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 824 (09/12/2020) - Cost £1

Miscarriage of Justice Victim William Holden Gets Green Light to Sue MoD and Ors

Court Delivers Judgment on Access To Coroner's Files: Lord Justice Treacy, sitting today Wednesday 25th November 2020, in the Northern Ireland High Court, ruled that a scheme introduced to regulate access to Coroners' inquest files held in the Public Records Office was unlawful where the person seeking access was a "properly interested person" under the coronial legislation.

Background: William Holden ("the applicant") was convicted of the murder of Private Frank Bell on 15 April 1973 and sentenced to death. The death penalty was commuted to a life sentence. He was released after serving 17 years following a successful referral of his case to the Court of Appeal by the Criminal Cases Review Commission. His conviction was quashed on the basis that the non-disclosure of documents which had been provided to the Court of Appeal in a confidential annex could have supported an application to exclude evidence contained in a confession he made at the time. The applicant has subsequently pursued a claim for compensation as a consequence of the miscarriage of justice and has issued civil proceedings against the Ministry of Defence and the Chief Constable of the PSNI.

The applicant's solicitors wrote to the Public Records Office of Northern Ireland ("PRONI") seeking access to the inquest file in respect of Private Bell to further his compensation claim and civil proceedings. Given the allegations which had been made against the applicant he would have been entitled to status as a "properly interested person" before any inquest in accordance with the Coroners (Practice and Procedure) Rules (NI) 1963 ("the 1963 Rules"). PRONI replied proposing to deal with the matter by way of an undertaking binding the signatory to keep the disclosed documentation in the strictest confidence and prohibiting sharing the documentation with any third party without the express permission of PRONI.

The applicant's solicitors replied challenging this decision and seeking disclosure of the full inquest file. Pursuant to this request, the documentation was disclosed under the Freedom of Information Act 2000 ("FOI Act") and Data Protection Act 1998 regimes which meant that it was heavily redacted. The applicant contented that he, as a properly interested person within the meaning of the 1963 Rules, would automatically have had an entitlement to view the inquest file without charge and, for a small fee, obtain copies of the papers. At the first hearing date, it was contended by PRONI that the Northern Ireland Courts and Tribunals Service ("NICTS") had disapplied Rule 38 of the 1963 Rules to inquest files transferred to PRONI.

Relief Sought: The applicant contended that the impugned undertaking was unlawful and should be so declared and quashed as it was irrational. He claimed it explicitly acted to frustrate and undermine the pursuit of legitimate legal remedies by introducing a prohibition on the use of disclosed documentation in court cases without the permission of PRONI. The applicant also submitted that PRONI had failed to take all relevant considerations into account in particular that Rule 38 of the 1963 Rules automatically provides him, as a properly interested person, with entitlement to view and obtain copies of the papers. He claimed that the depositions which make up an inquest file are prepared in the knowledge that the information contained in them is likely to be the subject of oral evidence in a public court and the operative presumption is that the statements will go into the public domain. The applicant further contended that the decision of NICTS to disapply Rule 38 of the 1963 Rules to inquest files transferred to PRONI is ultra vires, that NICTS has no power, or is acting outwith its powers in determining this. Finally, the transfer of the inquest file to PRONI for the preservation of the papers should not operate to obstruct a statutory entitlement to access the papers and that the approach of NICTS operates to frustrate the intention of the entitlement.

Arguments: The Court noted that while an inquest file is prepared from the file submitted by the police to the Coroner, the inquest file and the depositions contained therein are the property of the Coroner. The depositions are prepared in the knowledge that the information contained in them is likely to be the subject of oral evidence in the Coroner's Court and the expectation of those who make statements to the Coroner, or the police in the course of a criminal investigation, is that in due course they may be called to give evidence in a trial or an inquest. The operative presumption is that the statements will go into the public domain, through one or other procedure.

PRONI confirmed in correspondence dated 13 February 2015 that the undertaking is about "giving effect to the Minister's [Minister for the Department of Arts, Culture and Leisure - DCAL] wish that inquest and other relevant records should be voluntarily made available to those properly interested persons who have a valid reason for wishing to view or obtain such records." This was referred to as "the pilot scheme". It was conceded by PRONI that the level of disclosure provided under the undertaking procedure may be greater than that provided under the FOI Act as there may be a large number of potential exceptions to disclosure when applying the FOI Act.

In correspondence dated 21 December 2016, the Solicitor to the Attorney General confirmed that the process launched by the DCAL Minister in January 2015 had been replaced by the Crown Court Files Privileged Access Rules (NI) 2016 which came into operation on 30 March 2016. The correspondence also noted that PRONI was still processing requests under the Minister's pilot scheme but all new applications were being dealt with under the 2016 Rules.

PRONI argued that the pilot scheme which contained the undertaking was not an abuse of public power with regard to the granting of access to public records, but an attempt to enhance the extent and speed of access to such records. It submitted that the key considerations which informed the creation and content of the pilot scheme were a wish to afford earlier and greater access than might be the case under other legislation and that PRONI had carried out a consultation on the proposed scheme. PRONI said the decision to formulate the pilot scheme and the undertaking was a lawful and proper exercise of its powers and "a pro-active attempt to provide a solution to a matter of genuine public concern".

PRONI also contended that it had acted properly and proportionately on the basis of information available to it at the time when the redactions were made. The Court noted that there is no statutory right under the Public Records Act (NI) 1923 for a member of the public to call for PRONI to make records available; rather it empowers PRONI to make them available.

NICTS argued that documents transferred to PRONI are in the custody of DCAL. As such, following deposit with PRONI the Coroner no longer holds any documents or records that can be furnished by him under Rule 38 of the 1963 Rules. NICTS claimed therefore that it was not that Rule 38 was being misapplied but simply that the Coroner no longer holds any documents to release.

Conclusion: The Court said that the real mischief in this case is the inability of the applicant to access, pursuant to Rule 38 of the 1963 Rules, as a properly interest person, the inquest file of Private Bell. It said the reason he was not able to do so was that legal advice was received in 2013 that erroneously narrowed the scope of Rule 38:"The advice received in 2013, which is relied upon in the argument of NICTS, narrows the scope of Rule 38 so that

that rule only applies to inquest papers within the possession and control of the Coroner. There is, quite simply, no basis for such a narrow reading of Rule 38. Nothing in the 1923 Act governing PRONI, or anywhere else, calls for such a reading. Rule 38 has never been repealed. The archiving of Rule 38 documents does not mean the relinquishment of legal control. The power, and its exercise, under Rule 38 remains vested in "a coroner"."

The Court concluded that Rule 38 should be applied to the applicant's request. It added that the pilot scheme and the undertaking fettered the presumptive right of a properly interested person to full access to the inquest file (subject to the Coroner's full consideration of matters relevant to disclosure) and it was therefore unlawful to apply that scheme to the applicant in this case. It said the lawfulness and the impugned undertaking as it might have applied to other parties (ie parties who are not properly interested persons) is beyond the scope of these proceedings.

Cruelty Of UK Deportation Law Deemed 'Unavoidable Price to Pay'

Rudy Schulkind, Justice Gap:In the UK, many parents are separated from their children as a result of deportation, regardless of whether they are loving and capable parents. The separation if often permanent, and the damage caused to the children left behind is severe and long-lasting. Bail for Immigration Detainees (BID) has produced a research report that documents the harm caused to children by forcible separation from a parent. The research provides an in-depth overview of recent academic insights and discussions and explores the effects of forced family separation in two different contexts – incarceration and deportation. BID is also releasing a self-help guide to enable the research to be used by unrepresented appellants in deportation appeals. The removal of legal aid for immigration cases brought about in the 2013 legal aid cuts means that independent expert report documenting the likely harm caused to the child (produced by a child psychologist or independent social worker, for example) are often prohibitively expensive for appellants. Whilst this is no substitute for such an independent expert report, it may provide useful additional evidence in a deportation appeal. Imprisonment has far-reaching adverse consequences on the families and wider communities connected to prisoners. Outcomes for children of incarcerated parents are far worse on a number of different measures. Such children are more likely to have Adverse Childhood Experiences, are at significantly higher risk of mental health problems; more likely to suffer from nightmares, anxiety, and bedwetting. The effects of parental incarceration endure for considerable periods and are associated with a higher likelihood of offending, drug abuse, school failure and unemployment.

Deportation: We found mounting empirical research that has begun to document the short and long term effects of detention and deportation on children and families. Physical separation in the case of deportation disrupts the essential secure base of a child, thereby risking internalizing symptoms (depression, anxiety) and externalizing behaviours (withdrawal, aggression). Deportation leads to abrupt loss of familiar home environment and family structure. It can lead to family dissolution. Deportation is also associated with a loss of income and numerous US studies show how this can lead to housing insecurity, food insecurity, psychological distress, and falling from low income into poverty. The emotional effects are often compounded by successive traumatic experiences such as immigration raids and parental detention. The experience of deportation produces increased emotional and behavioural distress among children and places children at risk of developing a range of disorders, such as sleeping disorders, depression, anxiety and post-traumatic stress disorder.

How deportation law permits cruelty to children: To challenge deportation on the basis of their

parental relationship an individual must prove that they either have a 'genuine and subsisting parental relationship' with a 'qualifying child' who would experience the deportation as 'unduly harsh' (those sentenced to 4 years or more must show 'very compelling circumstances' – an even higher threshold that is almost impossible to meet). The Home Office interprets 'unduly harsh' as 'excessively cruel' – that is, deportation law currently permits cruelty to children provided that such cruelty is not 'excessive'. It is necessary to show that the level of cruelty would go above and beyond that which is inherent in requiring a child to grow up without a parent.

The Supreme Court in KO (Nigeria) v SSHD [2018] UKSC 53, found that to meet the test, mothers and fathers facing deportation must demonstrate that separation from their children would involve a degree of harshness going beyond 'what would necessarily be involved for any child faced with the deportation of a parent'. Put another way, certain adverse impacts on children are a necessary and unavoidable price to pay in deportation. The subsequent cases of PG (Jamaica) v SSHD [2019] EWCA Civ 1213 and SSHD v KF (Nigeria) [2019] EWCA Civ 2051 held that most children who have a parent facing deportation are likely to suffer significant psychological trauma, and that to succeed in their appeal a parent would have to show a risk of likely harm beyond what would be a normally expected consequence. Despite the 'great sympathy' expressed by the Court of Appeal in PG (Jamaica) for the children, Parliament has made clear its will that distress to innocent children is insufficient to prevent deportation.

This effectively means that the courts are obliged to accept that cruelty to a child is acceptable, even where the long term harm caused to the child, their family and community may be detrimental to society at large. As stated by LJ Baker in the case of KF (Nigeria), '[f]or those lawyers, like my Lord and myself, who have spent many years practising in the family jurisdiction, this is not a comfortable interpretation to apply. But that is what parliament has decided'. The injustices wrought in the name of UK deportation law hit the headlines in February 2020 with the deportation of the Jamaica 50. The heart-breaking stories of Reshawn Davis, Michael McDonald, Tajay Thompson, Howard Ormsby, and many others were highlighted in the press. All too often the children of people who are deported, and the suffering they are forced to go, is made invisible. It is clearer than ever that an overhaul of the UK's unjust deportation regime is urgently needed.

UK Ranked 79th Internationally in Terms of Accessibility and Affordability of its Justice System.

Elliot Tyler, Justice Gap: More than one in three people have little confidence that they could achieve a fair outcome when faced with a legal problem, according to the lawyers' main regulator which reckons that as many as 3.6 million people every year have unresolved legal problems. The report by the Legal Services Board (LSB) reveals that the basic legal needs of many are not being met with the UK ranking just 79th internationally in terms of the accessibility and affordability of its justice system. The study, which is published on the regulator's 1oth anniversary, highlighted the impact of the 2013 legal aid cuts introduced under the Legal Aid, Sentencing and Punishment of Offenders Act. The LSB stated: 'Reductions in the scale and scope of legal aid, pressure on third sector advice agencies, and a rise in litigants-in-person, are among the reasons why nearly nine in ten people agree that "law is a game in which the skilful and resourceful are more likely to get what they want" .'

The Legal Services Board argued that the debate over the publicly-funded legal system 'sometimes masks' the fact that there were significant access issues for population groups and areas of law that would be 'unlikely ever to be within the scope of even the most generously funded legal aid scheme'. 'Although affordability is an insurmountable obstacle for many

people, the barriers to access go beyond cost, embracing issues of legal capability and service design,' it said. 'While legal services are out of reach for large parts of society, the same population groups – BAME communities, people with disabilities, younger people, those on lower incomes and people with a low level of education – frequently appear in our data as worse off,' the LSB continued; adding that it was true of their access to legal services, quality of experience when doing so and how fair they perceive the outcome of their issue to be.

The report continued: 'Further, these groups are more likely to experience serious legal issues that add to the existing problems they face. Often this reinforces a cycle of disadvantage that contributes to widening social inequalities. Ultimately, a legal system that serves some groups of people less well than others will struggle to command the public confidence central to the rule of law.' The LSB also highlighted the 'unfairness present in the profession itself' particularly in recruitment, retention and progression. It flagged as a barrier preferences by employers for 'elite educational institutions' and identified 'working practices and cultures that exclude, unfounded perceptions of "hierarchy" between different types of legal professional, and "homophily" (a tendency to prefer people similar to ourselves)'. 'We must seize this moment, and with a clear strategy, good leadership and collective effort, we can build a market that the delivers fairer outcomes, stronger confidence and better services for society,' commented LSB chair Dr Helen Phillips. 'Success will also mean a sector that better reflects the communities it serves.'

Personal Data From Muslim Prayer and Quran app Harvested and Sold to U.S. Military and Others

Dougnty Street Chambers: An article by Joseph Cox that appeared in Vice.com earlier this week claiming that personal data from a Muslim prayer and Quran app was being harvested and sold to buyers including the U.S. Military was a stark reminder of how far technology can reach into our most intimate spaces and the urgent need for clear parameters to protect the forum internum. This app was one of many described in the article, but there can be few things more clearly associated with the forum internum than the experience of private prayer. The company behind the app in question issued a statement refuting the claims in the article and announcing it was going to launch an investigation. But the fact that such a window into users' inner spiritual lives could be accessed or sold at all is a wake-up call on the need to protect our most intimate thoughts, beliefs and ideas in the digital space. The pandemic has pushed many of our most personal experiences online and the inferences that can be drawn about our inner states are increasingly complex. The need for regulation to protect the forum internum has never been more pressing.

The Power of Prayer and the "Creepy Line" - The right to freedom of thought, religion and belief enshrined in international human rights law (e.g. Article 18 ICCPR and Article 9 ECHR) has two aspects, firstly an internal aspect, the right to hold thoughts and beliefs in the "forum internum" and secondly, an external aspect, the right to manifest religion and belief. This differentiation is crucial when considering the kind of protection the right attracts. Unlike many other rights, the right to freedom of thought in the "forum internum" has been recognised by the Human Rights Committee (General Comment 22) as absolute. While limitations on the manifestation of religion or belief may be permissible if they are lawful, justified, proportionate and non-discriminatory, what goes on inside our heads can never be subjected to interference for any reason.

Where this line is drawn is, therefore, a crucial question, but in the digital age, that question is a thorny one. In relation to the related right to freedom of opinion, the Former UN Special Rapporteur on Freedom of Opinion and Expression, David Kaye pointed out in his Report on encryption, anonymity, and the human rights framework that ""[I]ndividuals regularly hold opinions digitally, saving their views and their search and browse histories In other words, holding opinions in the digital age is not an abstract concept limited to what may be in one's mind." Google's former CEO Eric Schmidt was famously reported as describing what he called "the creepy line" and Google's policy to get right up to the "creepy line" and not cross it. The right to freedom in the forum internum is so fundamental to our humanity that, perhaps, one could view the line around the forum internum as that "creepy line" - crossing it would be such a violation of human dignity that it could never be acceptable. But the stories about the way big data is used to analyse and monitor individuals and communities on an industrial scale raise serious questions about whether that line is being respected in practice.

Richard Huckle: Serving 22 Life Sentences Upgraded to 23 Life Sentences!

BBC News: A psychopathic prisoner who murdered paedophile Richard Huckle in an act of "poetic justice" has been sentenced to a minimum of 34 years in jail. Paul Fitzgerald, 30, assaulted and strangled Huckle in a 78-minute attack in his cell at HMP Full Sutton East Yorkshire in October 2019. Fitzgerald said afterwards he wanted to cook and eat parts of Huckle's body. Sentencing him at Hull Crown Court, Mr Justice Lavender said he had been acting out his fantasies. "You are a psychopath and you derive pleasure from fantasising about raping, torturing, killing, and even eating others," Mr Justice Lavender said. "On this occasion you derived pleasure from acting out your fantasies." The court heard Fitzgerald went into Huckle's cell and tied him up. He then raped him and assaulted him with various weapons before strangling him with an electrical cord. Mr Justice Lavender said: "You intended to rape and kill Mr Huckle and, if possible, cook parts of him and eat them. "You did this for your own pleasure and also to inflict what you called poetic justice on a convicted paedophile." The court heard that Fitzgerald, who suffers from psychopathy, anti-social personality disorder and gender identity disorder, has previous convictions for violent and sexual offences, starting from the age of 13 and including the false imprisonment of a female prison officer. Fitzgerald, who appeared at the hearing by video link, was given a life sentence and must serve at least 34 years in jail. Huckle, 33, from Ashford, Kent, was given 22 life sentences in 2016 after admitting 71 charges of sex abuse against up to 200 Malaysian children aged between six months and 12 years.

Celtic Supporters Who Wore IRA Shirts to Match Win Appeal Against Breach of the Peace

Scottish Legal News: Three men who were convicted of committing a breach of the peace after attending a Celtic FC game wearing T-shirts with IRA imagery have had their convictions quashed by the Sheriff Appeal Court (Criminal Division). Daniel Ward, Martin Macaulay and Ryan Walker argued that the sheriff had erred in repelling submissions made on their behalf based on the contention that the Crown had failed to corroborate that the T-shirts depicted imagery of a proscribed terrorist organisation. The conjoined appeals were heard by Sheriff Principal Derek Murray, Sheriff Principal Craig Turnbull, and Appeal Sheriff Nigel Ross.

Black-Clad Figure: The appellants all attended a match between Celtic and Linfield FC, a Belfast-based team, at Celtic Park Stadium on 19 July 2017. The Crown led evidence given by three police officers, two from Police Scotland and one from the Police Service of Northern Ireland, who each described the three men as wearing identical white T-shirts printed with the image showing the head of a black-clad figure. One Scottish officer, Constable Stirling, described the image as depicting a paramilitary figure wearing a black beret and sunglasses with a camouflage scarf covering the mouth. The other, Constable Taylor, echoed this description but also mentioned the tri-colour flag of the Republic of Ireland being in the background of the image.

The Irish officer, Constable Nixon, said that the black beret was of the same style and colour as those worn by members of the IRA, and that the image was clearly meant to depict an IRA soldier. He also said he had regularly seen people dressed like that in the streets of Northern Ireland, at parades, and at the funerals of IRA members. Each of the appellants argued that it was necessary for the Crown to adduce evidence that the T-shirts contravened the law in the manner libelled in the charge, namely that they displayed an image of a figure "related to and in support of" a proscribed terrorist organisation. In response, the Crown submitted that the fact that the T-shirt bore an IRA related image was part of the narrative only, and that it was the breach of the peace that required to be corroborated.

Crown Selected Wording: The opinion of the court was delivered by Sheriff Principal Turnbull. Considering the evidence given by the police witnesses, he said: "Only the evidence of Constable Nixon was capable of establishing that the T-shirts displayed an image of a figure related to and in support of the IRA. The evidence of Constables Stirling and Taylor did not. Taken at its highest, the evidence was capable only of establishing that the T-shirts worn by the appellants each displayed an image of a paramilitary figure." On the details of the charge, he said: "Proof of the charge turns upon what the image depicts. The Crown selected the wording of the charge, and accordingly required to prove that the image was of a figure related to and in support of a proscribed terrorist organisation, namely, the IRA."

He continued: "The only evidence supporting the connection with the IRA was given by Constable Nixon. The Crown did not lead evidence to corroborate that point. The nature and specification of the proscribed organisation is an integral part of the charge of breach of the peace, as the Crown chose to libel it. In the absence of proof of that element, there is no other conduct libelled sufficient to support a conviction for breach of the peace." For these reasons, the appeals were allowed, and the convictions quashed.

Deliberately Provocative Gesture: The Sheriff Appeal Court also considered it appropriate to express a view on whether the charge would have amounted to a breach of the peace if all the necessary elements, i.e. corroborated proof that the T-shirt depicted an IRA member, had been present. Considering the details of the breach alleged, Sheriff Principal Turnbull said: "The wearing of a T-shirt (or top) which inter alia refers to a proscribed organisation can amount to a breach of the peace - see Maguire v Procurator Fiscal, Glasgow (2013). The wearing of a T-shirt which depicts an image in support of such an organisation is no different." Turning to the context of the case, he noted: "The context in this appeal was described in evidence by each of the three police officers: a football match between Celtic, a team based in Glasgow who are perceived to have a predominantly Catholic support, and Linfield, a team based in Belfast who are perceived to have a predominantly Protestant support. The match was the second of a two legged fixture." He continued: "The first match, which had taken place in Belfast a short time earlier, had involved what was described as significant crowd trouble between the respective groups of supporters both inside and outside the stadium. The potential for further serious disturbance to the community was evident." Based on these circumstances, he concluded: "It is difficult but to conclude that the wearing such T-shirts amounted to a deliberately provocative gesture directed towards the Linfield support. The wearing of such T-shirts in near proximity to the opposing supporters within or around a football stadium is conduct which, if proved, would in our view present as genuinely alarming and disturbing, in context, to any reasonable person."

Eight Out of 10 Police Forces Unaware of Guidance on Evidence Retention

Elliot Tyler, Justice Gap: The failure by police forces to properly store evidence 'risks wrongful convictions', according to a charity investigating miscarriages of justice. Freedom of Information requests made by the charity Inside Justice revealed that eight out of 10 police forces in England and Wales were not aware of the relevant guidance. The National Police Chiefs' Council guidance, published by the Home Office in 2019, sets out the requirements regarding the storage, retention and destruction of records and materials that have been seized for forensic examination.

The charity, which was founded by the journalist Louise Shorter, has released a short film highlighting the issue, seeking to pressure the police to adhere to guidance around post-conviction storage and retention of evidence collected. The six minute film ('What happens when evidence isn't kept?') includes an appearance by the daughter of Roger Kearney, who is serving life in prison for a 2010 murder he says he did not do. The Kearney case was revisited in a BBC documentary, Conviction: Murder at the Station, which saw Inside Justice's discovery that physical evidence – which included a carrier bag with a bloody handprint on – had been lost, contaminated or destroyed by Hampshire Constabulary. 'Our intention was to re-test these crucial items from the crime scene which were calling eyewitnesses to the murder,' Louise Shorter said, adding they had felt there was 'a real chance of identifying the killer.'

In response, Chief Constable Gavin Stephens said it was 'vitally important' that police are involved in rectifying a miscarriage of justice. 'The national guidance is something to pay very close attention to,' he added. 'Policing cannot operate without the confidence of our communities. There are lots of things that make up confidence; one of them is the fairness of the justice process.'

How To Survive Imprisonment By Terry G.M. Smith

It is a sad indictment upon the British Criminal Justice System that it is quick to dish out swingeing prison sentences to those convicted or wrongly convicted by the courts, but never, if ever, provide proper or adequate advice or guidance on precisely how prisoners are to successfully complete those sentences compos mentis. What we do know, however, when new prisoners are inducted at Prisons up and down the country, the Prison Service have an inherent duty of care towards their charges, insofar as, prisoners should be protected from the disturbing prevalence of self-harm and self-inflicted death. The latest figures released by the Ministry of Justice reveal that in the Twelve months to June 2020, there were 61,153 self-harm incidents in prisons, which shockingly amounts to 167 per day. Moreover, equally shocking, in the 12 months to September 2020, a total of 282 people died In prison, 70 by suicide and 26 by Covid-19. There Are 2,000 prisoners on suicide watch on any given day!

Primarily, what we should be asking ourselves is, if the Prison Service concentrated on giving prisoners appropriate and sufficient advice and guidance on how to complete their sentences successfully, then perhaps the shocking figures above would decrease. For instance, we learn as soon as prisoners are sentenced to a term of imprisonment, the Prison Service kicks into action with its induction process which is presented by Induction Orderlies, "Insiders", Safer Custody Reps and, indeed, the Samaritan's Listeners. These prisoners are an invaluable resource to Prison Governors, in a sense, that they initially "meet and greet" inductees on reception and explain how the prison operates and how to take full advantage of the opportunities available. More often than not, at the end of the day, the inductees find themselves in spartan and unfriendly cell leafing through the prison information handbook.

After the honeymoon period of reception has passed, two weeks into the sentence, the

prisoner is searching for ways to physically and mentally to survive the sentence since the prisoner may have days, weeks, months, years or even decades to serve and require some concrete advice and guidance in how to overcome and manage this massive and seemingly insurmountable obstacle. In the light of the self-harm figures above, it should not be taken as a given that all prisoners are capable of surviving a prison sentence.

The Prison Service point out, however: "Once the Sentence Plan process comes into action, this will help the prisoner to steer his or her way around the sentence". No amount of Offender Behaviour Courses (OBCs) are going to alleviate the stress and anxieties of a long term prison sentence. Quite clearly, what the new prisoner is looking for is evidence of role models who have previously been in an identical position and come through unscathed at the other end. One quickfire way for new prisoners to do this is to initially set shortterm goals, such as, the first social visit, the first legal visit to Appeal, reading your first book of literary significance, setting yourself physical and competitive targets in the gymnasium and, of course, if applicable, working on your miscarriage of justice. Principally, the main aim and objectives are to keep your mind active, to such a degree, that you forget that you are in prison. As the more that an inductee dwells on the fact that they are incarcerated. The more their mood will dip, and before they know it, they are in a tailspin towards despondency and depression.

As a prime example, in June 1983, when I had just been convicted and sentenced to 15 years imprisonment, I was allocated to HMP Wormwood Scrubs. While at the jail, I was introduced to a group of experienced long-term prisoners who had just been transferred to the Scrubs after a riot at HMP Albany. Immediately, the prisoners sensed that the I was like a fish-out-of-the-water and provided me with some much-needed advice and guidance. In short, Iwas given a crash-course in the survival of long-term imprisonment. The core issues at that time being to: (1) maintain strong family ties with love ones through regular correspondence and social visits; (2) stimulate your mind with books and academic courses and achievements, (3) keep yourself fit and healthy through regular sessions in the gymnasium and (4) if you are that way inclined, maintain and sustain your faith.

In 2010, however, after being wrongly convicted and sentenced to the ill-conceived IPP sentence with a minimum 12-year tariff. I was introduced to the writings of the psychoanalyst and concentration camp survivor Viktor Frankl. At which point, among other things, the author learnt during Frankl's time at Auschwitz concentration camp, in order to survive a dire regime of slave labour, physical beatings and starvation, he set his mind to create and develop a viable psychological hypothesis to counter the extreme psychopathological influences of the camp. Quinte ssentially, Frankl created, developed and refined a previously designed psychological theory of "Logotherapy". A tried-and-tested way to " •.• treat psychological problems by helping people to find meaning in their lives". (2) The guiding rationale being despite the enforced incarceration, beatings and cruelty meted out by the guards " •.• there was one part of their lives that remained free: their minds".(3) Moreover, Frankl declared: " it is not we who are permitted to ask about the meaning of life, it is life that asks the questions". Put another way, what Frankl was saying to us was never give up on your personal endeavours and struggles, as none of us knows what opportunities await us in the future. Put succinctly; we should not jump too quickly to assume that the best of our lives have already passed.

Frankl also added, human bein~are able to give meaning and purpose to their existence in three distinct ways: Firstly, by being creative, "by doing something, by acting, by creating, by bringing a work into being". A work of art, a labour of love; "something that outlasts us and continues to have

an impact. Secondly, "by experiencing something; nature, art or loving people. Indeed, Frankl asserts, "one cannot earn love, love is not a reward, but a blessing" Thirdly, through how one adapts and reacts to suffering. Insofar as the German Philosopher Friedrich Nietzsche (1844-1900) proclaimed: "Whoever has a why to live can bear almost any how". This includes " facing their death enduring a dreadful fate like-a concentration camp.

In short, our lives take on meaning through our actions, through loving and through suffering".

More recently, the author has become a victim of state-induced suffering not that dissimilar to the above. In a sense, in May 2020, after 12-years behind the prison cell door. The Parole Board denied my immediate release to enrol and study for a Master Degree at the Anglia Ruskin University but recommended "open conditions".

Four months later, however, the Secretary of State rejected the Parole Board's recommendation on the basis that the Parole Board had not presented "a wholly persuasive case"; as the I had escaped from lawful custody 36 years ago and am still maintaining my innocence --- which is my legal right. Besides, I had not completed any offence related work, which is not entirely true. As I had volunteered to re-assessed for all the OBCs required but due to "low" Re-Offending Predictor Scores (OGRS3), it was determined that he did not "meet the required criteria". Therefore, I have additionally penalized and punished as a posttariff IPP prisoner for the disputed failings of the Parole Board and the narrowness of the OBCs criteria.

As a result, the Secretary of State has instructed that the I remain in "closed conditions" and volunteer to enrol and complete an "Enhanced Behaviour Monitoring Course" when he already has one of the most exemplary behavioural records in the prison estate with a first-class BA Honours degree. Furthermore, it is almost Nazi-esque that there are still 2,223 people, human beings, in British prisons serving the indeterminate IPP prison sentence that was formally abolished in 2012, with nine out of 10 prisoners like the author, past their tariff expiry date. More starkly, 63 IPP prisoners have taken their lives while serving the endless IPP experiment.

Recently, the author wrote to the brainchild of the IPP sentencing policy Lord Blunkett who has sincerely expressed for the umpteenth time: "I am deeply disturbed by the way the whole of the implementation of IPP was delivered from 2005 onwards". Nevertheless, we learn, no one seems to be listening. In conclusion, I will end the same way that I started. It is a sad indictment on the British Criminal Justice System when a post-tariff IPP prisoner has to seek solace and support from the long-dead psychoanalyst and concentration camp survivor to make sense of a sentence that was appropriately terminated in 2012, but not retrospectively.

Sex Workers’ Safety in the Balance in Scotland

Heather Barr, Human Rights Watch: Consultation Ignores Safest Option for Workers — Full Decriminalization: The Scottish government is holding a consultation on “how best to challenge men’s demand for prostitution in Scotland, reducing the harms associated with prostitution and supporting women involved to exit.” Scotland’s laws currently criminalize many activities related to the sale and purchase of sex, including publicly soliciting or loitering for the purposes of selling sex, and “brothel keeping.” As Human Rights Watch wrote in our submission, our research in countries including Cambodia, China, South Africa, Tanzania, and the United States has led us to support full decriminalization of sex work. Our findings indicate that even when only buying sex is criminalized, it makes it harder for sex workers to protect themselves from violence. Laws prohibiting “brothel-keeping” often prevent sex workers from sharing work premises and protecting each other.

The opportunity for members of the public, especially people currently engaged in sex

work, to weigh in is important. But the government's framing of the consultation betrays a lack of understanding of the diversity of people who sell and buy sex. It also excludes the approach that best reflects international human rights law and research on how best to protect the safety of people who exchange sex for money – full decriminalization. The consultation asks people which of four approaches they see as most effective at preventing violence against woman and girls, but those options do not include full decriminalization. Laws such as those in Scotland criminalizing loitering and soliciting can force sex workers to make hurried and less cautious decisions about potential clients, or to work in more dangerous locations. These laws also leave many sex workers with criminal records that can make it harder to transition into other forms of work and access benefits and services.

The consultation also highlights "links between human trafficking, prostitution and serious organized crime." Human Rights Watch has also conducted extensive research on human trafficking and works to end human trafficking. Sex work is the consensual exchange of sex between adults. Human trafficking is a separate issue—it is a serious human rights abuse and a crime and should always be investigated and prosecuted. Laws and policies that clearly distinguish between sex work and the crime of human trafficking help protect both sex workers and crime victims. Scotland's consultation on sex work could help inform a new approach that better protects the safety and well-being of sex workers—if the government is prepared to hear those views.

Police Officer in Death Case Resigned Before Disciplinary Action

Mark Townsend, Guardian: The only police officer due to face misconduct proceedings over the death of a black man resigned before a disciplinary hearing could take place, the Observer can reveal. Witnesses claimed that the officer sprayed CS gas into the face of Edson Da Costa, and this could have "contributed" to his death according to an independent expert. The officer resigned more than 12 months ago – but the family was never told. Two other officers were also due to face "management action" over the death of Da Costa, this time for failing to ensure that an ambulance was called quickly enough. The family has still not been told what disciplinary action took place and when. It is not known if the officer who resigned in October 2019 before his misconduct hearing moved to another force.

Da Costa, a 25-year-old father, died after he was restrained by four plain-clothed police officers in east London in 2017 following a traffic stop. Learning that the one officer facing misconduct proceedings over the death of his son had resigned more than a year ago, Da Costa's father Ginario said: "This is a joke. Why are they not accepting blame, why have they not apologised to the family?" The family is also concerned that during the inquest into Da Costa's death, the coroner asked jurors to reveal if they or any family members had been "involved in any campaign groups such as Black Lives Matter", raising concerns over discrimination. Last night a spokesperson for the Black Lives Matter movement, which has organised global protests following the death of George Floyd at the hands of US police, called it an "attack on the freedom of association". They added: "Support for black lives cannot and should not mean exclusion from any area of civic life."

An Observer investigation into Da Costa's death has uncovered concerns about the behaviour of the officers, including questions over why he was stopped in the first place and how he was treated after he was subdued. News that no officer has faced any misconduct action over Da Costa's death has infuriated the family and is likely to further fracture trust between police and black communities following claims of discrimination on issues such as stop and search. Intensive-care expert Professor Jerry Nolan, who examined the case, said that the spraying

of CS gas at close range could have been a "contributory factor" in Da Costa's death. Two witnesses say that the officer was roughly 6cm away from Da Costa when he sprayed, contravening guidance that CS gas should not be used less than a metre from its target. When the officer was later questioned by investigators from the Independent Office for Police Conduct (IOPC), he refused to "confirm or deny that he had discharged his spray at close range".

The IOPC investigators also found that the officer had told the ambulance control-room that Da Costa was conscious and responsive, although in a statement he said he had told ambulance officials he was unconscious. "[The officer] had a duty to Da Costa to preserve life, but evidence indicates he may have failed to perform that duty to a satisfactory standard," said the IOPC in its conclusions. It added: "The evidence suggests a reasonable tribunal, properly directed, could find misconduct relating to his use of CS spray."

The serving of misconduct proceedings on officers does not indicate guilt. On Friday night an email from family lawyers alerted the Da Costa family to the situation and said that they were asking for "an explanation from the MPS [Metropolitan Police Service] as to how and why you were not informed by them of the outcome and for an apology". On Saturday a Met spokesperson said: "A human error meant, unfortunately, that the IOPC were not informed of the outcome." However they added that the watchdog had since been informed, and the family had since been briefed. "Once this omission in the process was learnt of, staff worked swiftly to notify the IOPC, and expressed their regret over this error. We understand the family have been updated by the IOPC," said the spokesperson. An inquest found that Da Costa had died by misadventure after being restrained face down by police after swallowing 88 wraps of drugs. The family wants a fresh inquest saying they were unhappy with several aspects of the proceedings.

Judge's Decision to Free Teenager Due to Covid Backlog Overruled

Owen Bowcott, Guardian: A crown court judge, who criticised the government for failing to fund the criminal justice system adequately during the pandemic, should not have freed a defendant awaiting trial, the high court has ruled. Judge Keith Raynor's decision in September to release a teenager who had been held on remand for almost a year – and beyond normal custody time limits – was one that was "not open to him", the lord chief justice, Lord Burnett of Maldon, said. The ruling, by Burnett and Lord Holroyde, reverses Raynor's judgment at Southwark crown court, which described the Ministry of Justice's efforts to keep the court going during the emergency as "inadequate". Raynor had refused to extend the custody time limit for the young man, who had been arrested for possession of heroin, cocaine and cannabis and charged with drug dealing. When he came before Raynor, he had been held in prison on remand for 139 days beyond his original custody time limit.

Raynor's judgment accused the MoJ and HM Courts and Tribunal Service (HMCTS) of a "systemic failure" to provide for jury trials to continue. "The lack of money provided by parliament to provide sufficient space for trials to be conducted does not amount to a good nor a sufficient cause to extend the custody time limit in this case," he said. The Crown Prosecution Service, however, challenged Raynor's decision, arguing that the fact that it was "neither practical nor safe" for jury trials to be heard within custody time limits during the pandemic was a "good and sufficient cause" to extend them.

Burnett and Holroyde, sitting in the high court, found that Raynor's conclusions about a lack of funding were "not sustainable". The judges said: "The problem was not lack of funding nor systemic failure the problem has been in expanding quickly the number of trial court rooms." The backlog of crown court cases grew from 39,000 to 49,000 between March and October. However, the judges noted, HMCTS was

provided with £142m in July and a further £83m in September for "a wide range of Covid-related actions", including adapting courts so jury trials could continue. "The problems in accelerating the capacity of the system to hold jury trials have been practical and logistical, rather than financial," Burnett and Holroyde added. "The decision of Judge Raynor that the prosecution had not shown that the need for an extension to the [custody time limit] was due to a good and sufficient cause was one that was not open to him."

Secrecy, Corruption And Cronyism

Nicholas Reed Langen, Justice Gap: In Shakespeare's Julius Caesar, Brutus, musing upon how to save Rome, considers the risk of Caesar, upon being crowned, turning on those who have lifted him up, 'scorning the base degrees by which he did ascend'. This is not a concern that anyone who helped Boris Johnson rise to power can empathise with, given Johnson has spent his premiership – including much of the government's pandemic response – distributing the nation's largesse to those who paved his path to No. 10, rather than to those who can best help the nation. Nor is this largesse merely pecuniary, with the prime minister showing a hitherto unrevealed side to his character by remaining resolutely faithful to his ministerial allies, keeping them in post regardless of how incompetent (Gavin Williamson), how venal (Robert Jenrick), or how malignant (Priti Patel) they may be.

Such corruption and cronyism is fatal to effective government. It dispenses with the normal rules of engagement, turning what should be a democratically accountable institution into the personal fiefdom of the prime minister, where he governs through whims and partisan interests, rather than being guided and bound by rules, conventions and principles. Not only is this harmful from an economic perspective, with the Chancellor's statement to the House showing how parlous the UK's finances are, but harmful to the functioning of government. As well as being able to ill afford money being wantonly spent on goods and services that achieve nothing but to line the pockets of Cabinet ministers' friends and allies, the nation cannot function under a government run on secrecy, deception and hypocrisy.

Little demonstrates this gaping void of principle more than the long suppressed independent report into the Home Secretary's conduct in office. Reports that accuse – or absolve – ministers of bullying are not supposed to sit on the prime minister's desk until he decides it is politically advantageous for them to be released, or until an involved party decides that enough is enough, and leaks it to the press. While Patel's conduct is egregious, and while she should be well on her way out of an office that she never should have held in the first place, the fact that the prime minister had the report sitting on his desk for months, and doubtless would have kept it there, is equally appalling.

If Downing Street had its way, this concealment and deception would form the core of its communications strategy. The prime minister is allergic to scrutiny, repeatedly ducking interviews with Andrew Neil, the BBC's former interrogator-in-chief, during the 2019 election campaign, and banning ministers from appearing on Channel 4 News and Radio 4's Today programme because their presenters did their jobs properly, subjecting him and his government to rigorous questioning.

Meanwhile, whenever he appears at Prime Minister's Questions, he spends more time trying to pin a nickname on Keir Starmer than engaging with the questions he is asked. The appointment of Allegra Stratton as press secretary is a further attempt to restrain the media, funnelling them and their questions through a fully briefed political operative, ensuring that the government line is precisely toed, and reducing the risk of unfavourable facts and figures breaking out into the public domain.

Secrecy is the foe of democracy. For a democratic government to rule legitimately, it must govern with the people's consent, and consent can only be properly given when it is informed. If a nation's people are left in the dark, groping for facts about how their executive is governing, it is a democracy in name alone. Preferring opacity and mendacity may be desirable in the short-term, but in the long run in undermines public trust, and this, in turn, erodes the willingness of the public to follow where the government tries to lead. In normal times, such failure may harm the government's policy ambitions, but at during a pandemic, such a lack of faith is ruinous for the health- physical, social, and economic- of the entire nation.

It is this need for faith that explains why courts and inquiries are ordinarily so adamant about the need for transparency in judicial processes. If people, both the parties involved and interested bystanders, are kept informed, able to bear witness to all the same information that the arbiters receive, they will be more willing to accept whatever decision is handed down. It is when people sense that the wool is being pulled over their eyes that they become recalcitrant.

Unfortunately, this principle has been turned on its head in the the Undercover Policing Inquiry, which began hearing evidence this month. This inquiry is investigating the undercover tactics used by police forces to infiltrate political organisations since 1968, but, ironically, has preferred to hear evidence in a manner that conflicts with the need for open and transparent justice. Ordinarily, inquiries are reasonably accessible to the public, while recognising that at times, they raise politically sensitive matters not suited to the public domain, with Lord Toulson asking in Kennedy v The Charity Commission, a Supreme Court case concerning the principles of open justice in inquiries, 'how …an unenlightened public [is] to have confidence that the responsibilities for conducting quasi-judicial inquiries are properly discharged?'.

In contrast to the Grenfell Inquiry, which is continuing to run during the pandemic and is streaming oral evidence online, the evidence given to the SpyCops Inquiry is available via text alone, with no audio or video, available, but instead a live transcript that cannot be paused or rewound. This makes it virtually impossible for the media to effectively report on the proceedings, with Dominic Casciani, the BBC Home Affairs correspondent, tweeting that the livestream is 'virtually unusable'.

Parallel to this, Sir John Mitting, the retired High Court judge running the inquiry, has been willing to approve a range of applications that seek to conceal the identities- both real and assumed – of the officers involved, on the basis that disclosing their real names may expose them to risk and violate their right to privacy. While in some cases, this may be plausible, most of the organisations these officers were sent into were peaceful, and they were last undercover decades ago. There is little to no real threat to them, but preventing their identities from being revealed frustrates the purpose they are giving evidence for- it stops those who were spied upon from being able to properly question and challenge their evidence. Instead, these campaigners and their lawyers will have to fly blind, still unsure as to who the undercover operatives really were. In turn, this renders the inquiry pointless, landing the taxpayer with a significant bill (with the inquiry having already cost 23m, and due to run for another three years), while doing enough to raise the ire and frustration of the campaigners, but nothing to redress their concerns.

All governments sometimes need secrecy. The public do not need to know about all of the unpleasant realities that running a government can involve. But the default position should be in favour of transparency, not secrecy. Independent reports like that by Sir Alex Allen into Priti Patel's conduct as Home Secretary should not be locked in the prime minister's desk, in the hope that the nation forgets about it, but subject to independent authority that can authorise their release, while procurement contracts and appointments to the government should be transparent, with executive positions in government also required to abide by clear and open recruitment processes. Little good comes from secrecy, but, as the SpyCops Inquiry is showing us, much harm can.

Scottish Government Defies Court Order to Hand Over Documents to Salmond Inquiry

Scottish government ministers have failed to hand over documents relating to the unlawful investigation of Alex Salmond – despite two court orders and a search warrant having been issued. The former first minister is considering further legal action against the government, The Times reports. Among the evidence to be given to the Holyrood inquiry is material that has not been seen by Mr Salmond or his legal team. David McKie, of Levy and McRae, the firm representing Mr Salmond, said the government had not provided an explanation for why the evidence has only now emerged. “Neither we nor our client had received a material number of these documents before,” he said. “This was in spite of formal recovery processes in both the judicial review and a warrant served on the government in the criminal case. A number of these could potentially have been of great assistance to our client. We are considering the legal consequences of this with our client and with counsel. We have asked the government for an explanation but they have not replied.” When Mr Salmond sought judicial review of the government's investigation, the Court of Session found the process was unfair and awarded him £512,000 in costs. MSPs at Holyrood voted again yesterday for the government to release legal advice relating to the judicial review, which is believed to be key to understanding why it maintained its case against the former first minister.

10-Year Report on Men’s Fatal Violence Against Women in the UK 2009 – 2018

On average, a woman is killed by a man every 3 days: This report brings together the killings of 1,425 women and girls aged 14 and over and the 1,419 men who ended their lives between 2009 and 2018. The report finds that the numbers of women killed per year, the methods used, the contexts in which women are killed and their relationships with the men who kill them have changed little over the ten-year period. The Femicide Census is not prepared to accept that this is inevitable and that we should merely be grateful that the numbers have stayed the same and not increased. The title of this report is a genuine quote from a woman predicting her own killing. Too many of the women in this report and their loved ones may equally have said, or thought, something similar. Our findings confirm the view of the Femicide Census that this is indeed one of the greatest public policy failures of the decade and so we urge renewed efforts to challenge male violence, hold perpetrators to account and, importantly, hold the State to account in its obligation to respect, protect and fulfil women’s human rights.The report identifies a range of actions for Government, policing and the criminal justice system, for law and policy, for data capture and accessibility, for technology and media and for support services for women subjected to male violence.

Hundreds of Thousands Take to Streets Against Security Law In France

Charlie Kimber, Socialist Worker: “They are in revolt against police violence, racism and more generally the situation we are currently going through.” Police attacked the Paris march with tear gas and baton charges. In response, protesters defended themselves against the cops and set light to a Banque de France office and a BMW luxury car showroom. Over 300,000 people demonstrated across France on Saturday 28th November, against the government’s proposed global security law. Some estimates suggested it was half a million. The massive turnout took place despite coronavirus restrictions. Marchers poured on to the streets in Paris, Marseille, Pau, Rennes, Bordeaux, Lyon, Lille, Nantes, Strasbourg and dozens of other cities and towns. The revolutionary socialist NPA party said it was “a huge awakening after months of political confinement”. “There were many young people on the protests—school students, university students, young people from working class neighbourhoods,” it said. The government’s global security law wants to create a new criminal offence of publishing images of police officers “with the aim of damaging their physical or psychological integrity”.This would include images of police acting violently against protesters such as the Yellow Vests and anti-racist demonstrators. Offenders would face a maximum penalty of up to one year in prison and a £40,000 fine. Cops would also be free to use drones with facial recognition technology to monitor protest marches. And there are harsh restrictions on journalists.

At the same time, in a separate education bill, the government wants to criminalise university protests, especially blockades and occupations. Offenders would face three years in jail. There were marches against the new laws the previous Saturday. But they were much bigger this week because of two horrendous examples of precisely the police violence the state wants to cover up. A video, now viewed more than 20 million times on the web, showed police violently assaulting a black music producer. Michel Zecler went to his recording studio in Paris last Saturday evening. He was said to be not wearing a mask as is required under pandemic laws. Presumably using this pretext, the police entered the building without warning and attacked him over a period of 20 minutes. “The violence goes on and on, it’s unbearable, it’s outrageous,” anti-racist activist Edouard told Socialist Worker. The police kicked Michel repeatedly, punched him around 20 times and hit him with a truncheon 15 times, mainly on the face and the skull. “I said to myself, if I fall to the ground I am not going to get back up,” Michel told the Loopsider media site. The beating stopped only when other people came to intervene. Police left, smashed a window and threw a teargas canister into the room. This foul violence came a few days after a police attack against a refugee encampment on Place de la Republique in France.

Riot police beat refugees sheltering in makeshift tents and chased them through the streets firing tear gas. The protests now are highlighting many other examples of police racism. Six weeks ago Olivio Gomes, a black man, was killed by police in the suburbs of Paris. Edilson, from the justice campaign for Olivio, said on the Paris demonstration, “Michel Zecler's case is not an isolated one “We come from the suburbs, and that's what we've been through since we were little. What shocked me the most about Michel's video is that there were dozens of police officers who were watching him being beaten without saying anything. It means that they are all the same.” The government of president Emmanuel Macron has been forced to denounce the violence seen in the videos. But everyone knows ministers will back the police. The government has used the cops to beat back Yellow Vest, anti-racist and workers’ protests during the last two years. But now Macron faces a big movement that is asking who the cops protect.

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.