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 815 (14/10/2020) - Cost £1

Nothing Like a Pandemic to Expose the Frailties of our 'Broken' Justice System'

Matt Foot and Jon Robins, Justice Gap: Not that readers need Covid-19 to remind them of the shortcomings of our courts. That's said, beware those with a vested interest – say, politicians or senior members of the judiciary – turning a crisis into an opportunity (e.g, pushing remote justice, limiting trial by jury etc). Let's be mindful of deep embedded structural problems getting pushed to the back of the agenda. In short, it's time we talked about miscarriages of justice. All too often there is a cognitive dissonance at play in the debate over criminal justice reform. Everyone signs up to the notion that it is 'broken' but there is never quite enough time to discuss one inevitable consequence: wrongful convictions.

The tiny constituency of concern that has built around the issue which used to be front page news back in the 'bad old days' (Birmingham Six, Guildford Four etc) is finally making some headway. Two powerful podcasts have been broadcast. Ceri Jackson's excellent Shreds: Murder in the Dock tells the appalling story of the five men falsely imprisoned for the murder of Lynette White in Cardiff in 1988, and the painful process to get released. Mark Williams-Thomas's The Detective concerns a current case known as the Three Musketeers, and the extraordinary circumstances they were said to have been involved in terrorism.

Widespread concern on the treatment of miscarriage cases generally led the All-Party Parliamentary Group on Miscarriages of Justice to institute a Westminster Commission into the Criminal Cases Review Commission. Such momentum as has been built, can't be lost now. The most cash-strapped part of our austerity/ pandemic-ravaged criminal justice system is its safety net. The CCRC's budget last year was £5.2m compared, down from £5.45m the previous year. When the miscarriage of justice watchdog opened its doors in 1997, its budget was £7.5m and it only had to deal with 800 new cases. Now it receives about 1,400 applications a year. The Birmingham-based group has just one job to do. In her first public pronouncement, the current chair Helen Pitcher last year said that sending cases back to the Court of Appeal was 'not be the be-all-and-end-all'.

We beg to differ. As a watchdog, the CCRC could never be accused of being overly gung-ho. In its first 20 years, the commission sent 33 cases a year on average back to the appeal judges; however that number crashed three years ago when it sent a dozen cases back. Last year, just 13 cases were sent back and the year before 19 cases including eight concerning asylum seekers convicted of entering the country with false documentation (we have no issue with the asylum seeker cases but separate them so readers better understand our point).

It is a bleak picture that is made all the more alarming by new revelations as to how the supposedly independent watchdog has allowed itself to be emasculated. At the time of writing a prisoner called Gary Warner is challenging the CCRC's decision to reject his case on the grounds that that it is not sufficiently free of Ministry of Justice control. It's a dismal state of affairs: the CCRC has been treated dismissively by the Court of Appeal, starved of funding by successive governments for over a decade and finally neutered by its 'sponsor' department facilitated by its own weak leadership.

If the miscarriage of justice watchdog can't stand up to the bean-counters at the MoJ, what hope for the wrongly convicted? If you are the victim of miscarriage of justice, the odds have never been more stacked against you. If by some miracle the CCRC refers your case to the Court of Appeal and its judges overturn your conviction (miracle #2), don't expect the state to compensate you for those hellish lost years. In the last two years, the MoJ hasn't paid out a penny as a result of the Coalition government's 2014 change in the law. Now to be eligible you compensation you have to be able to prove your innocence beyond reasonable doubt – in other words, our lawmakers have reversed the standard burden of proof. It's a scandal. Pandemic or not, we need to talk about miscarriages.

Son of Lockerbie bomber Obtains Court Order Allowing Appeal Against Father's Conviction

Scottish Legal News: The High Court of Justiciary has granted an order allowing the son of the man convicted of the Lockerbie bombing, Abdelbaset Al Megrahi, to appeal against his late father's conviction, following a referral of the case by the Scottish Criminal Cases Review Commission (SCCRC). Mr Megrahi's son, Ali Abdulbasit Ali Almaqrahi, sought orders authorising the institution of an appeal, for leave under the Criminal Procedure (Scotland) Act 1995 to found the appeal on additional grounds based on the non-disclosure of CIA cables and the recovery of two Protectively Marked Documents in the custody of the UK Government or Police Scotland. Parts of these grounds were not contained in the SCCRC recommendations. The applications were considered by the Lord Justice General, Lord Carloway, sitting with the Lord Justice Clerk, Lady Dorrian, and Lord Menzies.

Deficiencies in Testimony: Mr Megrahi was originally convicted in 2001 of the murders of 270 people aboard Pan Am flight 103 by the deliberate induction of an explosive device onto the plane in a High Court hearing in the Netherlands. The judges who convicted him did so based partially on the testimony of Antonio Gauci, who said he sold clothing that was found in the suitcase containing the bomb to a Libyan man. Two grounds of appeal were initially referred to the High Court for consideration, namely that no reasonable court could have found Mr Megrahi guilty based on the testimony of Mr Gauci, and the failure of the Crown to disclose a number of documents which could have had a material effect on Mr Gauci's evidence. The SCCRC was also asked to consider the significance of a failure to disclose the two PMDs, but did not refer the case on the basis of any significance attached to these documents. As a result of an appeal resulting from an earlier SCCRC reference in 2007, the 1995 Act was amended to include Section 19D, which states that the grounds for appeal from a reference must be related to a reason in the reference unless it is in the interests of justice to do otherwise.

The first appeal ground advance by the appellant was entirely within the grounds given in the SCCRC report, and thus posed no issue to the court. However, the second ground raised a discrete issue about an alleged systematic failure of the Crown to disclose documents, as distinct from a failure to disclose specific relevant items. This did not form part of the Reference although the SCCRC did make some oblique remarks about such a failure. In particular, the note referred to certain CIA cables which had a bearing on the evidence of the witness Abdul Majid, which was rejected by the trial court insofar as it incriminated Mr Megrahi. The SCCRC also identified as disclosable a number of police statements and reports relating to Mr Gauci's identification of Mr Megrahi in photos published in a number of magazines.

The SCCRC did not consider that the non-disclosure of the PMDs met the real possibility of a different verdict test. It went on to question why the Crown had not investigated the matter, which responded that they had contacted officials of a "foreign authority" who, in 2000, had told them that the information in the PMDs was incorrect. On that basis, the Crown had deemed the material non-disclosable. The SCCRC did not consider that the Crown's explanation for not investigating the information to be "a convincing rationale".

Real Harm to National Security: The opinion of the court was delivered by Lord Carloway. On the inclusion of appeal grounds which did not form part of the reference, he said: "Despite their cryptic comments about the possibility of the appellant being able to frame an arguable ground of appeal based on oppression, the SCCRC did not refer the case to the court on the basis of any systematic failure. They were correct to do, albeit for a rather different reason." He continued: "In the context of an appeal against conviction which is based upon an allegation of a failure to disclose relevant material, it is of peripheral, if any, significance to examine whether the Crown, or a particular prosecutor, acted in good faith or to analyse whether the Crown's systems were efficient or not. If a failure to have an efficient system in place were available as a ground of appeal, a finding of inefficiency would jeopardise all convictions at the time of such a system; even if proper disclosure had been made. That is why it cannot form the basis of a successful appeal."

On the CIA cables specifically, he said: "The Crown requested that the CIA cables should form part of the appeal since it would provide the Crown with an opportunity to explain the gradual disclosure of the cables during the course of the trial and avoid the possibility of a third Reference from the SCCRC, should the present appeal fail. On that basis, the court will allow the non-disclosure Ground 2 to include reference to the Part B material on the basis that it is in the interests of justice to do so." On whether the PMDs could be recovered, he noted the certificate produced by the Foreign Secretary considering the risk of disclosing them, which stated: "I am satisfied that the production of the documents would cause real harm to the United Kingdom Government's international relations. It would also cause real harm to the national security of the United Kingdom, because of damage to counter-terrorism liaison and intelligence gathering between the United Kingdom and other States."

Lord Carloway concluded: "In these circumstances, the court considers that it must see the PMDs before reaching a decision. The court will adopt the procedure which was planned in 2008 and order the production of the PMDs to the court. It will appoint a hearing at which the Advocate General and the respondent, who is in favour of disclosure, will be represented along with a special counsel to look after the interests of the appellant." For these reasons, the Court pronounced an order authorising the appeal, with the appellant being allowed to found the appeal on the additional ground of non-disclosure of the CIA cables. The application relating to the PMDs was continued to allow for them to be considered in a hearing by the court, with the appellant represented by a special counsel.

Free the Saoradh 9 and Dr Issam Hjjawi

Ruby Morris RCG: On 18 August 2020 nine activists from Irish republican organisation Saoradh were arrested in the occupied north of Ireland. With their houses raided and personal and family items confiscated, they were dragged off to Musgrave Interrogation Unit in Belfast. Days later, Saoradh offices and homes across Ireland were raided in a co-ordinated attack. The next morning, after a solidarity demonstration in Glasgow, which the RCG supported, a Saoradh Scotland activist was also arrested and questioned by Police Scotland. On 22 August Dr Issam Hijjawi, a Palestinian activist based in Scotland, was arrested at Heathrow airport and taken to Musgrave. All ten are now being held in prison. The arrests came after British MI5 infiltration of Saoradh by Glaswegian agent Dennis McFadden. McFadden, previously a police constable in Glasgow, has been active in republican circles for over 20 years and became Saoradh's joint resource officer in 2019, alongside Sharon Jordan, one of the ten arrested. McFadden entrapped activists by inviting them to meetings at houses he had bugged with high tech video and audio recording devices.

Known as Operation Arbacia and described by Police Service of Northern Ireland (PSNI) Crime Operations Assistant Chief Constable Barbara Gray as a 'community safety operation', this large scale attack involved British MI5 agents, Police Scotland, Gardai Siochana, the Metropolitan Police Service and over 500 PSNI officers. Addressing the House of Commons on 2 September, Northern Ireland secretary Brandon Lewis claimed the arrests to be the 'biggest step in tackling violent dissident republicans in Northern Ireland in a generation' and thanked the PSNI and its partners for their 'hard work' and 'professionalism'. The ten people arrested have been charged under the Terrorism Act 2006 with offences including directing terrorism, preparatory acts of terrorism, membership of a proscribed organisation, conspiracy to possess explosives with intent to endanger life and conspiracy to possess ammunition with intent to endanger life. Saoradh is regularly described in the media as having links to the 'New IRA', but has repeatedly stressed that it is a stand-alone organisation.

Dr Issam Hijjawi, originally from the West Bank in Palestine, is a respected Palestine solidarity activist in Scotland. He served as chair of the Association of Palestinian Communities in Scotland, represented the Palestinian Democratic Forum in Europe and supported Glasgow RCG and the Zionism is Racism Coalition in opposing Zionists marching on so-called anti-racist marches organised by Stand up to Racism. He is accused of preparatory acts of terrorism under Section 5 of the Terrorism Act 2006. As Scotland Against Criminalising Communities has pointed out 'Section 5 does not necessarily involve, as some people might suppose, preparation of a terrorist attack. Instead, it greatly expands the range of conduct that can be prosecuted under the already over-broad definition of terrorism given in the Terrorism Act 2000. People planning, or considering, travel to Syria have been convicted under Section 5. Actions carried out for the benefit of a proscribed organisation can also be prosecuted under Section 5.'

Since their arrests, Saoradh activists Sharon Jordan and Mandy Duffy have been resisting attempts at criminalisation. Instead of giving them the clothes which family members had brought to Hydebank prison, the staff attempted to give them 'jail issue' clothing, which they refused to wear. The principle of rejecting the 'convict's uniform' has a long history in Irish republican prisoner resistance; 44 years ago, on 14 September 1976, Kieran Nugent began the Blanket Protest, telling screws that if they wanted him to wear a uniform, they would have to 'nail it to my back'.

Issam Hijawi has a series of underlying medical problems for which he is struggling to get proper health care in Maghaberry prison. He has also been refused family visits via Zoom. Having been refused bail and then had to fight to be taken to hospital for an MRI scan, after the appointment, he was not returned to Roe House, the republican wing, despite there being empty cells there which can be used for self-isolating. Instead he was moved to another part of the prison, known for its inhabitable conditions and where a prisoner has already died of Covid. Issam began a protest hunger strike on 16 September, which was quickly joined by more than 50 republican prisoners in Maghaberry, Portloaise and Hydebank.

On 19 September, dozens of demonstrations took place across Ireland and internationally. RCG supporters in Glasgow joined the protest in Barrowland Park, where our speaker told the protest: 'It is not a crime to be a revolutionary Irish Republican. It is not a crime to be a revolutionary Palestinian. Let's be clear, it is British imperialism and its allies who are the guilty ones; they are the criminals, not Issam and his Irish republican comrades.'

The RCG condemns the arrests, the ongoing harassment and political policing used against Irish republicans and anti-imperialists. This is a clear attack on the democratic right to organise and all those who oppose the racism and imperialism of the British state must unite to

demand the immediate release of the Saoradh 9 and Dr Issam Hijjawi.

Human Rights Lawyers Sue Trump Administration For 'silencing' Them

Julian Borger, Guardain: Prominent US human rights lawyers are suing the Trump administration over an executive order they say has gagged them and halted their work pursuing justice on behalf of war crimes victims around the world. As a result of the order in June threatening "serious consequences" for anyone giving support to the work of the international criminal court (ICC) in The Hague, the lawyers say they have had to cancel speeches and presentations, end research, abandon writing ICC-related articles and dispensing advice and assistance to victims of atrocities. The effect, according to the plaintiffs, has been an unprecedented infringement of their constitutional right to free speech and a chill that has pervaded the world of international humanitarian law. "This is just a wallop, a gut punch, silencing the activities that really have been my life's work," said Diane Marie Amann, professor of international law at the University of Georgia and one of the plaintiffs. She argued Donald Trump's order was a betrayal of an American tradition of global leadership on human rights, including the creation of the Nuremberg Tribunal and a leading role in the establishment of the ICC. "It is so sad to think that the country in which I was born, in a city called Libertyville, Illinois, is prohibiting me from doing that work," Amann said.

The executive order was followed in September by the imposition of sanctions – originally designed to be used for drug traffickers and terrorists – against the ICC chief prosecutor, Fatou Bensouda, and another senior ICC official. Amann has served as an unpaid special adviser to Bensouda on children in conflict since 2012. "I work on behalf of children who are affected by armed conflict, who are killed, tortured, sexually abused, forced to become child soldiers, and trafficked," Amann said, adding that she has had to curtail her work as a result of the US targeting of Bensouda, or face the risk of personal sanctions possibly including the seizure of her family's assets. "Since the designation of Prosecutor Bensouda, I have refrained from giving her any advice," Amann said. "I have withdrawn from public presentations to which I had already committed, out of fear that public discussion of the work of the ICC might be construed to violate the sanctions regime. I have refrained from engaging student research assistants to assist me in work in the subject area, out of fear of exposing them in some way."

The lawsuit was filed on Wednesday morning 30th September, 2020, in a federal court in New York by Amann, three other US-based law professors, all acting in their private capacities, and the Open Society Justice Initiative (OSJI). It is directed against Trump, secretary of state Mike Pompeo, treasury secretary Steven Mnuchin, attorney general William Barr, the director of the office of foreign assets control, Andrea Gacki, and their respective departments. It calls for the enforcement of the executive order to be halted while the court considers its constitutionality. The administration has presented the sanctions against the ICC as a response to the court's decision to investigate suspected war crimes by all parties in Afghanistan, including US forces. Pompeo also assailed the ICC for investigating Israel for its actions in the Palestinian territories. "This is a targeted sanctions authority directed at persons determined to have engaged in specific activity that threatens the foreign policy and national security of the United States or to have materially supported such persons," a state department spokesperson said. The sanctions, the spokesperson added, "apply to individuals who have directly engaged in ICC efforts to investigate US personnel without the consent of the United States, or have materially supported individuals who are designated for such actions".

The lawsuit argues that the executive order is so vaguely worded that it threatens a far broader range of cooperation with the ICC by lawyers, human rights groups and the others.

The OSJI argued that it could affect a casual giver of advice or even the airline transporting sanctioned ICC officials, or the hotels where they stay. "We spend lots of time in many places around the world meeting with victims to help them understand how the court works ... how they can provide evidence to the court," James Goldston, OSJI's executive director, said. "And all of that is essentially put on hold now because it may well be prohibited by this order. That's the fear, and it's such a broad order, that it's hard to tell." The four law professors suing the administration are all dual nationals, which they say makes them more vulnerable to the executive order, but say it could be used against any Americans.

Andrew Loewenstein, one of the lawyers representing the plaintiffs, described the Trump executive order as "entirely exceptional. Historically, the powers vested in the president to issue economic sanctions of this type have been used in relation to terrorist groups or drug kingpins or in relation to serious violations of human rights," Loewenstein, an attorney at the firm Foley Hoag, said. "It's never been used in a circumstance like this, where the ultimate target of the sanctions are the the prosecutor and others of senior officials of the international criminal court, who are engaged in wide-ranging efforts to prosecute and investigate international crimes including crimes against humanity, war crimes, and genocide." The plaintiffs say the order will have repercussions around the world, inhibiting non-US human rights lawyers and activists who fear being barred entry or having US assets confiscated. Goldston said: "It is I think a threat to the notion that the United States stands for human rights, and on ability to say anything to anybody about human rights in the world."

Basil' From The Hatton Garden Security Vault Heist Ordered to Pay £6million

One of the ringleaders from the Hatton Garden security vault heist has today been ordered to pay £5,997,684.93. Michael Seed, known as 'Basil', 58, was convicted in March 2019 for his part in the £13.69million heist, believed to be one of the largest burglaries in English history. Wearing a face covering and wig to disguise his identity, Seed was the one who entered the vault through the drilled hole and helped empty the contents. He was seen walking away from the scene with a bin bag over his shoulder, presumed to be full of gold, jewellery and precious stones. Three years later police officers raided Seed's one-bedroom Islington council flat where they found an array of items stolen from Hatton Garden. Seed has continued to deny his involvement in this high value burglary, and any knowledge of the proceeds of the burglary except for the jewellery valued at £143,078 that was found in his flat. He said that he worked in the jewellery business but no evidence to support this was found and victims identified some of the items discovered at his flat as their own.

Today (1 October 2020) at Woolwich Crown Court Michael Seed has been issued with a confiscation order of £5,997,684.93 which he must pay within three months or he could face seven years in prison. Adrian Foster, Chief Crown Prosecutor of CPS Proceeds of Crime said: "Despite Mr Seed's protestations of innocence the CPS was able to prove that he was the masked man, and that he and his conspirators took millions of pounds worth of precious stones, gold and jewellery. "He has now been ordered to pay almost £6 million. If Mr Seed fails to pay the money he owes in time, he will face up to seven years in prison. "Where we can take money from people who have profited from crime, we do. Last year the CPS recovered over £100 million, stopping hundreds of criminals benefiting from their ill-gotten gains. "

Notes to editors: Michael Seed (DOB: 09/08/1960) was found guilty of conspiracy to burgle the Hatton Garden Safe Deposit Company and money laundering on 15 March 2019 and was sentenced to 10 years in prison. Adrian Foster is the Chief Crown Prosecutor for CPS Proceeds

of Crime (CPS POC), which is a specialist division dedicated to the recovery of assets and money. Details of other Confiscation Orders: John Collins (DOB 05/09/1940), Brian Reader (DOB 28/02/1939), Daniel Jones and Terry Perkins were given a joint confiscation order of £6,396,273.75 plus extra sums dependent on their personal circumstances. Any money paid by any of the men as regards the joint amount would be treated as a payment towards each co-defendant's confiscation order. £3,635,204 of recovered jewellery was returned to victims following conviction. The remainder, which could not be accurately or safely identified, is being sold at auction. Amount paid to date: £1,659,793 Where a defendant refuses to pay their Confiscation Order in a timely way, CPS Proceeds of Crime can invite the court to impose an additional default sentence on them of up to 14 years' imprisonment. The full debt continues to be in force until it is paid and interest is charged against it at 8% (the civil judgement debt rate).

Status of the remaining defendants: Terry Perkins died in prison in February 2018 and steps are being taken to recover funds from his estate Daniel Jones's default sentence was activated on 14 August 2018 where he was sentenced to a further six-and-a-half years' imprisonment John Collins' default sentence was activated on 1 August 2019 where he was sentenced to a further six and a half years' imprisonment Brian Reader was taken before the court on 12 February 2020, however due to his deteriorating health the District Judge declined to impose the seven years' default sentence upon him.

Black History Month: Frank Crichlow an Inspiring Stand Against the Establishment

Tomáš Tengely-Evans, SWP:Frank Crichlow "first came into contact with Notting Hill police station" after he opened a cafe in west London in 1959. He was to become an icon of resistance to the cops' repression for the rest of his life. Crichlow was born in Trinidad, then one of Britain's colonies in the Caribbean, in 1932. At the age of 21, he came to Britain on the SS Colombie. British politicians had encouraged immigration to meet labour shortages. And like many Afro-Caribbean migrants, he moved to west London and worked for British Rail for a few years. Looking back at that time, from the vantage of the 1990s, Crichlow described how black people met "racism when they went into a shop or tried to get places to stay". And how fascist groups organised amid the racist atmosphere.

In 1956 Crichlow formed the Starlight Four band, which found some success with TV and radio appearances. He used the money to set up the El Rio cafe in Westbourne Park. It attracted a wide clientele from black migrant workers to famous writers, a Tory minister and businessmen. It also attracted the police who used the "Sus Laws"—similar to Section 60 stop and searches—to frame people on trumped up charges."The basic reason was racism," remembered Crichlow. In 1968 Crichlow set up a new venture called the Mangrove restaurant. Within its first year, cops had raided it six times. People organised a protest on 9 August 1970 and marched on the police station. Cops beat up protesters and arrested 12 for incitement to riot. While the magistrates' court threw out the charges, the Director of Public Prosecutions reinstated them. Police rearrested Crichlow and eight others, including leading members of the British Black Panthers Altheia Jones-LeCointe, Barbara Beese and Darcus Howe. After a defence campaign and a nearly 60-day trial, the jury cleared the Mangrove 9 of the main charge.

Crichlow said, "It was black power time and people were looking for something to identify with. "We had telegrams from people all over the world. They were saying the nine people had stood up against the whole establishment." But the police harassment of the Mangrove continued. In 1988 the police used a sledgehammer to break down the door. They arrested Crichlow and 11 others,

charged them with supplying heroin, and banned him from going near the Mangrove for a year. There were big debates in the defence campaign. Some leading figures came from a black nationalist perspective. They wanted a campaign that only involved black people or was only passively supported by whites.

Others argued for black and white unity against the police and racism. They included Communist Party member Trevor Carter and Socialist Workers Party members. Crichlow was acquitted. In 1992 the Metropolitan Police was forced to pay out £50,000 in damages for false imprisonment, battery and malicious prosecution. The Mangrove closed in the same year, but Crichlow continued his activism until his death in 2010. He didn't "see myself as a leader". "As I see it I stood up for my rights and a lot of people identified with that." he said. "We weren't going to put our tails between our legs."

Villainous John O Supporter of Murderers and Terrorists

In 2002 the then Home Secretary David Blunkett asked for a £340,000 grant to the National Coalition of Anti-Deportation Campaigns (NCADC) to be reviewed. This was after he and the then editor of the daily mail, Paul Dacre had met for breakfast at one of their weekly meetings. Mr Dacre described the grant to NCADC as the 'Barmiest Grant the National Lottery had ever made. Mr Blunkett tried to stop the grant himself but found he had no legal power to do so. So he leant on the National Lottery, who suspended the grant, subject to an in-depth review as to how the grant was made. The review, which lasted eight months, came to nothing as NCADC had done nothing illegal or unconscionable, they released the grant to NCADC. I John O, was then the Co-Ordinator and ran NCADC; I was subject to personal attacks in the media by the Daily Mail and other media. At the time NCADC and himself had to keep their heads down. NCADC never distributed the two worst media stories at the time, hoping the storm would blow over which it did. So am now sending both articles to a select number of people. Though both were trying to do damage, I am pretty well proud of the content, as everything they said was right. In Solidarity, John O

Mr O, the Ex-Trucker Who Stand up For The Terrorists

Neil Sears, Daily Mail Circa 2002: With his pony tall and grey beard, John O'Reilly appears to be nothing more than an easy .golng eccentric. But the 59-year-old former lorry driver with no academic qualifications has been agitating for the past quarter of a century for the abolition of immigration laws. Far from being laidback, the self-styled 'Mr O' believes the Government is 'Colluding with fascism by limiting asylum. He finds himself under the spotlight thanks to his leadership - on an annual wage of £30,000 - of the National Coalition of Anti-Deportations Campaigns.

His dream of flinging the nation's doors open to all-comers is yet to be realised, but he has had his triumphs. An early success, the Daily Mail can reveal, involved the revocation order on Jamaican armed robber Metso Moncrieffe. Moncrieffe arrived in Britain in 1979 but by 1981 had been jailed for three years for robbing a man while wielding an imitation pistol. Home Office officials ordered him to be deported on upon release - but the ex-con went into hiding while Mr O and fellow radicals launched a drive for him to be allowed to stay. The campaign climaxed in the storming of the England-India cricket test at Edgbaston in 1086, when protestor Joanna Duchesne stopped play by hiding the bails down her trousers. The following year Moncrieffe was allowed to stay.

Mr O was not much in evidence this week at the Asian community centre he uses as his campaign headquarters, spending more time in hi council maisonette nearby in the ethnically mixed Lozells district of Birmingham. Behind a steel security gate with a massive padlock, his home is well kept. Many other houses on the street are boarded-up. Mr O, who describes himself as 'Scottish-Irish', briefly emerged to outline his belief that all immigration laws are racist

I don't think there should be any immigration laws, because they 'discriminate against people who aren't British nationals, 'Mr O said. 'I've been involved in campaigning against deportation orders since 1979. 'At first, I was just giving leaflets out, but I was a dedicated volunteer from 1985, and have been the national coordinator of the organisation since 1995. 'We've had 100 successful campaigns against deportation orders. We are very proud of the work we do in helping people to avail themselves of their rights. About his qualifications for his publicity-funded role, Mr O said: 'it all comes from years of experience opposing deportations. 'I was expelled from one school and literally thrown out of the other; I didn't even get a school leaving certificate.

Asylum Campaigner Backs Murders Too

London News, Circa 2020: The leader of the controversial asylum seekers' charity being investigated by the Home Office is also an active supporter of freedom for notorious killers. John O'Reilly backs Winston Silcott, Michael Stone and Barry George. Mr O'Reilly- who calls himself 'John O' - is the leader of the National Coalition of Anti-Deportations Campaigns (NCADC), which has used grants from the National Lottery to seek residency rights in Britain for convicted terrorists. He believes all immigration laws are racist and that even terrorists should be entitled to enter the country and live here. Fresh evidence of his extreme beliefs emerged last night when the Daily Mail discovered that as well as running the NCADC on lottery-funded pay of £30,000 a year, the 59-year-old former lorry driver also runs Miscarriages of Justice UK. Working from his home in the Lozells district of Birmingham, Mr O'Reilly edits MOJUK's extensive website which campaigns for a host of infamous prisoners to be set free. MOJUK openly admits that it is unconcerned whether the prisoners it champions actually committed the offences concerned, only that they had a fair trial. Amongst the most prominent cases is that of Winston Silcott, who had his conviction for murdering PC Keith Blakelock in the Broadwater Farm riot in 1985 overturned after a long campaign, but remains in jail for life for stabbing a man to death. MOJUK has also taken up the cause of Bary George, whose appeal against his conviction for the murder of television presenter Jill Dando was recently rejected, and Michael Stone, serving life for Killing Lin and Megan Russell in 1996. Mr O'Reilly describes the prisoners as 'hostages of the state'.

Black Working-Class Youth Criminalised Excluded in the English School System

While a minority of young, multiracial working-class Londoners caught up in serious youth violence are schooled in the Pupil Referral Units (PRUs) and Alternative Provision (AP) that forms part of the 'PRU-to-prison pipeline'; little is known about how the education system for the excluded came about. The IRR's new paper, How Black Working-Class Youth are Criminalised and Excluded in the English School System: A London Case Study, reveals that over the past forty years, exclusion from mainstream school has coincided with systematic 'educational enclosure'.

In this period, the state has responded to inner-city youth rebellions and political agitation for racial and social justice by depriving working-class communities of education. Consequently, a two-tier education system, with 'deserving' and aspirational students in the academy sector and 'undeserving' and alienated kids in the PRU and AP sectors has emerged. The 'undeserving', steadily cast adrift in education, are not mere anomalies in a system that encourages learning and race-class inclusivity; they represent a system that has been purpose built to segregate. As the paper explains, London is leading this educational trend. The proportion of pupils in PRUs and AP in the capital is almost double the national rate, with young boys of black Caribbean heritage overrepresented in the sector.

This report aims to support important on-going campaigns for education justice, by excavating the specific political conditions that have ushered in regressive reforms. This history has been forgotten and urgently needs retelling at a time when think-tanks and government are in the business of expanding the PRU sector by rebranding it as AP and privatising it through academisation. Author of the report and IRR researcher Jessica Perera says 'amidst the Black Lives Matter protests, we have seen increased demands to decolonise the curriculum. At the same time, the coronavirus pandemic has exposed a system which fails working-class students. This paper reminds us that those who have been continually failed are found in PRUs and AP and that their segregation is a damning indictment of a planned education malaise, which has been designed and deployed on a specific section of society with a history of resistance and rebellion.' IRR Director, Liz Fekete added, 'With this paper, the IRR challenges the superficial analysis that stigmatises young Black Londoners for knife crime whilst failing to look reality in the eye. Could it be that factors such as austerity, privatisation and educational enclosure have in fact hardwired racial injustice into society?

Overseas Operations Bill - Uniquely Reprehensible

Nicholas Reed Langen, Justice Gap: In 2005, Lord Bingham, giving the judgment of the House of Lords, wrote that 'torture is… totally repugnant to the fundamental principles of English law'. This absolute rejection of torture, as an anathema to our national values, is no longer so absolute, judging by the language of the Overseas Operations Bill, which passed its second reading in the House of Commons last week. This bill reveals a government that is not concerned with upholding the dignity of the British military, ensuring that soldiers who act dishonourably are held to account. Instead, preserving the 'morale' of the soldiers is apparently its priority, more concerned with ensuring that the military's recruitment efforts are buoyant than with respecting international law.

The primary ambition of the bill is ostensibly to protect soldiers from having their conduct in the field unnecessarily scrutinised. This, in and of itself, is no bad thing. Soldiers operate in unfathomably challenging conditions, facing circumstances that civilians cannot begin to imagine. Amid the chaos of the battlefield, the fear of prosecution, fear that would do little but distract from any military operation, should be far from soldiers' minds. Nor should soldiers worry about every action they took after the event, forced to relive and reconsider all their decisions, trying to decide if they will face a judge and jury for shots fired amid the heat of war.

In the aftermath of the Iraq War, this was not entirely the case. Admittedly, there is little dispute that British soldiers deployed to Iraq violated the Geneva Convention and vast swathes of international law. In 2009, video footage was leaked to the British press, showing soldiers grabbing Iraqi boys from off the street, and viciously beating them. This was not a lone event, but one of many to come to light, with British soldiers treating Iraqi prisoners abhorrently, most notoriously at Basra, a British military base. All these prisoners should have been treated with dignity, as prisoners of war. Not used as punchbags for our soldiers.

But for some lawyers, these genuine claims were not enough. Most notoriously, Phil Shiner, of Public Interest Lawyers, brought manufactured claims, as well as genuine ones, against the British Army, some of which were heard in the Al-Sweady Inquiry, which examined the conduct of British troops at the Battle of Danny Boy, ultimately exonerating them. Condemning the lawyers who had instigated the inquiry, the inquiry's report concluded that the allegations were a 'product of deliberate lies, reckless speculation and ingrained hostility'.

It is the conduct of Phil Shiner and his ilk that has driven much of the public demand for our soldiers to be protected from unnecessary prosecution. The revelation of the false claims transformed the public's mood, who redirected their disgust and outrage away from the military, and towards the lawyers. This, in part, is what the bill is trying to take advantage of, showing the pub-

lic that the government is on the side of 'our boys' by protecting them from vexatious claims.

The bill seeks to do this through a 'triple lock' mechanism. First, for any allegations over five years old, there is a presumption against prosecution. In particular, this presumption requires prosecutions to consider if the circumstances the accused faced in the field mean it is not in the public interest to proceed. Second, if there has already been an investigation, and 'no compelling new evidence has emerged', the default position should be against prosecution. Third, and possibly the most alarming of this unpleasant trio, is the requirement for the Attorney General to approve of any prosecution where first two hurdles are surmounted.

Given that the legislation exempts sexual offences from these 'triple locks', it would seem that the government has not forgotten that some crimes are so heinous that they should always be prosecuted. Yet war crimes and crimes against humanity, equally reprehensible offences, are not exempted. This puts the UK, once more, in potential breach of treaties that it has signed, including the Geneva Conventions and the UN Convention on Torture. Brian Houlder QC, former director of service prosecutions, said that it was a 'national embarrassment' that we should 'treat torture and other grave crimes, including homicide, as excusable'.

Nor is it legitimate to try and use the traumatic realities of the battlefield as an excuse. No one disputes the challenges that soldiers face, but as Dan Jarvis has written for The House, British soldiers are some of the most highly trained in the world. If the trauma of the battlefield has devastated a soldier, causing them to act in ways they never ordinarily would have done, that should be a matter for mitigation, not a hurdle against prosecution.

It is equally illegitimate to leave the final say with the Attorney General, an increasingly politicised figure. Ordinarily, prosecutions are decided upon at arms length from government, with the Director of Public Prosecutions an independent office of the executive. Even though the Attorney General is supposed to hold their obligation to the law above party politics, the conduct of the current holder of the office, Suella Braverman, has shown that it is all too easy for lawyers-turned-politicians to choose political expediency over their oaths of office. Any refusal by an Attorney General would be tainted with illegitimacy- and would raise the intriguing possibility of judicial review.

Yet these are not the only flaws within the bill. While the government has focused on the elements of the bill that protect the soldiers from the fear of unwarranted prosecution (a fear that is overblown, if the actual number of military prosecutions over, for instance, Iraq, are counted), the more alarming and consequential is how it protects the government. In recent years, courts have become less willing to allow governments to use the justification of war as an excuse for failing to protect the rights of soldiers and victims. In 2013, the Supreme Court ruled in Smith v Ministry of Defence that the government had to consider the soldiers' right to life under Article 2 of the ECHR, and that simply being abroad did not mean they sacrificed the protection of UK law entirely, while in Al-Skeini, the European Court of Human Rights held that detainees under the control of the UK abroad are also protected by the ECHR.

For critics of judicial review, this 'lawfare' hinders the ability of the government to properly wage war, distracting the government with unnecessary concerns, like the rights of soldiers. Despite the courts acknowledging that the realities of war mean that governments cannot be expected to uphold rights as fully in combat situations, the fact that the military is open to the scrutiny of civil courts at all is too much for these critics. The Overseas Operation Bill seeks to address such criticism by imposing stringent and absolute time limits on when claims can be brought. Rather than the current position, which sets a limit of three years for civil claims and one year for human rights claims, but then gives the court the discretion to allow a late claim to proceed, the bill would remove this discretion

from the court. Instead, any claim filed outside of the time limit will be barred absolutely.

This means that while purporting to defend our soldiers, in reality the bill undermines them, limiting the ability of our soldiers to hold the government to account for failing to protect their rights on the battlefield, as well as the rights of those detained. Nor can it reasonably be said that the harm done to soldiers' interests is an unfortunate, but necessary, consequence of trying to limit late, vexatious claims from alleged victims. Of the cases filed against the MoD, a vastly disproportionate number come from soldiers, with John Healey MP telling the Commons' chamber last week that troops and veterans make twenty-five claims for every one claim made by an alleged victim.

Such an amendment reflects this government's ongoing disdain for the courts and its objection to independent scrutiny. It does not acknowledge that the courts are slow to intervene in military decisions, and only allow claims to proceed after expired time limits when there are valid reasons for them to do so (and indeed, actions against the MoD . Fettering their discretion actively harms the interests of our soldiers, limiting the ability of the courts, for instance, to allow claims for PTSD to proceed when the symptoms begin after the time limit has passed. This is why the British Royal Legion, which cares for our veterans, have noted their concern for what the legislation might mean for our troops and veterans, and their families.

Given that, for Brexiters, our departure from the EU heralds the return of Britain as an independent nation onto the world stage, it is curious that that the government is choosing to return with not one but two pieces of legislation that breach international law. Unless we are planning on using our newfound freedom to join the more reviled members of the international community, such laws achieve little. Our senior military officers understand the repercussions of this bill, with Lord Guthrie, former chief of defence staff, saying it 'would let torturers off the hook'. Couple this with the fact that it also tells our troops that the government is more interested in protecting itself than their rights, and it is a uniquely reprehensible bill. After Labour abstained from the bill's second reading, the Conservatives tweeted that Labour 'refused to back Britain's armed forces'. This nationalistic propaganda belies the reality of the legislation, trusting that the British people will focus on the government's spin, rather than its expansion of unaccountable executive power.

Covid rules in prisons blocking rehabilitation, say UK campaigners

Jamie Grierson, Guardian: Coronavirus measures in prisons in England and Wales have in effect delayed the release of potentially thousands of prisoners by blocking chances for inmates to take part in rehabilitation activities required to progress their sentences, campaigners say. Nearly 11,000 prisoners serving indeterminate sentences, and about 5,815 inmates serving extended determinate sentences, need to be able to demonstrate to the Parole Board that they have taken part in certain activities to reduce their risk and allow their release. But support to reduce the risk of reoffending and prepare people to lead law-abiding lives has all but stopped, potentially delaying the release of people back into the community, the Prison Reform Trust says in a report seen by the Guardian. The uncertainty is leading to increasing despair and hopelessness and putting a significant strain on prisoners' mental health and wellbeing, already suffering as a result of lockdown, the charity has warned.

Prisons were placed under a severely restrictive regime in March, which reduced time spent out of cells to about 30 minutes a day, suspended prison transfers and forced new arrivals to be quarantined for 14 days, and is yet to be fully unwound. Peter Dawson, the director of the Prison Reform Trust, said: "The purposes of prison include working to ensure that the person emerges less likely to reoffend than when they went in; and that depends on opportunities for meaningful activities that develop skills as well as self-esteem. "So long as the 'regime' for any prisoner consists of 23-

hour days in [a] cell, the public are being shortchanged on their investment in prisons. The prison service has committed to a 'rehabilitative culture'. Now is the time to double down on that commitment." Among the prisoners serving indeterminate sentences are those jailed under the terms of an imprisonment for public protection (IPP). Scrapped in 2012, the IPP was a form of indeterminate sentence under which offenders were given a minimum jail tariff but no maximum. The Prison Reform Trust has been exploring the experience of prisoners and their families during the pandemic as part of its Capptive project. It draws on evidence from 85 prisons in England and Wales, 117 serving prisoners and 25 families, interviews with legal and criminal justice practitioners, as well as the findings of inspections at 15 prisons during the pandemic.

One indeterminately sentenced prisoner told the charity: "For myself it's brought more uncertainty within uncertainty, because I am serving a short-tariff IPP, I had not long been on an offender behaviour course before lockdown … and I was due for parole sometime after September, I was told. But I never had a date, which was eating away at my mental health, and now I'm sure that I probably won't see a parole board this year without completing this objective." A Ministry of Justice spokesperson said: "We remain vigilant and prison staff are working hard to move back towards a full regime where possible – 80% of prisons have now begun to resume work and education."

MPs Back Bill to Authorise Mi5 and Police Crimes

BBC News: MPs have backed the latest stage of a bill to allow undercover agents to commit crimes on operations. The government says the legislation will give a "sound legal footing" for those who work to "protect the public". But backbenchers are divided over the implications for human rights and civil liberties, and many have concerns over if the right safeguards are in place. Former Tory minister David Davis has warned the bill could "impinge on innocent people". During a debate on the bill, shadow home secretary Nick Thomas-Symonds said Labour would not oppose it at this stage. But he said the party would "seek to improve [it] on the vital issue of safeguards, so the public can have confidence in the process and our law enforcement bodies can carry out that vital work of keeping us all safe". However, a number of Labour MPs were expected to break party orders to abstain on the vote, with both Apsana Begum and Zarah Sultana tweeting to say they would vote against it. Speaking in the Commons, Ms Begum said: "There is a grave, serious and very real danger [the bill] could end up providing informers and agents with a license to kill."

BBC home affairs correspondent Dominic Casciani said the legislation would explicitly authorise MI5, the police, the National Crime Agency and other agencies that use informants or undercover agents to commit a specific crime as part of an operation. The law will require MI5 officers and others to show the crime is "necessary and proportionate", but security officials will not say which crimes they will consider authorising, as it could lead to terrorists and other serious criminals working out who is undercover. However, the legislation stresses agencies must not breach the Human Rights Act, which requires the government to protect life. A senior judge will report on how the power is used and there will be no role for the Crown Prosecution Service in reviewing the crimes.

Safeguards: Opening the debate earlier on Monday, Home Office minister James Brokenshire said the bill would "help keep our country safe". He said it would "ensure operational agencies and public authorities have access to tools to keep us safe from terrorists, safe from serious organised crime groups and safe from those who wish to cause harm to our country and citizens". And he also pointed to comments by the new director general of MI5, Ken McCallum, that claimed such operations had thwarted 27 terror attacks in the country since March 2017. But a number of MPs from across the House raised concerns around safeguards to ensure agents would not be able to

commit crimes such as murder or torture. Tory MP Steve Baker said: "For those of us who like the red meat of law and order, it has forced us to look inside the abattoir and we don't like what we see. "I can't imagine ministers will be authorising killing or torture, but [that should be] on the face of the bill so the public can have confidence." Labour's Yvette Cooper, who chairs the Home Affairs Select Committee, also said the safeguards were "very vague and very broad", calling for them to be "strengthened to get this legislation right".

A Mother's Letter to Her Son in Jail

Dear Son: Just a few lines to let you know I'm still alive. I'm writing this letter slowly because I know you can't read fast. You won't know the house when you come home; we've moved. It was a lot of trouble moving. The most difficult was the bed.you see the man wouldn't let us take it in one piece. It wouldn't have been too bad if your father hadn't been sleeping in it at the time. About your father, he has a lovely new job. He has 500 men under him. He's cutting the grass in the cemetery. Your sister got herself engaged to that fellow she's been going out with. He gave her a beautiful new ring, with three stones missing. Our neighbors, the Browns, started to keep pigs. We got wind of it this morning. I got my appendix out and a dishwasher put in. There was a washing machine in the new house when we moved in but it isn't working too good. I put 4 shirts in it, pulled the chain, and I haven't seen the shirts since. Your little brother came home from school yesterday crying. All the boys in the school have new suits. We can't afford to buy him a new suit, but we are going to buy him a new hat and let him look out of the window. Your sister had a baby this morning. I haven't heard yet if it's a boy or a girl, so I don't know if you're an aunt or an uncle yet. Your uncle Buck was drowned in a vat of whiskey last week. Four of his workmates dived in to save him, but he fought them off bravely. We cremated him and it took three days to put out the fire. Your father didn't have much to drink for Christmas. I put a pint of castor oil in his pint of beer. It kept him going till New Year's day. I went to the Dr. on Thursday: your father came with me. The Dr. put a small glass tube in my mouth and told me not to open it for 10 minutes. Your father offered to buy it from him. It only rained twice since last week. First for three days and them for four days. It was so windy on Monday one of our chickens laid the same egg four times. Your loving Mother,PS I was going to send you £10 but I had already sealed the envelope.

MPs Call For Stricter Safeguards For Private Prosecutions

Owen Bowcott, Guardain: Private prosecutions should be subject to more effective safeguards so that defendants receive a fair trial and do not pay excessive costs, MPs have recommended. Following the scandal over the Post Office's misguided criminalisation of scores of its sub-postmasters, the justice select committee has warned of the danger where an "alleged victim in a case is also the investigator and the prosecutor". Without central records, the report cautions, there is no way of confirming what it suspects is a sharp rise in prosecutions launched by individuals, companies and organisations such as the RSPCA. Legal aid costs, however, show that in 2014-15 a total of £360,000 was paid out of central funds for private prosecutions in 32 cases. By 2019-20 the costs had risen to nearly £12.3m in 276 cases.

There are other financial temptations. Firms can pay less in court fees for private prosecutions than if they pursue civil claims, the committee heard. MPs say the increase of private prosecutions in England and Wales may well be a consequence of the "limited resources of both the Crown Prosecution Service and police". The CPS was subject to swingeing cuts under austerity policies from 2010, although its resources have increased more recently. Although the CPS plays a key role in overseeing the right to bring private prosecutions, the report notes, "in practice

it cannot be expected to be a regulator as well as a private prosecutor".

Among the report's recommendations are that private prosecutions should be subjected to the same standards of accountability as public prosecutions. Organisations that frequently conduct private prosecutions should be regulated "to ensure they have the same evidential and legal standards as public prosecutors". The committee also calls for: A central register of all private prosecutions. An enforceable code of standards for all private prosecutors and investigators. Privately prosecuted defendants to be informed of their right to a case review by the CPS. Those convicted not to pay more than they would have if convicted by public prosecutors. The CPS's oversight role to be enhanced.

Private prosecutions brought by the Post Office and the RSPCA suggest it is not sufficient to rely on the courts alone to identify and remedy problematic prosecutorial practices, the report says. "An increase in private prosecutions is likely to make that situation worse," it adds. "Without effective oversight of the system as a whole, the government is going to struggle to identify any reforms that could make the overall prosecutorial system work more effectively and deliver better outcomes for the public and for access to justice." The committee chair, the Conservative MP Sir Robert Neill, said: "The power to prosecute individuals, and potentially deprive them of their liberty, is an onerous power which must be treated with the utmost seriousness. "We've received evidence that the number of private prosecutions is increasing sharply. The overwhelming majority of private prosecutors uphold high standards. But the Post Office cases show the potential danger of the power to prosecute being misused. "If the number of such cases continues to grow, the government will need to ensure that there are systems in place which make such private prosecutions comply with the highest possible standards."

A Ringing Sensation in His Rectum

A prisoner who complained of intolerable pain was found to have four phones stufed up his arse. The man, imprisoned in the Indian city of Jodhpur in Rajasthan, who had been jailed in a case of an 'unnatural offence', was rushed to hospital, where the discovery was made. The inmate identified as Deva Ram, who is lodged in Jodhpur central jail for the last 18-months, started suffering unbearable pain. When asked about the cause, he confessed to have forcefully inserted mobile phones in his rectum. He was immediately rushed to the hospital," said Kailash Trivedi, Jodhpur central jail superintendent.

Northern Ireland: Prison Segregation Costs More Than £2m a Year

More than £2m is spent every year segregating loyalist and republican prisoners in NI prisons. Justice Minister Naomi Long confirmed the figure in response to an Assembly question from TUV MLA Jim Allister. Twenty-three dissident republican and 19 loyalist prisoners were separated on four landings at Magheraberry prison, Mrs Long told MLAs. A further three dissident republican female prisoners were segregated at Hydebank Wood jail. The total cost of maintaining the segregation was £2.3m

If prisoners apply to the secretary of state to be segregated and meet the criteria then they must be accommodated, Mrs Long said. She added: "The separated regime exists because of conditions in wider society create a need for the regime. Bringing about an end to the separated regime depends on our collective success in tackling paramilitarism, Criminality and organised crime." She said the executive has an action plan which it is committed to implementing and said there is a focus on ending segregation in prisons. The minister also confirmed to North Antrim MLA Jim Allister that almost half a million pounds was spent preparing a landing to accommodate three dissident republican prisoners at Hydebank Wood. She said £482,000 was spent preparing the landing at the prison's Fern House. Extensive work was required to repurpose the unit and the work had to be completed within a two week period, she said. "Structural, electrical and mechanical work was all required to enhance security and it was right that we ensure an adequate level of security was in place to manage the challenge presented by separation," Mrs Long said. The minister insisted "less than £6,000" was spent on soft furnishing in the cells and a recreation room. She said: "This is not in any shape or form about luxury or preferential treatment it is about decency and it is about security and managing a very difficult environment." Accommodation that was previously used to segregate female prisoners is now being used as a mother and baby unit.

Maghaberry Prison: Investigations Into Two Self-Inflicted Deaths Begin

Approximately 80% of inmates in Maghaberry Prison, Northern Ireland's largest jail, are on prescription medication. Investigations have begun into the deaths of two prisoners within the space of 10 days at Maghaberry Prison in County Antrim. Ulster Unionist MLA Doug Beattie said he has concerns that staffing levels are "contributing to safety problems". However, this claim has been rejected by the Prison Service, which said "adequate numbers are on duty at all times". The deaths are believed to have been self-inflicted, according to a source. As is customary, the circumstances of the deaths are under investigation by the Prisoner Ombudsman. Mr Beattie said he had written to the ombudsman, Lesley Carroll, stating complaints had been raised with him by prison staff. "They have alleged that staff levels of night custody officers are far below what they should be and that, in being understaffed, both prisoners and staff are put at risk," said Mr Beattie. "Prisoners, regardless of the crime they are in prison for, deserve to be safe and cared for, and at times that means safe even from themselves," he added.

Government Suffers Lords Defeats Over Immigration Bill

The government has faced a string of defeats in the House of Lords over its post-Brexit immigration bill. The proposed legislation has passed its initial stages in the Commons - where Boris Johnson has a majority of 80. But peers have now approved five amendments while scrutinising the bill. They include keeping the current rules for unaccompanied child refugees after the end of the transition period, which sees them reunited with close relatives in the UK. It is the second time the so-called Dubs amendment - presented by Labour's Lord Dubs - has been approved by peers, but turned down by MPs. Afterwards, Lord Dubs tweeted: "The Commons now needs to do the right thing by these uniquely vulnerable children and support the amendment." But Home Office Minister Baroness Williams said the UK had made a "credible and serious" offer to the EU agree new arrangements; and that it wouldn't be right to undermine those negotiations through domestic legislation. The government also faced three further defeats on other amendments proposed to the bill.

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.