless others is – only the tip of the iceberg. From stop and search to the death penalty, the entire system exhibits the same pattern. And whilst fallibility means that innocent people will be sentenced to death and face execution, racism means that, in the United States, they will be disproportionately black. Decades of legal battles uncovered that evidence used against Ndume Olatushani had been fabricated, and evidence of his innocence suppressed, with systemic racism playing an undeniable role in his fate. In 2012, he accepted an Alford Plea – officially maintaining his innocence whilst pleading guilty to second degree murder in order to avoid years more legal battles sat behind bars. On the record, he remains a felon, with no right to compensation or even so much as an apology. Meanwhile, Joe Belenchia's murderer has never been found. His reflections on race, injustice, and innocence on death row make for powerful reading as the protests against the death of George Floyd continue.

Oskar Butcher: How and why do you think that you ended up on death row?

Ndume Olatushani: The reality is that race was a primary issue – as it always is with the death penalty in America. Race and class just come into play. I was accused of killing a white person in the south of the United States, and I was tried by an all-white jury in a city that was majority black. That speaks volumes. The prosecutors used every one of their peremptory strikes [during jury selection] to remove black jurors, which is how I ended up with an all-white jury. I also think that during my trial, the only thing that the state was interested in was closing the case – because they knew that I was innocent. The authorities certainly weren't trying to solve my case. All the evidence that was used against me was fabricated, so it's not like they made an honest mistake. They knew I was not the perpetrator, because the evidence that they used against me in court was fabricated, and evidence of my innocence was withheld – meaning that the jury never even heard it.

Ndume: How was death row different to other parts of prison that you experienced?

No: The difference in treatment on death row, as opposed to the general prison population, is like night and day. Can you imagine being in a four by nine foot cell, where you can't even stretch your arms out? Imagine being in that space for 23 hours a day – and the only time outside of your cell is one hour of recreation in a cage. And whenever you come out, you're handcuffed and shackled by your ankles, escorted by two prison officials. They would even chain and shackle me, for 15 minutes, to move me two feet into the shower. I was allowed to shower for less than 10 minutes before I was removed, shackled and chained – again for 15 minutes – and scooped two feet back into my cell. During nearly 20 years on death row – 19 years, 11 months and a few days to be precise – I never had the opportunity to touch grass, even though it was right outside my cage. So, the first day that I got off death row, I went out in the general prison population yard, took my shoes off, and walked barefoot on grass. I could walk around in the prison yard, with the sun directly on top of me, unhindered by a cage. It may not sound like nothing, but it really was. Compared with the way that I was treated on death row, isolated and in solitary confinement for 23 hours a day, the 8 years that I spent in the general prison population was much better. It was like night and day for me.

OB: It seems impossible to imagine for someone who hasn't been through it…

Ndume: The best way to understand would be, when you go home tonight, go into your bathroom and imagine having to spend 23 hours of the day in there, and that the only hour you can go outside is into a cage. That would be my suggestion to get a sense of what it might feel like. But as you say, without being there, you really can't know what it's like when people are telling you that they are going to execute you.

OB: What went through your head when you first heard the death sentence being passed?

Ndume: The prevailing emotion was that I was really angry. I was really angry that I had to sit through that kangaroo process, where these people were telling all of these lies, and doing it with a straight face as if they were telling the truth. And then seeing the jury buy it, my most prevailing emotion was certainly anger. But I also experienced a lot of pain for my mother, because she had to sit through it all and was made a party to that circus. That was the real thing for me, the hurt and pain that I felt for my mother and, alongside my anger, the helplessness of being unable console her.

OB: It struck me when we met was that you have a very calm demeanour, which was surprising given everything that you've been through.

Ndume: The thing that changed that anger for me was that, two years into my imprisonment on death row, my mother was killed in a car accident. Once that happened, it laid me flat on the ground. It was only after I began to pick myself up from that blow that I realised that, in order for me to move forward, I would have to let go of the anger that I had towards the people who had put me on death row. I knew that I had to move on. But I want to be really clear about this: I didn't completely get rid of the anger. Anger is a human emotion, a part of life, and we should be angry when we look around and see injustice before our eyes. The thing that I learnt was that we should channel that anger into doing something – in my case, first off, that was saving my life. There are always going to be things that knock us down in life. The important thing is, really, how you pick yourself back up. The person that I am today is only here because I was able to survive my fight after my mother was killed.

OB: Alongside, of course, your relationship with you mother, are there any relationships from that time that stand out?

Ndume: Of course, I built relationships with people who were with me on death row. Some of them have been executed, some of them are still sitting there. I'm still in constant contact with several people who are still death row. I feel that I really have a responsibility now to let people who are in broken circumstances know that, as long as you have hope and keep getting up, everything is possible. A number of people from the outside world also extended their hand of friendship to me when I was on death row, when I really had nothing to offer anybody. I had the privilege to develop many such friendships. They are still very important to me, and I'm still in touch with those people. But I was so fortunate, and am so fortunate, because even though I was sitting on death row, I always had my family who stood with me. I came from a very strong family who stood by me, and they knew I hadn't done it.

OB: What would you say is your overriding memory of being on death row?

Ndume: I think that it would have to be hope. I know that it's true in life as well, but, if you've ever seen somebody in prison without hope, that's really a sad existence. A couple of people who I was good friends with committed suicide because they lost hope. I was able to maintain the hope that one day I would be free. Even though I realised and understood that if the truth didn't come out, I was going to be executed. Certainly, there were times when I felt despair, but those were always fleeting moments for me, and I would go right back to hope, which allowed me to keep getting back up. But I didn't do that by myself – my family and friends helped me even when I didn't feel like I wanted to. They helped me to get up by the mere fact of standing with me, even when it felt like the world was against me.

OB: Can you tell me about how you came to discover art, and what that has meant for you?

Ndume: Really, but for my art, I wouldn't be sitting here right now. It was part of that hope. The pictures that I painted on death row, all of them were borne of the idea of hope – of what could be, and of what I wanted to see. I actually came into art right before my mother was killed in a car accident. There was an artist on death row with me at the time, and I commissioned him to do a portrait of me to send to my mother. Long story short, when the guy did this "portrait", it looked nothing like me – but I had to pay him! Cigarettes were like currency, and I gave him 6 or 7 cartons even though it didn't look anything like me. And I'm sitting in this cell, looking at this picture, and I'm thinking man – I could have done a better job myself and kept my money! Shortly after that is when my mother passed, and when I was trying to pick myself up, I just began to draw. And eventually I started painting too. So that's really how I got into art. I stumbled upon it as I was going through this tragedy, and it was the best thing that could have happened to me. If it weren't for my art, I have no doubt that I wouldn't be sitting here talking to you now, because it was really through my art that people were drawn a little closer, and when they were drawn closer, they learnt about my story. I even end up meeting my wife through my art, and it was through her work that we contacted the lawyers who eventually brought me home.

OB: Tell me about the 'Alford plea' and what it tells us about the American justice system?

Ndume: Through the Alford plea I was able to go before the court after being I prison for almost three decades, maintain my innocence, and essentially say that it's in my best interests – rather than spending 2-3 more years in prison – to plead guilty to a lesser offence. In that way, I could leave prison right away. But from my perspective, the Alford is really in place to absolve the state from being responsible for what they've done. It happens on a weekly basis that innocent people, like myself, walk out of prison after decades, for things that they didn't do. But once I accepted this Alford plea, the state could say "well, we still have this conviction". And so, in spite of all the evidence, they don't even have to apologise for what they did to me, or try to make me whole again – even though they never could. It completely absolves the state of any responsibility and, in that way, it exonerates the state of its crimes.

OB: What would you say to someone who argues that we can keep the death penalty, as long as it is only for people who are 'definitely guilty'?

Ndume: As long as you have the death penalty, innocent people are going to be subjected to it. Period. And once that mistake is made, you can't ever reverse it. So, no country or state should be in the business of executing people, because the only thing it does is cheapen life. The United States is one of the most violent societies in the world. Well, if executions work, why are we so violent? I think it's in part because we've got a state that's killing people. And as long as that system is in place, innocent people are inevitably going to be caught up in

it.

OB: What have you been doing since your release, and what are your plans for the future?

Ndume: Since I've been home, I've really been trying to educate people about the death penalty, as well as another pressing issue here in the USA: mass incarceration. There are hundreds of billions of dollars to be made in locking people up in the USA, and in this country, that simply means that somebody is going to jail. A lot of people who are sitting in jail really don't need to be there, but they are, ultimately, because imprisonment is such a lucrative industry. As I said earlier, we don't have to look far to find a whole lot to be angry about, and we should be angry. But we need to take that anger and channel it to do something about these issues. I feel a very real responsibility to work on these issues of social injustice within the criminal justice system – and the death penalty is right at the top of it.

CCRC Refer Eight More Post Office Cases for Appeal – Bringing Total to 47

All of the CCRC referrals so far are being made on the basis of an abuse of process argument concerning issues with the Post Office's Horizon computer system which may have had an impact on the safety of the convictions. Then CCRC believes the argument gives rise to a real possibility that the appeal courts will quash these convictions. More details about the circumstances of the convictions and the reasons for the CCRC referrals are set out below in our press release from 26th March in which we announced our decision to refer the first 39 cases. It can be seen here: Those cases have now been formally referred with the individual applicants and the Court of Appeal having been sent CCRC Statements of Reasons setting out in detail the reasons for the decision. The referral of the eight further cases has been decided and the formal referral will follow in the coming days. As with the earlier 39 referrals, because of the Covid-19 lockdown, the CCRC decision-making committee met virtually to decide these cases using remote access IT technology.

A Black Man's Life Not Valued': Attack on Long Delay of UK Police Death Inquiry

Mark Townsend, Guardian:An official review into the death of a black man who was punched repeatedly by police, beaten with a baton and Tasered has been delayed for the last year because investigators have yet to obtain a transcript of the inquest. Campaigners said the "unacceptable" hold up of the inquiry into the death of Darren Cumberbatch, 32, delivered the "message that the life of a black man is not valued". Cumberbatch died of multiple organ failure in hospital in July 2017 after being arrested by police at a probation hostel in Nuneaton, west Midlands. His family say the electrician's body was covered in bruises and "strange marks" when they visited him in hospital, where he died nine days after being apprehended. The incident prompted a series of marches for justice in Coventry, Cumberbatch's home city. An inquest heard he was punched 15 times by officers, and that police restraint, including use of Tasers and batons, contributed to Cumberbatch's death. The coroner said the level of restraint used by Warwickshire Police was "excessive". After the inquest concluded in June last year, the independent police watchdog pledged to "review the findings" of its investigation, not yet made public, into Cumberbatch's death.

However, the IOPC has now admitted to the Observer that it has failed to even acquire the transcript of the high-profile inquest. Birmingham campaigner, the Rev Desmond Jaddoo, representing the Cumberbatch family, said he was left almost speechless by the inability to obtain a record of the coroner's court. "It's not good enough, it speaks for itself," he said, adding the case had eroded trust in the police in a city which last week saw thousands of demonstra-

tors protest about the death of George Floyd in US police custody.

Deborah Coles, director of the charity Inquest, said: "Demonisation, obfuscation, delay and denial are the reality for bereaved families seeking justice. It is unacceptable that a year on from the inquest finding that police restraint was excessive force, those investigating this have done nothing." Coles added: "This sends out a message that the life of a black man is not valued. This is not just an issue in the US. Darren's death is one of a pattern of deaths synonymous with state violence, structural racism, injustice and impunity." Further marches against police brutality are planned in Birmingham later this month where protestors will remember Cumberbatch and others, including former footballer Dalian Atkinson, who died after officers Tasered and physically restrained him.

In October 2018, the IPOC said it had completed its investigation into Cumberbatch, shared it with his family, and that its publication would "await the conclusion of an inquest". However, following the inquest the watchdog announced it wanted to "review" the investigation's findings. An IOPC spokesperson said: "To do so effectively we require a transcript of the coroner's court proceedings to progress this work further." They added: "We have been chasing this since last year and we now understand that a transcript is being prepared. It is essential that we compare the information given in detailed live evidence at the inquest with that evidence gathered during our investigation.

Contact with the Midlands Police Can Be Fatal: Sean Fitzgerald Monday 7 January 2019 - Trevor Smith 4th January 2019 - Mark Yafai, 1st July, 2015 - Rafal Delezuch - 15th August 2012, Xuan Wei Zhang, 4th April 2012, Lloyd Butler – 4th August 2011, Demetre Fraser - 31st May 2011, Kingsley Burrell-Brown - 30th March 2011, Mikey Powell - 7th September 2003, John Leo O'Reilly – 3rd July 1994, all ten died after coming into contact with West Midlands Police.

Jeremy Bamber Refused Access To Documents on Essex Family Murders

Simon Hattenstone and Diane Taylor, Guardian: Jeremy Bamber, who is serving a whole life sentence for one of Britain's most notorious multiple murders, has been refused access to documents that he believes could help clear his name. Mr Justice Knowles upheld an earlier high court decision in January that backed the Crown Prosecution Service's refusal to grant Bamber's request for post-conviction disclosure of items relating to the possible existence of a second silencer found at the at White House farm in Essex where the murders took place in 1985. In his judgment, delivered a week after the hearing held on Skype at Leeds administrative court, Knowles said: "I am unable to say that the CPS erred in law in refusing to make the disclosure sought."

However, the judge provided hope to Bamber in his quest to clear his name and ruled that new evidence in the case could be used to make fresh submissions to the Criminal Cases Review Commission (CCRC). He said: "This does not leave the claimant without a remedy. Much work has already been done and he has the makings of a fresh submission to the CCRC, including an unqualified report from Mr Boyce [a ballistics expert] in support of his case that there was a second moderator recovered from the farm. That provides him with the necessary basis for arguing that his convictions are unsafe."

Bamber's adoptive parents, Nevill and June Bamber, were shot and killed inside their farmhouse in Tolleshunt D'Arcy during the night of 6-7 August 1985, along with their adopted daughter, Sheila Caffell, and her six-year-old twin boys, Nicholas and Daniel. Bamber, then 24, had phoned the police to say his father had called him, saying Caffell had "gone crazy and has the gun".

Initially, police believed Caffell had fired the shots then turned the gun on herself. But, on 10 August, after the police ended their examination of the crime scene, a relative of the Bamber parents, David Boutflour, found a silencer in the gun cupboard of the farmhouse. It was later said to contain blood belonging to Caffell. The case turned on the silencer – the prosecution argued it was impossible for Caffell to have shot herself with the silencer on because her arms were not long enough to pull the trigger, and therefore the killer was Bamber. Noone else was under suspicion. On 7 September 1985, Bamber's ex-girlfriend told police he had discussed killing his family with her and that he was involved. On 29 September 1985 Bamber was charged with the murders. At the end of the trial in October the following year, the jury was sent out to reach a verdict, but returned to ask the judge for clarification on the silencer and blood evidence. The judge said it contained only Caffell's blood. The jury convicted Bamber by a 10 to two majority.

At last week's hearing, the silencer again played a crucial role. In 2011, Bamber discovered that a week before the 1986 trial, the head of biology at Huntingdon Forensic Science Laboratories wrote to Essex police saying the blood on the silencer "could have come from Sheila Caffell or Robert Boutflour", another relative. That letter was not disclosed to the jury. Robert Boutflour, now dead, gave evidence for the prosecution. He was a regular visitor to White House farm and had used the guns kept there for shooting. In 2019, a peer-reviewed report compiled by Boyce was sent to the CPS about the possibility that there had been more than one silencer. Boyce concluded that, based on differing groove patterns, sizes and exhibit numbers, "at least two sound moderators had been examined in this case". He said access to the actual original case documents could provide more detail.

Joe Stone QC, representing Bamber, argued that the existence of a second silencer could "have undermined the conclusion reached by the jury" and "put a wholly different complexion on the prosecution case". The CPS argued that Bamber's legal team was engaged in a "fishing exercise". Annabel Darlow, representing the crown, said: "It doesn't matter if 40 sound moderators were found at the property. The only significance of the sound moderator is that it had blood type matching to Sheila Caffell deep within the baffles."

However, the judge added in his ruling: "If ever there was a case where the CCRC should be approached to make a decision on what is said to be new evidence, it is this one. This is a massively complex case which has been investigated and reinvestigated by more than one police force over some 35 years. The body of material is vast. After so many years, and so much litigation, the CCRC is the body undoubtedly best placed to consider the claimant's arguments." Speaking from Wakefield prison, Bamber said: "The fight will continue and my substantial and compelling submissions will be made to the CCRC as soon as possible. We know that ultimately, disclosure of the material or not, we will win and I will be freed.

Serco Wins Covid-19 Test-And-Trace Contract Despite £1m Fine

Diane Taylor, Guardian:Calls for government to cancel £45m deal with outsourcing company over track record of poor performance. Serco, one of the companies that has secured a lucrative government contract for the Covid contact-tracing programme, was fined more than £1m for failures on another government contract just months ago, the Observer has learned. The revelation has led to campaigners against the privatisation of public services to call for the £45.8m test-and-trace contract to be cancelled. Serco has a range of government contracts both in the UK and overseas, much of it focused on criminal justice and immigration. It has already had to apologise after breaching data protection rules on its test-and-trace contract by inadvertently revealing the email addresses of new recruits. The junior health minister, Edward Argar, is a former Serco lobbyist.

Serco, whose chief executive is Rupert Soames, grandson of Sir Winston Churchill, is one of a

number of companies that has contracts with the Home Office to provide accommodation for asylum seekers. As a result of failures in this contract in 2019, Serco was fined more than £1m by the government, but no breakdown of the failures has been disclosed in a freedom of information response obtained by the Scottish Refugee Council after a six-month battle. This latest fine does not appear to have hampered Serco's ability to win a raft of government contracts in recent months. According to the company's website, alongside the test-and-trace contract, it secured an £800m 10-year prisoner escort-and-custody contract in October 2019, and in February this year a new contract, valued at £200m, to manage two immigration removal centres close to Gatwick airport . Serco has received larger fines in the past, notably more than £19m as part of a settlement with the Serious Fraud Office over failures in electronic tagging dating back to 2010.

Cat Hobbs, the director of We Own It, which campaigns against the privatisation of public services, said: "The public will be outraged to hear this latest news of a further fine. We call on the government to cancel Serco's contracts and bring test, track and trace into local, expert public sector hands." A Department of Health and Social Care spokesperson said: "As part of an unprecedented response to this pandemic, we have drawn on the expertise and resources of a number of public and private sector partners to support our NHS and social care sector." "A Serco spokesperson said: "Service credits are a natural part of undertaking a demanding and rigorous contract such as Compass [housing people seeking asylum]." Service credits are sums deducted from a company's monthly invoice when it fails to meet key performance indicators. The spokesperson added: "However, it showed significant improvements … and Serco developed a strong reputation for service delivery."

COVID Restrictions Affect Vulnerable Women Prisoners

Mothers Had Not Seen Their Children For Two Months. Three women's prisons visited by the Inspectorate during the COVID-19 emergency were found to have introduced significantly restricted daily regimes to tackle the spread of the virus. While this approach was well communicated by staff who maintained positive relationships with prisoners, inspectors were troubled by the negative impact of the restrictions on some women at HMP & YOI Bronzefield, HMP & YOI Eastwood Park and HMP & YOI Foston Hall. As at all prisons, face-to-face visits had stopped. At the three women's prisons, video-based visits had yet to come into operation and some women had not seen their children for two months. Inspectors were also concerned about the suspension of specialist support for some of the most vulnerable women and the fact that many were released without accommodation.

Inspectors carried out short scrutiny visits on 19 May. Peter Clarke, HM Chief Inspector of Prisons, said: "All three establishments had implemented regime restrictions to ensure prisoners could only come out of their cells in smaller groups, generally on one landing. In addition, those who were new to custody, were vulnerable to COVID-19 or had symptoms of the virus were isolated from the rest of the population." Isolation was generally managed well at Bronzefield and Foston Hall. However, at Eastwood Park managers needed to address weaknesses in this area. Social distancing was understood by both staff and prisoners and, while difficult due to some narrow corridors and small offices, was generally adhered to at Eastwood Park and Foston Hall. However, social distancing was not routinely observed at Bronzefield.

The regime for women was most limited at Foston Hall, where most only received 30 minutes of exercise each day. Women at Bronzefield received an hour, as did the majority of prisoners at Eastwood Park. Face-to-face education had been largely suspended and inspectors were concerned by the absence of any organised PE provision. Mr Clarke said: "Our findings highlight the particular impact many of the restrictions implemented to control the spread of the virus has had on this population. We found that self-harm had increased from the high levels seen prior to the restrictions being implemented."

Managers at all three sites had put in place measures to support prisoners at risk of self-harm and it was positive to see enhanced welfare checks and access to peer support at Bronzefield and Eastwood Park. Despite these efforts, Mr Clarke added, "we were concerned about the impact of the very sudden withdrawal of a range of interventions from a small number of prisoners with very high levels of need." The report noted: "Despite the work of staff, the very restricted regime meant prisoners at risk of self-harm felt isolated from others and craved more human contact."

The suspension of visits had had a particularly acute impact. Mr Clarke said: "We spoke to women who had not seen their children for two months and were understandably frustrated by the delays in supplying any video calling provision. The prisons had continued to receive significant numbers of new prisoners and early release schemes in operation had been largely ineffective in reducing the population. It was positive that all three sites had maintained release planning processes, but Mr Clarke added: "This hard work was undermined by the lack of accommodation for many on release. Since the start of the restrictions, 40% of prisoners released from Bronzefield and Eastwood Park and 20% of those release from Foston Hall had no accommodation on the day of their release."

"This report highlights positive practice in several areas and it is a credit to staff that most prisoners we spoke to were positive about staff-prisoner relationships, despite the significant restrictions in place. However, the particularly high level of need within the women's estate makes it all the more important to prioritise work to improve the support offered to prisoners with multiple and complex needs, implement an effective alternative to visits and for HMPPS to work with other government departments to improve provision of accommodation on release."

Whitehall Held Secret Review Into 15 Possible Cases of Torture or Rendition

Dan Sabbagh, Guardian: Fifteen potential cases of torture or rendition involving British intelligence at the height of the "war on terror" were examined last year in a secret Whitehall review, whose existence was revealed in court proceedings on Tuesday. None were deemed by officials to have involved British spies being party to human rights abuses – a decision that is being challenged by two MPs and the human rights charity Reprieve as part of a high court judicial review.

Lawyers acting for the former Conservative minister David Davis and Labour's Dan Jarvis want to overturn a decision by Theresa May to ditch a promise to hold a judge-led inquiry into the involvement of British intelligence in torture and rendition following 9/11. Ben Jaffey QC, representing the MPs, told the high court that the existence of the 15 torture or rendition files had only emerged in a witness statement made by an MI6 officer known only as AA as part of disclosure proceedings. "This material is central to the case," Jaffey said. "There are fifteen potential cases that might require further investigation. But the government's view is none of them in fact do – and there is no detail about any of them."

AA's statement, which was read out in court by Jaffey, however, says it is the government's position that "none of these 15 cases presents an extant and unmet investigative obligation" after the Whitehall review, which was ordered on behalf of May in October 2018. Tuesday's hearing was to decide whether the judicial review should be heard in secret. The government argues that because the charity and the two MPs are not victims, there is no need for them

to hear the detail of the case in open court. But Jaffey told the court the claimants believed the government had a requirement under article 3 of the European convention on human rights, which bans torture and inhumane treatment and requires allegations of it to be fully investigated. That could only be discharged if the judicial hearing was heard in public and more details about the 15 cases emerged so it could be tested whether May was right to have concluded no public inquiry was needed, Jaffey said. In this area "the government has repeatedly been found to have given incomplete accounts", the barrister added.

The most notorious case is that of Abdel Hakim Belhaj, a Libyan dissident who was abducted by the CIA in 2004 from Thailand and sent back with his wife, with the help of information supplied by MI6. While back in Libya he was tortured and sentenced to death, although he survived and ultimately received an apology from May. Few other cases have been as thoroughly investigated. A public inquiry under Sir Peter Gibson was halted by the government while the Belhaj case was concluded in the courts – and an ensuing inquiry by the intelligence and security committee was abandoned after being prevented from taking evidence from witnesses. After Tuesday's hearing, Davis said he wanted to see the case dealt with transparently, "not this unBritish, Kafkaesque, secret courts process", while Jarvis said: "I believe the public has a right to know what was done in its name." The director of Reprieve, Maya Foa,said: "Evidence of British involvement in kidnap, torture, and rendition must be opened up to public scrutiny." Judgment as to whether the full proceedings would be heard in public or private was reserved by the presiding judges, Dame Victoria Sharp and Mrs Justice Farbey. The full case is due to be heard in the autumn at the earliest.

Barriers Faced by Women Seeking to Appeal Criminal Convictions and Sentencing

Barriers identified to accessing the Court of Appeal included gendered factors, such as an under-confidence of women to take on appeals. More than four-fifths (86%) of women writing for advice on appeal were significantly outside of the 28-day appeal window from the date of their conviction or sentence. Reasons for delay included the fact that women often did not feel comfortable revealing their experiences of gendered trauma such as domestic abuse to legal representatives at trial and were afraid of being disbelieved. As a result, such reports often came to light well after conviction and sentence and well outside of the 28-day appeal window.

More than half of the women felt that custody was a disproportionate punishment for their crime. A third of the women felt that the effect of imprisonment on their children had not been considered by the sentencing judge. More than a quarter of the women felt that their pre-sentence report was incorrect or incomplete and complained that their mitigating circumstances were not given appropriate weight at sentencing. Shame played a large role in undermining women's confidence to seek an appeal.

Further barriers identified include a lack of access to information about the appeals system. More than a third of women did not know how to lodge an appeal application. It was also apparent that varying standards of advice were offered by trial lawyers, with half of women complaining of ineffective assistance of legal advisors. Lawyers felt that it had become harder to win cases in the Court of Appeal and that the fundamental attitude of the Court was to dissuade attempts to appeal. Lawyers also raised the significant cuts to Legal Aid funding and its severe impacts on the ability of women to gain access to justice. Collectively, the findings question whether a system that is out of reach to many of those that it serves can ever be described as procedurally fair. This new research adopted a mixed-methods approach,

which included analysis of 132 letters from women in custody

Self-Harm Increases Among Female Prisoners In England During Pandemic

Guardian: Self-harm has increased among female prisoners during the coronavirus pandemic and some are being released without anywhere to go, inspectors have said. Inspectors, who carried out scrutiny visits on 19 May, said they were troubled by the impact of new restrictions at three female-only prisons - Bronzefield, Eastwood Park and Foston Hall. The restrictions were aimed at helping to control the spread of the virus but the inspectors were concerned about the suspension of specialist support for some of the most vulnerable women. Peter Clarke, the chief inspector of prisons, said: "We found that self-harm had increased from the high levels seen prior to the restrictions being implemented." Despite enhanced welfare checks and support in place at Bronzefield and Eastwood Park, Clarke said: "We were concerned about the impact of the very sudden withdrawal of a range of interventions from a small number of prisoners with very high levels of need." An inspectors' report noted: "Despite the work of staff, the very restricted regime meant prisoners at risk of self-harm felt isolated from others and craved more human contact." Prisoner release schemes were "undermined by the lack of accommodation for many on release", according to Clarke.

He said: "Since the start of the restrictions, 40% of prisoners released from Bronzefield and Eastwood Park and 20% of those release from Foston Hall had no accommodation on the day of their release." The inspectors' report on the scrutiny visits added: "This was not a safe way to release potentially vulnerably prisoners, especially during a pandemic." Efforts to reduce the amount of inmates through release schemes had proved largely ineffective as significant numbers of new prisoners were admitted. Under the new restrictions, face-to-face visits and education sessions had stopped and prisoners were allowed out of their cells in smaller groups.

The inspectors were concerned by the absence of any organised physical education provision and they said that social distancing was not routinely observed at Bronzefield. They said video-based "visits" not been set up and some women had not seen their children for two months. The report comes as children separated from their mothers, and the prisons minister Lucy Frazer, are set to give evidence to the joint committee on human rights on Monday. Details about the significantly restricted daily regimes were well communicated by staff who maintained positive relationships with prisoners, the inspectors added.

Pshibiyev and Berov v. Russia - Curtailment of Family Visits - Violation of Article 8

The applicants, Mr Pshibiyev and Mr Berov are Russian nationals who were born in 1978 and 1981 respectively. They are detained in Kemerovo and Sverdlovsk. The case concerned the fact that the applicants were unable to receive either short visits under appropriately substantiated procedures or extended visits from members of their families. On 15 October 2005, a group of armed men attacked several State institutions in the city of Nalchik in the Kabardino-Balkarian Republic. In the framework of the investigation into these incidents,Mr Pshibiyev and Mr Berov were arrested and remanded in custody. On 22 October and 24 October, 2005 Mr Pshibiyev and Mr Berov were moved to remand prison no. IZ-7/1 in Nalchik. During their detention on remand, they received a number of short visits from members of their families in the remand prison. On 12 September 2011 Mr Pshibiyev and Mr Berov submitted requests to the Supreme Court of the Kabardino-Balkarian Republic for extended visits from members of their families. The Supreme Court of the Kabardino-Balkarian Republic rejected the requests. Pursuant to section 18(3) of Law no. 103-FZ of 15 July 1995 on the pre-trial detention of persons suspected or accused of criminal offences, individuals

held in a remand prison were only eligible for short family visits lasting no longer than three hours, under the supervision of a prison guard.In July 2012, Mr Pshibiyev and Mr Berov submitted fresh requests. The Supreme Court of the Kabardino-Balkarian Republic once again rejected the requests on the same grounds.On 14 September 2012 Mr Pshibiyev and Mr Berov appealed to the Constitutional Court of the Russian Federation. On 7 February 2013, the Constitutional Court dismissed the complaint. On 23 December 2014, the Supreme Court of the Kabardino-Balkarian Republic sentenced Mr Pshibiyev and Mr Berov to 17 and 15 years' imprisonment respectively.

Relying on Article 8 (right to respect for private and family life) of the Convention, the applicants complained of the fact that they had been unable to receive extended visits from members of their families during their period of detention in the remand prison. They also criticised the practical arrangements for the short visits which they had received. Violation of Article 8. Just satisfaction: EUR 13,000 each to Mr Pshibiyev and Mr Berov in respect of non-pecuniary damage, and EUR 3,000 to the applicants jointly in respect of costs and expenses

Lies, Lies and More Damned Lies - Truth Exists; Only Lies Are Invented

In Gulliver's Travels, Jonathan Swift lets Captain Gulliver explain to the Houyhnhnms, a race of highly intelligent horses dedicated to reason and truth, that lawyers are: intrinsically corrupt, trained from the cradle in defending falsehood and will argue that white is black (or vice versa), according to what they are paid to argue. TV series like Shark, Damages or Better Call Saul portray lawyers as willing to lie and obfuscate in order to get the results they want, not always serving justice. Outside of fiction, in Britain, Europe and many other stable jurisdictions with an independent judiciary, lawyers tend to be viewed as trustworthy, being under professional and legal obligations to act with honesty and integrity at all times.

As discussed previously, we expect truth in law and are justifiably upset about deceit, sharp practice and cover-ups. Most jurisdictions have laws that punish perjury, knowingly making false statements and actions or attempts which pervert the course of justice. Outside of law, our relationship with lying is more complicated. Some lies are indeed serious manipulations and betrayals of trust. But we also "fib" about inconsequential things, tell "white lies" to save people from perceived embarrassment or hurt and "pro-social lies" to flatter or encourage others. We lie to portray ourselves in a better light, buy more time or think the person we lie to is not entitled to the whole truth. Psychologist Aldert Vrij notes that everybody lies and not all lies necessarily trouble us. Indeed, the recent elections in UK or US demonstrated that a majority seems comfortable voting for presidents and prime ministers who are notorious liars, bullshitters (see below) and untrustworthy characters.

What's a lie? Unsurprisingly for lawyers and philosophers, there is no universally accepted definition. Dictionaries tend to define lying as "making a false statement with the intention to deceive". But is an intention to deceive necessary for statements being lies? In jurisdictions like the UK or US, where good faith is not a fundamental requirement in contractual negotiations, negotiators often deliberately misstate their initial bargaining positions and expect their counterpart to do likewise. False statements meant ironically, in hyperbole or metaphors are not intended to deceive either. And utterances in totalitarian regimes, such as "The Party is always right" are also not meant to deceive, like polite excuses demanded by etiquette ("John is indisposed" as opposed to "He is too hungover to talk to you"). They are social code rather than lies.

Lies are also different from BS. Philosopher Harry Frankfurt proposed that while a liar cares about but attempts to hide the truth, a bullshitter doesn't care about truth but only whether a listener is persuaded by his nonsense. It is also unclear if silence can be a lie: In People v Meza

(1987), a Californian court found Mr Meza guilty of perjury, as relevant law defined certain intentional nonverbal conduct as equivalent to making a statement. Mr Meza's silence and failure to react to questions was taken as a negative statement. The list goes on – does a liar have to know that his statement is false or merely believe that it is? Does a liar have to assert the truth of a statement before it becomes a lie or is a false statement without assertions of truthfulness enough? What about bluffing or "lies by omission" – assertions or conduct intended to deceive but not necessarily using false statements? And truthiness – statements claimed to be true based on gut-feeling, without evidence or recourse to facts, logic or scrutiny?

The Smell Of Burning Pants In The Morning: Humans are bad lie-detectors: even police, lawyers, psychologists or HR staff who pride themselves on having great "BS-radars" are statistically actually no better than chance. They just get lied to more often and are professionally incentivised to look for lies, which creates a false belief of being a better lie-detector than the average person. Ultimately we depend on truthfulness and trust to navigate our society, not just the law. Lawyers in Scotland are trained to "tell it to clients like it is", both as a professional duty and mark of respect for the people we serve. Respect for people and professionalism are also crucial for the art of government – but that's a different subject entirely. Benjamin Bestgen is a solicitor and notary public (qualified in Scotland). He also holds a Master of Arts degree in philosophy and tutored in practical philosophy and jurisprudence at the Goethe Universität Frankfurt am Main and the University of Edinburgh. Scottish Legal News

Charles Bronson Wins First Step in Fight For Public Parole Hearing

Owen Bowcott, Guardian: Prisoner's lawyers argue Parole Board's blanket ban breaches right to a fair trial. Charles Bronson, one of the UK's most notorious prisoners, has won the first round in a battle to overturn a blanket ban on Parole Board hearings being held in public. At a remote video hearing in the high court, lawyers for the 67-year-old argued that Ministry of Justice regulations preventing people hearing arguments about whether inmates should be released were illegal because they breached his right to a fair trial and started from the assumption that hearings should be in private. Bronson, who was born Michael Peterson but changed his name to Charles Bronson and later to Charles Salvador, was jailed in 1974 for armed robbery of a post office and sentenced to seven years in prison. Because of his violent behaviour, he has remained in jail almost continuously and spent much of his time in solitary confinement.

The public furore in 2018 over the Parole Board's initial decision to release the convicted serial sex attacker John Worboys forced changes in the way the outcome of hearings were subject to scrutiny. They did not, however, give the public or media the right to attend. Bronson, who has a Parole Board hearing coming up to consider his case, wants the hearing to be in public to ensure there is open justice. The Ministry of Justice maintains the requirement for open justice is met because the Parole Board can permit observers to attend and will release a summary of any final decision.

But Matthew Stanbury, counsel for Bronson, told the high court in a preliminary application for permission to bring a legal challenge that Parole Board rules did not permit proceedings to be held in public. "In this case Mr Salvador has waived his privacy rights," he said, "Whereas Mr Worboys did not want anyone to know about [his hearing]." Stanbury accepted it would not be possible for groups of journalists to be admitted to HMP Woodhill, a category A prison, to attend a hearing physically but said the advent of remote video technology meant there was no practical reason why proceedings could not be livestreamed. Stanbury told the court that the board's rule 15 (3) states "an oral hearing … must be held in private". He added: "It is

a blanket ban on public hearings and is intended to be such."

Jason Pobjoy, counsel for the Ministry of Justice, said the rules were intended to give prison governors a "broad discretion" in deciding whether to admit others to Parole Board hearings. "The open justice principle applies but does not mean that there's a right to a full public hearing," he added. At the end of the high court hearing, the judge, Mr Justice Swift, ruled that there were arguable grounds for a full hearing of Bronson's claim that the Parole Board rules offend the principle of open justice. A date for the trial of the issues has not been set.

Criminal Justice System Failing Disabled Defendants

Owen Bowcot, Guardain: The criminal justice system in England and Wales is failing defendants who are disabled or have mental health conditions and needs reform to ensure everyone receives a fair trial, the equalities watchdog has warned. In a report, called Inclusive Justice, the Equalities and Human Rights Commission (EHRC) calls for better treatment for those with learning disabilities, autism and brain injuries who have to go to court. The complexity of the criminal justice system and its specialist language presents a particular problem for disabled defendants and puts them at risk of not being able to participate effectively in the legal process, the report says.

There is significant overrepresentation of people with learning disabilities and mental health issues passing through the criminal system, according to the EHRC. Too few legal professionals have adequate training to appropriately assist those with with impairments. Increased digitalisation of the courts system and remote hearings during the Covid-19 crisis threatens to make the situation worse, the report notes. It quotes one woman defendant, for example, as saying: "I know I've done something wrong, but I'm really not quite sure what that was."

A crown court judge told the EHCR: "It seems to me that language is the real key, that the way we speak in court has to change … We do have to speak in a way which is not so far removed from the way that ordinary people speak and that includes people with impairments. David Isaac, the chair of the EHRC, said: "A non-discriminatory criminal justice system, that everyone can participate in, underpins our society. It stands for democracy, equality and the rule of law. It should give us all the chance of a fair trial, no matter who we are.

"But disabled people often face barriers to understanding their situation and making themselves properly understood to others. This can result in them feeling bewildered by the system and treated unfairly, which puts their right to a fair trial at risk. Clearly the system needs a redesign. The UK and Scottish governments need to make it a priority to understand the needs of disabled people in the system, giving serious consideration to our findings and recommendations, and commit to making our criminal justice systems fair for all."

The report concludes that the justice system has not been designed around the needs and abilities of disabled people and that reforms in England and Wales risk further reducing participation. Defendants' impairments are not always recognised, the report says, adjustments are therefore not made and lawyers need more guidance and training. There should also be better monitoring of data on disabled defendants in the courts.

A spokesperson for HM courts and tribunal service said: "We work closely with disability groups to ensure we have reduced the barriers that disabled people may face throughout justice system. "This includes identifying people who have mental health, learning disabilities, substance misuse or other vulnerabilities at the earliest opportunity, and providing intermediaries to help with remote hearings. We welcome the EHRC's report and look forward to

engaging with them to help improve our provisions further."

Compensation For Woman After Rape Trials Collapse Over Police Failings

A woman who police believe was sexually abused by a gang from the age of 12 has been paid a five-figure compensation sum after three trials collapsed following police failings. Fourteen people were found not guilty in March 2019 after police failed to gather evidence properly. Northumbria Police and Crime Commissioner Kim McGuinness said the woman deserved better from police. The woman, who is in her early 20s, said she felt "let down and angry". She said she spent four years giving police statements and had been given no "clear explanation" by the force of what went wrong. I still feel very let down and disappointed," she said. "I'm more angry that there's no trust. The police are not saying 'this is what happened and we're sorry. I had done everything that they had asked us to do and more. And then they didn't trust me enough to tell the truth."

The force has apologised to the alleged victims for "police failings which resulted in the cases not going ahead at court". Assistant Chief Constable Rachel Bacon said a review by a department "independent of the investigation" is being concluded but "areas of learning have already been identified" with "action taken to address these". She said the review's findings would be shared publically once they have been shown to the victims. Ms Bacon said: "The victims remain at the forefront of our minds and we are committed to ensuring they receive the support they need. "I would like to make a direct appeal to anyone who is the victim of any form of sexual offence, please do get in touch - we are here to support you and to seek justice."

The woman, who cannot be named for legal reasons, was one of three people who agreed to give evidence in three trials as part of the force's Operation Optic, all of which collapsed. The 14 defendants, one woman and 13 men, had denied the charges against them. The operation had investigated allegations the group had groomed, raped and trafficked three girls, including one aged 12, in Newcastle between 2010 and 2014. At the time the trials at Newcastle Crown Court collapsed last year Judge Robert Adams said the investigation "must be transparent and fair" and there was no "reasonable prospect of conviction in each case". The force carried out an internal investigation. Solicitor Richard Hardy, who represented the woman in her civil action, said he found it worrying the force did not refer itself to the Independent Office for Police Conduct. He said: "I think it's a lost opportunity for Northumbria Police to have regained public confidence by opening their doors, inviting an independent investigation rather than looking into this matter themselves and keeping it in house, "They've lost the opportunity to achieve some real transparency, some accountability and outside scrutiny and that does remain a concern." The woman said the years of alleged abuse had marred her life. She said: "The men didn't allow me to spend time with family or friends so I missed out on all the normal teenager stuff and my teenage years. "That was my childhood and then a big chunk of my adult life just wasted." Ms McGuiness added: "This woman has been through a series of traumatic events that led her to a court room experience none of us would ever want to go through. "She deserved better than the service she got from the police, and they have rightly apologised to her. "Now she and others need to know what went wrong. I have made clear to the police that updating her on the findings of the report needs to be treated as a priority."

Jailed Roma's At Large

A pair of prison escapees have reportedly left behind a note promising to return after dealing with family business. The prisoners, Davad Zukanovic and Lil Ahmetovic, allegedly escaped the prison just outside Rome, Italy earlier this month. They are believed to have sawed through the bars of their cell, scaled the prison walls using a fire hose, and broken through the final wire fence with bolt-cutters. The pair, who are cousins, left behind a note explaining that their sons needed help and their wives could not step in because they are also in prison, The Times reports. The men are both of Roma origin and were serv-

ing sentences for crimes against property and public administration, according to local media.

Capacity, DOLS and Covid-19- Updated Guidance

Sophy Miles, Doughty Street Chambers: There are a number of important aspects that were not touched on in the earlier guidance, which was considered here. The new guidance includes a section on making a best interests decision for someone who lacks capacity to consent to being tested for Covid-19. Whilst rightly reminding practitioners that no two best interests decisions will align exactly, the guidance identifies factors that may form part of the "relevant circumstances" for the purpose of section 4 Mental Capacity Act 2005 ("MCA").

"There is currently no cure for COVID-19, but targeted treatment, based on a positive test result, can improve lives (by reducing the severity and duration of symptoms), and in some cases, save lives. Testing an asymptomatic patient at risk of infection, for example before they move to another setting, can also identify infection earlier and improve outcomes for that person. Decision-makers should consider this context when making best interests decisions about testing." It is suggested that this could also be useful when identifying the "relevant information" that a person with capacity to consent would need to be able to understand, retain, use or weigh and communicate.

The guidance stresses the importance of the role of IMCAs and RPRs: "If you're an IMCA or an RPR, you should continue to represent and support the person who is or maybe subject to the Deprivation of Liberty Safeguards (Deprivation of Liberty Safeguards (DoLS)) authorisation during the pandemic". Remote techniques should be used but it is of note that the guidance now recommends face to face visits if "absolutely essential or example to meet the person's specific communication needs, urgency or if there are concerns about their human rights." This is welcome and may be a response to the intervention from Mr Justice Hayden, Vice-President of the Court of Protection in his letter to Directors of Social Services which you can read here, where he drew attention to the worrying drop in deprivation of liberty applications under section 21A and section 16. All of this however is dependent on the willingness of the care home to facilitate such access.

Further guidance is given about additional restrictions imposed on those who are subject to DOLS authorisations. The Government suggests that if face to face visits are prohibited but virtual contact is supported, this would "not be much more restrictive" and would not require a DOLS review. This may be a reference to the judgment of Hayden J in BP v Surrey CC, which you can read here. In that case the judge the following arrangement in a care home which had banned face to face visits at the start of the pandemic: *"The plan that was ultimately put together provides for BP's education in to the world of Skype with creative use of a communication board and the exploration of concurrent instant messaging. Additionally, the family can, by arrangement, go to BP's bedroom window which is on the ground floor and wave to him and use the communication board. All this will require time, effort and some creativity. I am clear that there is mutual resolve by all concerned. I am entirely satisfied that this is a balanced and proportionate way forward which respects BP's dignity and keeps his particular raft of needs at the centre of the plan. It has been important to recognise that in addition to his Alzheimer's BP's deafness is a separate and protected characteristic, as defined in Section 148(7) of the Equality Act 2010. As such, it requires to be identified and considered as a unique facet of BP's overall needs."*

Care therefore needs to be taken to ensure that the "virtual" contact is genuinely tailored to the need to each individual. The guidance clarifies that even where a person leaving hospital faces a reduced choice of destinations because of the requirement for a swift discharge, a "best interests decision" will still need to be made between the available options. This follows from the decision of the Supreme Court in N v ACCG.

Finally – and, it is suggested, somewhat belatedly- there is welcome guidance on how the emergency health powers should be used in relation to someone who lacks the relevant mental capacity. Where these powers, rather than the MCA or Mental Health Act, are used, the public health officer will "seek someone appropriate who is close to the person, such as a family member, or someone involved in the person's care, such as an IMCA or their key worker, to assist in supporting the person to be involved in the process as far as possible." Moreover, there is information on access to an appeal to the Magistrates Court if an order under the emergency powers is made: "If someone lacks the capacity to make an appeal, it can be made by someone or some authority on their behalf. This may, in some cases, be necessary even if the person is not objecting or does not appear to understand that they can make a challenge." Legal aid practitioners will be aware that only exceptional funding is available for such appeals.

HMP Full Sutton – Purposeful Activity Has Declined

HMP Full Sutton, a high security men's prison near York holds many prisoners convicted of very serious offences. Over 80% were assessed as presenting a high or very high risk of harm to others, and nearly 60% were serving indeterminate sentences. In 2020, the grades awarded for respect and rehabilitation and release planning remained the same, while safety improved to the highest grade, good. However, purposeful activity declined to not sufficiently good. Full Sutton had the lowest levels of violence in the high security estate, with a comparatively small proportion of prisoners (22%) reporting to us that they felt unsafe at the time of the inspection. However, prisoners suffering with mental health problems or who were disabled had more negative views of their treatment, including their safety, than other prisoners. The prison was urged to analyse and take action on these perceptions. Inspectors were disappointed by the findings for purposeful activity. There were not enough work or activity places for the population, and allocation was too slow in some cases. Ofsted inspectors recognised that plans were in place to bring about improvements, but those had yet to materialise. Inspectors were disappointed that around 40% of prisoners did not have an up-to-date assessment (OASys) of their risks and needs. In a prison such as this, with many prisoners serving very long sentences, it is obviously important that they should feel that their needs have been recognised and that there is an opportunity to make progress. More could be done to help prisoners maintain meaningful contact with families and friends . Public protection work was generally robust, an important finding given the high risk posed by so many of Full Sutton's prisoners, though inspectors were disappointed that around 40% of prisoners did not have an up-to-date assessment (OASys) of their risks and needs. Mr Clarke commented: "In a prison such as this, with many prisoners serving very long sentences, it is obviously important that they should feel that their needs have been recognised and that there is an opportunity to make progress."

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.