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 725 (26/12/2018) - Cost £1

Was Emma Jayne Magson Wrongly Convicted of Murder?

Caroline Lowbridge, BBC News: Emma-Jayne Magson, 25, is serving a life sentence for murder, after shestabbed her partner with a steak knife then left him to bleed to death. Yet her family believes her murder conviction was a miscarriage of justice. Why? "I've done what my Dad did to you." Joanne Smith felt her heart sink as she read the text message from her daughter Emma-Jayne Magson. Two decades earlier Joanne had been stabbed by her partner, and now Emma had fatally stabbed her own partner, 26-year-old James Knight. Emma and James had both been out drinking that night and were thrown out of a taxi because they were rowing. The argument continued in the street and back at Emma's home. At some point Emma picked up a steak knife and plunged it into James's chest, puncturing his heart. James then somehow ended up in the street outside his brother's house, where Emma was seen sitting on top of him. When James's brother and a neighbour tried to help she failed to say she had stabbed him, so they unwittingly left him to die.

Despite all of this, Justice for Women, an organisation helping 25-year-old Emma, believes she is one of many women who may have been wrongly convicted of murder after fighting back against abusive partners. The organisation is the same one helping Sally Challen appeal against a murder conviction for bludgeoning her "controlling" husband to death with a hammer. "If I honestly thought hand on heart Emma really meant to do that [kill James], I would never stand by Emma," says her mother. "But I just know Emma. I know she loves James. And that's so frustrating for me because I know how much she loves him; even to this day she loves him."

So how did Emma come to kill James Knight? Emma was only eight months old when her father attacked her mother in front of her and her older sister, Charlotte, in 1993. "He locked me in a flat and stabbed me," recalls Joanne. "They were both in my arms. He went for my throat but as I ran he slashed my legs." Despite Emma being too young to remember what happened, Joanne says the stabbing had a lasting impact on her. "We moved around, we went into a safe house," says Joanne. "There were scars on my legs and I had to learn to walk again." Joanne says Emma had a close relationship with her older sister. "It was just them," says Joanne. "They had a bedroom together; they did everything together." Then Charlotte died, aged nine, following a complication from an operation.

Joanne sounds regretful when explaining what she did next - her grief-stricken decision to bring Charlotte's body back to the family home for two weeks. Emma was seven years old at the time. "Charlotte was in my bedroom for a week, in my bed," says Joanne. "For the first week she was in my room then I brought her downstairs in an open casket. "I don't think I considered anybody but myself."

While Emma had been quiet as a child she started rebelling as a teenager. "As she got to about 13 she started drinking, acting out really, mainly for attention," says Joanne. Joanne had left Emma's father but says there was violence in a subsequent relationship, and the pattern repeated when Emma got into relationships herself. One of Emma's partners "fractured her skull and put her in hospital and she had a leak on the brain". Emma had a daughter, who is now four years old, when she was 21. Joanne says the birth was "traumatic" and she suffered from post-natal depression.

Emma met James a year after her daughter was born, in the autumn of 2015. They got together at about the time James's relationship ended with the mother of his two children. James had been staying with one of his brothers in Sylvan Street in Leicester, while Emma lived a few doors down with her daughter. John Skinner, who was friends with James and worked with him as a binman, described him as "a family man" who had lots of friends. "James had a very good group of friends... he was popular in and amongst his mates and at work. Whenever he wasn't working with me people always wanted to work with him because they knew you could have a laugh and he would get the work done." John says the relationship with Emma appeared to begin well. "When they first got together James looked really happy and bubbly and like he was moving on with his life and he just seemed really happy and settled." He became aware of arguments creeping in but thought this was normal for a couple getting settled. "I've seen them have an argument once where it got quite heated but in my opinion they both gave as good as they got," says John."I've never seen either of them be violent towards each other."

Joanne felt her daughter changed as the relationship went on. "James wanted her to stay in the home, and James didn't want her to wear makeup," she says. In the murder trial, the prosecution described their relationship as "volatile". Emma's family claim James was physically and emotionally abusive. She "always had bruises", her mother says, but would explain them away as "play fighting". James's mother, Trish Knight, maintains her son was not violent. "James has no history of violence towards women," she says. "James was with his previous girlfriend for nine years, who he has got two children with, and there was no violence in that relationship." The BBC contacted James's former partner but she did not want to contribute to this piece. She told The Sun he was "a real romantic" at the start of the relationship and "an amazing dad" to their daughters.

However, she discovered James was smoking cannabis and taking steroids towards the end of their relationship. "It was a far cry from the man I fell in love with," she told The Sun. "It caused row after row and no matter how much I begged him to stop, he didn't listen." James's mother still insists he would never have hit anyone. "James could shout, and James had hit a wall. If James lost his temper he would hit a wall rather than hit somebody," says Trish.

John noticed a physical change in his workmate. "He did get a lot bigger, obviously, you could tell there was something going off," says John."Obviously he was always obsessed with looking good... he used to go to the gym after work. "If you do the job and you work hard it keeps you fit in itself but he went that extra mile." Emma already had a daughter, who is now four years old

Emma miscarried their baby in the middle of March 2016. Miscarriages are known to trigger mental health problems, but Emma's family say the loss was even more traumatic because half of the baby was left inside her despite a hospital procedure intended to remove it. She then returned to hospital for a further procedure to have the remains removed. Emma telephoned her mum to say James blamed her for losing the baby. "A nurse had to have a word with them in the hospital because he was calling her a slag, saying she was with black men, that's why she lost it," says Joanne. James's mum said he had been "thrilled" about the prospect of becoming a father again, and she never heard him blame Emma for the miscarriage. "He was upset," Trish says. "I think he was angry it had happened to them." Fateful night out: Emma decided to go on a night out with a friend on Saturday 26 March 2016, the Easter bank holiday weekend. That night, Emma met up with James at a bar in Leicester city centre.

Louise Bullivant, her new solicitor, says door staff at the pub asked James to leave because they were concerned about his behaviour. "There was an incident between James and door staff which resulted in him being asked to leave and Emma decided to leave with him," she says. "There's no

doubt that they had both been drinking." They argued in a taxi and the driver asked them to get out, meaning they had to walk home. During the journey, CCTV captured James grabbing Emma around her shoulder and neck and pushing her to the ground. A statement from Emma was read out in court, in which she claimed she stabbed James in self-defence. "Once in the kitchen, he grabbed me around my throat and pushed me back," it said. "I was right next to the sink and reached out to grab something. I picked up the first thing which came to hand which was a steak knife; the knife was in my hand and I hit out once. I didn't mean to harm him, I just wanted to get him off'. I think something triggered; I think she had had enough," says Joanne. James's mum says nobody really knows what happened. "There were only two people who were there that night and one of them can't give his version of events," says Trish.

James's last moments - Emma said she stabbed James in the kitchen of her house in Sylvan Street, Leicester James did not die immediately. In fact, he somehow ended up outside his brother Kevin's house a few doors away, lying face down in the street, at about 02:30. Kevin and a neighbour, Michal Ladic, came out to help but Emma did not tell either of them she had stabbed James. "He was still alive when I came to them," says Michal. "I wanted to turn him around but she was sitting on him. He was face down, topless, she was sitting on him. "I asked if he was all right and she said he was just drunk. In his evidence at the trial, Kevin said Emma told him James was drunk and had been beaten up by bouncers earlier on. When asked what impression he got from Emma, Kevin said: "That everything will be fine in the morning - he just needs to sleep it off." Kevin helped lift James into Emma's house and placed him on the floor of the front room. Kevin did not realise his brother had been stabbed and left, telling him: "I will see you tomorrow." Emma rang 999 and asked for an ambulance, but again did not mention James had been stabbed. When asked what had happened she said: "Um, I don't know, my boyfriend's here and he's making weird noises. I don't know what's going on." Later in the call she said: "It looks like he's had a fight with someone." When the operator explained the ambulance might take a while, she replied: "No, that's fine, don't worry about it."

The prosecution claimed Emma deceived people into not saving James's life, and described her as "cold, brutal and manipulative". However, her mother believes she simply didn't realise James was dying. "I don't think she knew how serious it was in that moment," says Joanne. James was known as "King James" and Emma got a tattoo in tribute to him after his death Kevin was awoken by Emma banging on his door, screaming that James was dead, about 40 minutes after he had seen them both outside his house. Kevin went to Emma's house and Michal was already there trying to save his life, having heard Emma's screams. "We didn't know he had been stabbed," says Michal. "The body was so clean, nothing on him, and only when I gave him mouth-to-mouth and the second breath raised his chest and that wound opened and my eyes popped out. I just took the phone from Kev and told the operator that he was stabbed in the heart. "Then I was trying to do the CPR for another 15 minutes and she was getting in my way, like 'I want him back, I just want him to wake up'. "I remember telling Kev to drag her off him, and he did it, he took her off so I could carry on with the mouth-to-mouth and CPR."

Emma's grandmother says she saw marks around Emma's neck. Emma phoned her grandmother, who got a taxi straight there. "The ambulance had taken James away," says Lynda Allen. "There were police everywhere. Eventually, they let me go through and she walked down the road to me. All she had got on was a little nightdress, no shoes, nothing. "She put her head on my shoulder, crying." Lynda noticed marks around her neck, which were also noted when Emma was later examined in police custody. Emma was not initially arrested as police did

not realise she was responsible for stabbing James. She was allowed to go to her mother's house, where she told her mother she thought she had killed James, who told police. Emma was then arrested and taken away after being allowed to say goodbye to her daughter.

The Murder Trial - Emma decided not to give evidence at her trial. Unusually for someone accused of murder, Emma remained on bail throughout her trial at Leicester Crown Court. Her new solicitor believes this "says a great deal about the court's approach to the evidence". Emma decided not to give evidence herself, but her legal team argued she had acted in self-defence, did not intend to kill or harm James, and had suffered a loss of control. Her family believe she was scared and did not understand what was happening during the trial. "How can I put it without sounding nasty?" says her grandmother. "Emma's very slow on the uptake. If you said something to Emma and she didn't understand it, where it's quite simple to me and you, I would have to sit and explain everything to her. "I don't understand the law but I would have thought there would be somebody there to talk things through with her that she didn't understand." Emma's new solicitor believes if she had been supported by an intermediary, such as a trained social worker, she might have followed the trial better and participated effectively. Emma was found guilty of murder in November 2016 and given a life sentence with a minimum term of 17 years.

After the trial ended, Emma's mother was approached by a police officer who told her to contact Justice for Women. The group helped Emma get a new legal team, which is trying to appeal against the murder conviction using psychiatric evidence. The original psychiatrist instructed by the defence team had diagnosed Emma as having an emotionally unstable personality disorder (EUPD), but for some reason this was not used as evidence at her trial. Emma's new legal team went back to this psychiatrist for a further assessment, and also instructed a clinical psychologist who diagnosed Emma as having a pervasive developmental disorder-not otherwise specified (PDD-NOS). Even the psychiatric expert originally instructed by the prosecution now agrees that Emma was suffering from a recognised medical condition at the time of the killing. "He says he has revised his view and now supports a diagnosis of EUPD and PDD-NOS," says Emma's solicitor. A petition was launched demanding "justice for James", saying that Emma should stay in prison and "do her time".

However, Court of Appeal judges in London have found Emma has an "arguable" case and granted permission to appeal. Emma speaks to her young daughter on the phone every day, and she visits the prison every week. "They are so close," says Joanne. "She's going to see her mum today and she said 'I'm going to my mum's house, I can't wait. I love my mum's house'. "It's just so sad."

Trish says her son James had no history of abuse in his relationships. For James's young daughters, their weekly visits are to his grave. "They ask if Daddy is watching them," says Trish. "One of his daughters when she's old enough wants to go in the sky to see Daddy." Joanne empathises with James's mum, but maintains Emma should not have been convicted of murder. "I've lost a child so I know what James's mum is going through. I understand, I really do," she says. "I just hope Emma can come out and be a mum to her daughter and get on with her life. "She will never forget James ever, she won't. I know that she loves James and I know that if she could take that night back she would. 100% she would." On 22 November the Court of Appeal granted permission for Emma-Jayne Magson to appeal against her murder conviction. Her legal team is waiting for a date for the next hearing.

Sister of IPP Prisoner Who Took His Own Life Calls For Urgent Action

Jamie Grierson, Guradian: The sister of a prisoner who took his own life when being held under a now-abolished sentencing regime has called for urgent action to deal with thousands of inmates still jailed under the widely derided system. Tommy Nicol was jailed under an imprisonment for public protection (IPP) sentence – a form of indeterminate sentence that he described as the "psychological torture of a person who is doing 99 years". He made the comment in a handwritten formal complaint at Erlestoke prison around five years into his IPP sentence for robbery and about nine months before he killed himself.

The horror inflicted by the perceived neverending nature of IPP was acknowledged by the government's decision to scrap their use in 2011. The scheme was applied far more widely than intended, with some IPP sentences issued to offenders who committed low-level crimes. But despite the use of the sentencing power being scrapped, nearly 2,600 prisoners still remain locked up under the defunct regime, which saw offenders given a minimum jail tariff but no maximum for a range of crimes.

Since his death in September 2015, his sister Donna Mooney has discovered more about Tommy's experience in the prison estate than she is sometimes able to bear. Now she is calling for the remaining IPP prisoners on minimum tariffs of four years or less to be immediately switched to determinate sentences. She wants to meet with the justice secretary, David Gauke, to discuss what happened to her brother. The proportion of the IPP population who have gone beyond their minimum tariff continues to increase – 89% of IPP prisoners were post-tariff as of 30 September. "In all of this I'm not justifying what he did," she says at her home in south-west London. "He did something and there should have been consequences for that but he is still a human being." She explains that her brother was the eldest of six children – three boys, three girls – and struggled with a "traumatic" childhood.

Nicol was in and out of young offenders' institutions and prison from his teenage years – but Mooney always felt as if his emotional and rehabilitative needs were ignored. Of all the six siblings, Nicol remains the only one who ended up in trouble with the law. "He was very institutionalised," she says. "Outside of that, he was happy, friendly, a kind person. He would rather have had a family and a job. He just wasn't able to do that." In 2009, he committed his most serious offence – he stole a car from a mechanic's garage. The owner caught him in the act, a tussle broke out and the man's arm was injured. Nicol was jailed at St Albans Crown Court in 2009.

"At that point he didn't really know what an IPP was," Mooney says. "When he told me I thought, 'it can't be true'." Nicol started his prison sentence at HMP Rye Hill in Warwickshire. His understanding was that it would benefit his prospects for release to access a therapeutic community, only available in a small number of prisons, and to do this he would need to undergo a psychological assessment. He requested this early on but it never took place. In 2013, his tariff completed, he received his first knock back from the Parole Board for release – who informed him he should access a therapeutic community. This frustrated him but he persevered and requested a jail transfer. He applied to two therapeutic communities, but was unsuccessful.

In June 2014 he was transferred to HMP Coldingley in Surrey where there were no relevant courses for him to complete. While there he filed a formal complaint that he had been transferred to a prison that could not offer him the relevant mental health support. It was in Coldingley where serious difficulties began to emerge, but which Mooney says were ignored. Nicol moved himself into solitary confinement – known as the care and separation unit (CSU) – in protest. He spent 48 days alone and went on hunger strike for four days. No mental health support was provided.

In November 2014 he was transferred to Erlestoke prison in Wiltshire, where he made another formal complaint in which he labelled IPP sentences "psychological torture". In February 2015, a psychological assessment was conducted that concluded he would benefit from accessing a therapeutic community. In June 2015, six years into his sentence, he received another knockback from the Parole Board and was told the next review would be in 2017 – eight years after he was jailed on a minimum four-year tariff. A month later he returned to the CSU where he languished for 80 days. He went on hunger strike for seven days. His behaviour started to become increasingly unusual.

Mooney breaks down in tears as she continues her brother's story. "That's for me where you see it really starting to affect him," she says. He was transferred once again on 15 September 2015 to HMP The Mount, in Hertfordshire. His behaviour became increasingly erratic. He self-harmed, setting a fire in his cell. He was moved to the CSU in the Mount, where he was observed rocking on his knees, groaning. He wrapped himself in sheets and made a paper plate mask. But no mental health support was provided.

On 19 September 2015 he was moved to an unfurnished cell – the harshest prison environment available – for 24 hours. A video of guards restraining Nicol as they moved him was recently played at his inquest in front of Mooney and other horrified family members. He was heard chanting and talking to imaginary people while in the cell. "It was awful," she says. "He was having this mental health episode, and four guys go in and restrain him."

Finally, on Monday 21 September 2015, the governor requested mental health support to see Nicol. The mental health team attempted to access him but were denied due to safety concerns on three occasions. After a seven-hour stint in an unfurnished cell he was returned to the CSU and three hours later was found unresponsive. Four days later he was pronounced dead in Watford general hospital. Despite being unresponsive, he had been held in restraints in his hospital bed. His family were not informed until he had died. He was 37. "I can just see how much this sentence has impacted him – it's made my brother take his life," Mooney says. "He had a complete loss of hope." She also believes had Nicol known he had a fixed release date – even if it was longer than the period he ultimately spent in jail – he would still be alive.

Dr Dinesh Maganty, a consultant forensic psychiatrist who gave evidence to the Harris review into deaths in custody, gave evidence at Nicol's inquest. Explaining the issues around the impact of the IPP sentence, he said that one crucial element in any self-inflicted death is loss of hope. "I would hope that if I say something it will stop other families having to go through this – this is traumatising," Mooney says. "It's not just the person in prison it affects – it has affected every single one of us.

"Barrister Slapped on Finger Nail for Distributing Cocaine

Max Walters, Law Gazette: A barrister has been reprimanded and fined for sending cocaine to a chambers. In a regulatory decision published last month the Bar Standards Board (BSB) said Richard Thomas Keogh failed to act with integrity for being in possession of the drug. Keogh was reprimanded and fined £750. The BSB notice said Keogh had 'inadvertently' sent the drug to an unknown chambers. He also received a police caution for possession of a class A drug. The BSB said Keogh, who was called to the bar by Middle Temple in November 1991, failed to act with integrity and behaved in a way which was likely diminish trust in the profession and which could be seen by the public as undermining his integrity. The sanction, which is open to appeal, was issued through a 'determination by consent', meaning the case would not be sent to the Bar's disciplinary tribunal. The chambers in question has not been named. The incident took place in April last year.

Solicitors Told About Vulnerable Prisoners Policy - Five Months After It Was Introduced

By Monidipa Fouzder, Law Gazette: London criminal defence solicitors have this week been instructed not to speak to too many prisoners on a single visit to police cells in order to help courts deal with vulnerable defendants as quickly as possible. The London Criminal Courts Solicitors' Association has welcomed the policy - but was surprised to learn that it was introduced five months ago. HM Courts & Tribunals Service wrote to members of the defence community yesterday informing them that magistrates' courts across London introduced an overnights/vulnerable prisoners policy on 6 August.

The policy was introduced 'as a result of the number of vulnerable prisoners who were not being reached until the afternoon and were therefore spending excessive amounts of time in a cell. Also, some of those remanded in custody were not reaching the relevant establishments until late and on occasions being locked out', the letter states.

Solicitors are asked, when they arrive at court, to immediately liaise with the list caller to ascertain who the vulnerable prisoners are. When taking instructions, they are asked to speak to no more than two individuals before returning to court. HMCTS says: 'We do appreciate that it may be more convenient for you to speak to all prisoners you are representing on one visit, but your reporting back to the court more frequently assists the court in calling on the most vulnerable first so we do ask you strictly to observe this "two at a time" rule.'

The London Criminal Courts Solicitors' Association welcomed the policy to prioritise vulnerable prisoners' needs, telling HMCTS in a letter yesterday that 'we have been calling for such defendants to be treated with fairness, empathy and dignity for decades'.

Jonathan Black, the association's president, said: 'Although it is suggested in your letter that the initiative was implemented in August 2018, it appears that none of the defence community was aware of it and it would have helped to have consulted us so that we could input as stakeholders and advise as to any obstacles to successful implementation.'

The association made several observations in its letter, telling HMCTS that is it more efficient for duty solicitors to deal with as many clients as possible in one sitting in the cells.

Responding to the letter, HMCTS operations manager Alison Aedy said the policy was 'not a criticism to how solicitors work, if anything it is more geared to the police, [Crown Prosecution Service] and the court for being more pro-active.'

Prisoners' Release

Asked by Lord Trefgarne: To ask Her Majesty's Government in what circumstances Ministers may order the release of prisoners serving indefinite sentences for public protection without reference to the Parole Board; and how many prisoners have been so released during the last two years.

Answered by: Lord Keen of Elie: Prisoners serving indeterminate sentences, including those serving a sentence of imprisonment for public protection (IPP), may be considered for release on compassionate grounds, in exceptional circumstances, specifically where the prisoner is terminally ill, or bedbound or similarly incapacitated. Public protection is the priority, and a prisoner will not be released on compassionate grounds unless the risk of re-offending is minimal. One prisoner, serving an IPP sentence, has been released on compassionate grounds during the last two years. This figure has been drawn from administrative IT systems which, as with any large scale recording system, are subject to possible errors with data entry and processing.

Stansted 15 Launch Appeal Against 'Disproportionate' Convictions

Damien Gayle, Guardian: The 15 immigration activists found guilty of a terror offence for blocking the takeoff of a deportation charter flight from Stansted airport have launched an appeal against their convictions. After a nine-week trial, the protesters were last month convicted of endangering the safety of an aerodrome, an offence under the 1990 Aviation and Maritime Security Act that carries a maximum sentence of life in prison. The verdict – described by Amnesty International as a “crushing blow for human rights in the UK” – came after the judge told the jury to disregard all evidence put forward by the defendants to support the defence that they acted to stop human rights abuses.

Monday 8/02/2019, lawyers representing all 15 defendants lodged submissions amounting to around 100 pages at the court of appeal in London. They are arguing that the judge was biased in his summing up of the case, that he should have allowed the defendants to make the defence of necessity, and that he got the law wrong about what the offence means. They also claim that the court did not properly check that the attorney general had properly given consent for the terror charge to be levied against peaceful protesters, and that the judge should have ordered disclosure of the materials sent to the attorney general when deciding whether to sign it off. Raj Chada, partner at Hodge Jones & Allen, who represents the activists, said: “The conviction of the Stansted 15 was a travesty of justice that needs correcting in the appeal courts. It is inexplicable how these protesters were charged with this legislation, and even more so that they were found guilty. “It is our strongly held belief that charging them with this offence was an abuse of power by the attorney general and the CPS. It is only right and fitting that this wrongful conviction is overturned.”

Prosecutors had tried to argue that the charge did not amount to a terror offence since it was not detailed in any of the terrorism acts that set out the framework for such crimes. However, subsequent research by the defendants has found that it is included as a “convention offence” in the 2006 Terrorism Act. As such, it is in fact a crime to “encourage or glorify” the protest by the 15 defendants, Chada said. During the trial, the defendants had sought to make the case that the charge had been inappropriately brought, but were again denied the opportunity by Judge Christopher Morgan. In a last-ditch move, their legal team had called for the jury to be dismissed after Morgan gave a summing up that they said amounted to a direction to convict.

Helen Brewer, one of the 15, said: “We are appealing against our convictions because justice has not been done. Justice will only be done when we are acquitted of a crime that is completely disproportionate to an act of peaceful protest and when the Home Office is held to account for the danger it puts people in every single day – people who have sought asylum in this country fleeing harm and persecution in the very places the government deports them to.”

The group’s conviction followed a peaceful action that stopped a chartered deportation flight from taking off on 28 March 2017. Members of the group cut a hole in the airport’s perimeter fence before rushing on to the apron at Stansted. Four protesters arranged themselves around the front landing gear of the aircraft, locking their arms together inside double-layered pipes filled with expanding foam. Further back, a second group of protesters erected a two-metre tripod from scaffolding poles behind the engine on the left wing. One of them perched on top of the makeshift structure, while others locked themselves to the base to prevent it from being moved. In the moments before police arrived, they were able to display banners, including one that said: “No one is illegal.” Eleven people who were due to be removed from the UK on the flight are still in the country, with two having been given right to remain.

As well as Brewer, Edward Thacker, Benjamin Smoke, Melanie Strickland, Lyndsay Burtonshaw, Laura Clayson, May MacKeith, Melanie Evans, Alistair Tamlit, Nicholas Sigsworth, Emma Hughes, Ruth Potts, Jyotsna Ram, Joseph McGahan, and Nathan Clack, all aged between 27 and 44, are due to be sentenced in the week commencing 4 February.

Jail For Solicitor "Who Wouldn't Ask Too Many Questions"

Neil Rose, Legal Futures: A solicitor who was the 'go to' lawyer for a gang of criminals because he would not ask too many questions about where their money came from has been jailed for seven years. Forty year old Ross McKay, was found guilty of three offences of money laundering by Manchester Crown Court last week. His offending came to light through Operation Isidor, an investigation run by Greater Manchester Police's (GMP) economic crime unit into the activities of an organised group who had been laundering the proceeds of their criminal enterprise, including drug-dealing, tax evasion and mortgage and property fraud.

Mr McKay was found to have been complicit in the group's criminal activities by providing his conveyancing services in order for the money to be laundered. Deposits were put down on houses where the true illegal source of the funds was disguised from the lenders, mortgage applications used nominees instead of the names of the legitimate purchasers, and claims about income were wildly exaggerated in order to secure the loans. In total, the solicitor was responsible for the conveyancing in over 80 property transactions for several criminals, all of whom were subsequently convicted of serious criminal offences, including money laundering and fraud.

GMP said Mr McKay was their "go-to solicitor as they knew that he would carry out the property transactions without asking too many questions about the nature of their business, the sources of the deposits or the connections between the parties to the transactions". According to a report in the Manchester Evening News, Judge Timothy Smith told Mr McKay: "You were expected to be a person of utmost integrity and honesty. You fell far short of those high standards of professionalism, trust and integrity that are to be expected of a solicitor. "You failed, as was your duty, to uphold the law and the proper administration of justice. By your actions, you enabled criminal property to be acquired on a significant scale, and chose to involve yourself in the activities of those involved in crime, organised crime and, in the case of Mr Black, drug dealing." He was referring to Billy Black, a gangster currently serving a 22-year sentence, whose activities also saw the conviction last year of a solicitor on seven counts of failing to comply with money laundering regulations and one count of failing to disclose his suspicions.

Senior financial investigator Adrian Ladkin, of GMP's economic crime unit, said: "McKay was fully aware that the purpose of the transactions was to launder criminal proceeds and he was deliberately dishonest in facilitating them. As a solicitor, McKay was in a position of trust, but he spectacularly failed in his legal duties through his corrupt and unlawful actions. It is thanks to the meticulous work of the officers in this case that today he has been brought to account for his deceitful actions." Last month, one of the men Mr McKay helped, Scott Rowbotham, was ordered to pay £3.5m in the largest proceeds of crime case ever undertaken by GMP, or face 10 years in jail. He was jailed for three years and eight months in May 2017 and is now out of prison.

Aiding and Abetting: Joint Enterprise

Asked by Lucy Powell: To ask the Secretary of State for Justice, how many cases involving a conviction on the grounds of joint enterprise have been referred to the Criminal Cases Review Commission since it was established; and of those cases how many people have been given leave to appeal.

Lucy Frazer: The Criminal Cases Review Commission have received 219 applications which they have categorised internally as a joint enterprise case. This categorisation only applies to applications received by the CCRC post the decision made by the Supreme Court in the case of R v Jogee [2016]. Four cases have been referred to the Court of Appeal for further appeal.

Prison Law Which Prevented Male Inmate From Attending Father's Funeral Breach Of Article 14

In Chamber judgment in the case of Ecis v. Latvia (application no. 12879/09) the European Court of Human Rights held, by five votes to two, that there had been: a violation of Article 14 (prohibition of discrimination) in conjunction with Article 8 (right to respect for private and family life) of the European Convention on Human Rights.

The case concerned a male prison inmate who complained that he had not been allowed to attend his father's funeral under a law regulating prison regimes which discriminated in favour of women. The Court found that men and women who had committed a serious crime and had received the same sentence were treated differently. Men were automatically placed in the highest security category and held in closed prisons, while women went to less restrictive partly closed prisons. The law meant that the applicant had been automatically banned from attending the funeral, while a woman would have had such a possibility. There had been no individual assessment of the proportionality of such a prohibition and he had suffered discrimination which was in violation of the Convention.

Principal facts The applicant, Martit;ls Ecis, is a Latvian national who was born in 1981 and lives in the Ventspils district (Latvia). Mr Ecis was sentenced to 20 years' imprisonment for kidnapping, and aggravated murder and extortion in 2001. Under the applicable legislation, he began his sentence in 2002 as a maximum security inmate in a closed prison. He later progressed to the medium security category in the same facility. In 2008 Mr Ecis complained to the authorities that male and female prisoners who had been convicted of the same crimes and given the same term of imprisonment were treated differently when serving their sentences. In particular, women were initially placed in partly closed prisons rather than closed prisons, allowing them to more rapidly obtain certain privileges, such as leave. The Justice Ministry dismissed his complaint, referring to the Sentence Enforcement Code and the fact that the legislature had decided that men and women should be treated differently when it came to the execution of prison sentences. There was no discrimination as both sexes' rights were restricted and both were deprived of their liberty. Mr Ecis lodged three complaints with the Constitutional Court in 2008 about alleged discrimination against male prison inmates as under the law women who had committed the same type of crime and were serving the same sentence had more lenient conditions.

The Constitutional Court declined to institute proceedings for any of the complaints on the grounds of insufficient legal reasoning. Among other things, it found that Mr Ecis had failed to specify why the difference in the legal treatment of men and women should not be allowed and why male and female prisoners convicted of the same crimes were in comparable situations. His third Constitutional Court complaint, in October 2008, included the fact he had not been allowed to attend his father's funeral, whereas a woman prisoner in the same situation would have been.

The applicant complained that men and women convicted of the same crime were treated differently when it came to the prison regime applied to them, in particular with regard to the right to prison leave, which meant he had not been able to attend his father's funeral. He relied on Article 14 (prohibition of discrimination), in conjunction with Article 8 (right to respect for private and family life), Article 5 (right to liberty and security) and Article 10 (freedom of expression).

The Court decided to deal with the case under Article 14 in conjunction with Article 8. It also dismissed a preliminary objection by the Government that the applicant had failed to exhaust domestic remedies. In particular, when rejecting Mr Ecis's third case, the Constitutional Court had, at least in part, expressed its position on the substance of his complaint. On the mer-

its, the Court observed that it had consistently held that Article 14 could apply if people in an analogous or relevantly similar situation had been treated differently. Such was Mr Ecis's case, which concerned men and women who had been convicted of serious or especially serious crimes, the application of prison regimes and their impact on prisoners' family life. Not all differences in treatment violated Article 14, but there had to be a legitimate aim, and the means employed had to be in proportion to the aim.

The Government had argued that treating men and women differently in prison was justified by the fact that female prisoners had distinctive needs. The Court accepted that argument in part, particularly when it came to maternity. Nevertheless, any measures still had to be proportional. The Court noted that under the Sentence Enforcement Code Mr Ecis had not been allowed to attend his father's funeral because he was a medium-security prisoner in a closed prison. No other considerations had been taken into account when the authorities had refused him leave. However, a woman convicted of the same crimes would automatically be placed in a partly closed prison and, having served the same amount of sentence and progressed to the same security level, would be eligible for leave.

The Government had argued that women inmates were less violent, but had not backed up that argument with specific data. In any case, the Court could not accept that all male prisoners were so much more dangerous that individual risk assessments were not needed.

Furthermore, the Committee for the Prevention of Torture (CPT) had criticised Latvia's system of setting pre-determined minimum periods under various prison security regimes, stating that it was up to prison authorities to decide on such arrangements, based on agreed criteria and individual assessments of inmates.

The Court shared the Government's view that women prisoners should not face prison conditions that were harsher than necessary, but the same was also true of men. While Article 8 did not guarantee leave from prison to attend a funeral, the domestic authorities still had to assess such requests on their merits. In addition, European prison policy increasingly emphasised rehabilitation, with family ties being important in aiding the reintegration of both sexes.

The Court concluded that while some differences in treatment could be justified, a blanket ban on males leaving prison, even to attend a funeral, did not help the goal of meeting the particular needs of female detainees. The refusal to assess Mr Ecis's request to attend the funeral owing to a prison regime which was based on his sex had had no objective and reasonable justification and he had therefore suffered discrimination and a violation of his Convention rights. Just satisfaction (Article 41)

Discharging Restricted Patients And Deprivations Of Liberty

Local Government Lawyer: The Supreme Court has issued a significant ruling on the power to impose conditions on a discharge of a restricted patient which would amount objectively to a deprivation of the patient's liberty. The Court of Protection team at 39 Essex Chambers analyse the judgment. In Secretary of State for Justice v MM [2018] UKSC 60 the Supreme Court (Lord Hughes dissenting) has upheld the ruling of the Court of Appeal that neither the Secretary of the State nor the Mental Health Tribunal has the power to impose conditions on a discharge of a restricted patient which would amount objectively to a deprivation of the patient's liberty. The parameters of the problem are clearly defined: the patient, MM, "is anxious to get out of hospital and is willing to consent to a very restrictive regime in the community in order that this can happen. The Secretary of State argues that this is not legally permissible." It was agreed that MM had capacity to consent to the restrictions, which undoubtedly satisfied the 'acid test' set down in Cheshire West.

As Lady Hale (for the majority) noted (at paragraph 24) that: It is, of course, an irony, not lost on the judges who have decided these cases, that the Secretary of State for Justice is relying on the protection of liberty in article 5 in support of an argument that the patient should remain detained in conditions of greater security than would be the case were he to be conditionally discharged into the community. However, Lady Hale considered that there were three key reasons why MM could not consent to conditions amounting to confinement: The first was one of high principle, as the power to deprive a person of his liberty is by definition an interference with his fundamental right to liberty of the person, it engaged the rule of statutory construction known as the principle of legality, as explained by Lord Hoffmann in R v Secretary of State for the Home Department, Ex p Simms [2000] 2 AC 115, at 131: the principle of legality means that Parliament must squarely confront what it is doing and accept the political cost. Fundamental rights cannot be overridden by general or ambiguous words. This is because there is too great a risk that the full implications of their unqualified meaning may have passed unnoticed in the democratic process. In the absence of express language or necessary implication to the contrary, the courts therefore presume that even the most general words were intended to be subject to the basic rights of the individual.

Lady Hale took the view that Parliament had not been asked – as they would have to have be – as to whether the relevant provisions of the MHA: Included a power to impose a different form of detention from that provided for in the MHA, without any equivalent of the prescribed criteria for detention in a hospital, let alone any of the prescribed procedural safeguards. While it could be suggested that the FtT process is its own safeguard, the same is not the case with the Secretary of State, who is in a position to impose whatever conditions he sees fit. (paragraph 31)

The second was one of practicality. The MHA confers no coercive powers over conditionally discharged patients; as Lady Hale noted (although many may not realise): "[b]reach of the conditions is not a criminal offence. It is not even an automatic ground for recall to hospital, although it may well lead to this." The patient could therefore: withdraw his consent to the deprivation at any time and demand to be released. It is possible to bind oneself contractually not to revoke consent to a temporary deprivation of liberty: the best-known examples are the passenger on a ferry to a defined destination in Robinson v Balmain New Ferry Co Ltd [1910] AC 295 and the miner going down the mine for a defined shift in Herd v Weardale Steel, Coal and Coke Co Ltd [1915] AC 67. But that is not the situation here: there is no contract by which the patient is bound. (paragraph 32).

That led on to what Lady Hale identified as the third and most compelling set of reasons, namely that she considered that to allow a person to consent to their confinement on conditional discharge would be contrary to the whole scheme of the MHA. This provided in detail for only two forms of detention (1) in a place of safety; and (2) in hospital. Those were accompanied by specific powers of conveyance and detention, which were lacking in relation to conditionally discharged patients – "[i]f the MHA had contemplated that such a patient could be detained, it is inconceivable that equivalent provision would not have been made for that purpose" (paragraph 34). There was, further, no equivalent to the concept of being absent without leave to that applicable where a patient is on s.17 leave, it again being "inconceivable" that "if the MHA had contemplated that he might be detained as a condition of his discharge […] that it would not have applied the same regime to such a patient as it applies to a patient granted leave of absence under section 17" (paragraph 36). Finally, the ability of a conditionally discharged patient to apply to the tribunal is more limited than that of a

patient in hospital (or on s.17 leave), this being "[a]t the very least, this is an indication that it was not thought that such patients required the same degree of protection as did those deprived of their liberty; and this again is an indication that it was not contemplated that they could be deprived of their liberty by the imposition of conditions."

Lord Hughes, dissenting, took as his starting proposition that what was in question was not the removal of liberty from someone who is unrestrained. Rather: The restricted patient under consideration is, by definition, deprived of his liberty by the combination of hospital order and restriction order. That deprivation of liberty is lawful, and Convention-compliant. If he is released from the hospital and relaxed conditions of detention are substituted by way of conditional discharge, he cannot properly be said to be being deprived of his liberty. On the contrary, the existing deprivation of liberty is being modified, and a lesser deprivation substituted. The authority for his detention remains the original combination of orders, from the consequences of which he is only conditionally discharged.

He then took on each of the set of reasons given by Lady Hale for the majority before concluding at paragraph 48 that: [i]t seems to me that the FTT does indeed have the power, if it considers it right in all the circumstances, to impose conditions upon the discharge of a restricted patient which, if considered out of the context of an existing court order for detention, would meet the Cheshire West test, at least so long as the loss of liberty involved is not greater than that already authorised by the hospital and restriction orders. Whether it is right to do so in any particular case is a different matter. The power to do so does not seem to me to depend on the consent of the (capacitous) patient. His consent, if given, and the prospect of it being reliably maintained, will of course be very relevant practical considerations on the question whether such an order ought to be made, and will have sufficient prospect of being effective. Tribunals will at that stage have to scrutinise the reality of the consent, but the fact that it is given in the face of the less palatable alternative of remaining detained in hospital does not, as it seems to me, necessarily rob it of reality. Many decisions have to be made to consent to a less unpalatable option of two or several: a simple example is where consent is required to deferment of sentence, in a case where the offence would otherwise merit an immediate custodial sentence.

Comment: It is clear that this is not a judgment that the majority wished to reach, for the self-evident reason that it will both prevent restricted patients from being discharged from hospital and (worse) require the recall of any patients who are out of hospital on conditions amounting to a confinement, at least where they have capacity to consent to those conditions. Despite Lord Hughes' heroic efforts to find a way through to a different answer, it is in reality difficult to see how the majority's iron logic was not correct. Of course, in at least some situations, the judgment will prompt very careful consideration of whether all of the actual or proposed conditions are in fact strictly necessary, which could only be a good thing. But the combination of this decision and the earlier decision in Cheshire West, making clear how low the bar for the test of confinement is set, does seem to lead to an odd outcome. The only way in which that outcome could be reversed, it is clear, is by way of legislation. In the circumstances, perhaps it is no bad thing that there is at present a review of the Mental Health Act underway, and hence a realistic possibility that there may, in due course, be legislation to respond to that review, in which consideration could be given of what should happen in this situation, and opposed to what (on the logic of the Supreme Court decision) must currently happen.

It is important to note that Lady Hale for the majority expressly declined to engage with the question of whether "the Court of Protection could authorise a future deprivation, once the FtT has granted a conditional discharge, and whether the FtT could defer its decision for this

purpose." This was, in part, because it had been raised too late in the day, but also because even if this did give rise to discrimination against those with capacity, it could make no difference to the outcome of the case, which depended solely on the construction of the relevant provisions of the MHA. Lady Hale did not entirely close down the possibility that the Court of Protection could step into the breach, or that authority to deprive the person of their liberty under arrangements considered necessary by the Secretary of State/MH Tribunal could be provided by way of a DoLS. This may, therefore, remain one of the very few areas where it is a curious (even perverse) benefit to lack capacity in a material domain. It will be fascinating to see how a slightly different composition of the Supreme Court tackle the question of CTOs, and whether they can authorise a deprivation of liberty, in the judgment to be handed down in due course in PJ.

HMP/YOI Swinfen Hall – All Areas of Prison Life Adversely Affected By A Poor Regime

HMP/YOI Swinfen Hall in Staffordshire, holding 530 males aged between 18 and 28, was found by inspectors to have improved in some respects, and to have committed and hard-working staff. However, all areas of prison life were adversely affected by a poor regime. Many prisoners were locked up for 22 hours a day, which meant they did not attend training and education or get access to telephones or showers, and often had to eat in their cells, on or near cell toilets. Swinfen Hall was last inspected in 2016.

Peter Clarke, HM Chief Inspector of Prisons, said: "While there had been noticeable improvements in some areas, none of them had been sufficient to raise any of our healthy prison assessments. "There had been improvements in the provision of education and skills, and some of the residential accommodation had benefitted from refurbishment…But the simple fact was that, despite the improvements, too many fundamental issues still needed to be resolved.First and foremost among these was the poor regime, which had a negative impact on so much else in the prison. We found that it was disrupted about 60% of the time, limiting access to work and education. Thirty-nine per cent of prisoners told us they were locked in their cells for more than 22 hours each day during the week, a figure that rose to 65% at weekends. This meant that only 27% had daily access to telephones, limiting their ability to maintain family contact or to complete domestic tasks such as cleaning their cells. Only a quarter of prisoners were able to have a daily shower, which compared very poorly with the 89% who were able to do so in other similar prisons…The quality of relationships between staff and prisoners was also clearly adversely affected by the poor regime and the long periods of lock up. Mr Clarke added: "It was our clear view that if the regime could be improved, Swinfen Hall could become a quite different prison."

Inspectors noted that health care provision was generally good, and prisoners held positive views about it. The prison also had a robust approach to dealing with violence, and the fairly new violence reduction strategy had much to commend it, although there needed to be a sharper focus on violence reduction. However, Mr Clarke said, "we were particularly concerned by the very high levels of self-harm, and the fact that this was disproportionately high among younger prisoners…A significant amount of this total was attributable to a small number of prisoners, but this was nevertheless extremely worrying. The poor regime undoubtedly affected many areas of prison life, but clearly had a particularly acute impact on younger prisoners and those who were vulnerable or prone to committing acts of self-harm. Overall, Mr Clarke said: "There was much good work being carried out at Swinfen Hall by a committed and hard-working staff group, but the prison will not fulfil its potential to provide a consistently purposeful and caring environment for the young prisoners held there unless and until the poor regime is improved." 22 recommendations from the last inspection had not been achieved, inspectors made 57 new recommendations.

Grayling Under Fire as Serious Crimes Committed on Parole Soar by 50%

Jamie Doward, Guardian: Chris Grayling in 2013 when he was justice secretary. Critics say the fragmentation of the probation service on his watch has led to a rise in serious crimes committed by offenders on parole. The number of rapes, murders and other serious crimes committed by offenders on parole has risen by more than 50% since reforms to probation were introduced four years ago, according to official data that has triggered calls for the government to rethink its plans for another shake-up of the service.

Serious further offence reviews – which take place when a convicted offender under supervision is charged with another serious offence (SFO) – rose from 409 in the year before the 2014 reforms to 627 in the 12 months up to last April. The new figures for England and Wales – which were shared with Plaid Cymru's justice spokeswoman, Liz Saville Roberts – come as it emerges that coroners have taken the highly unusual decision to reopen inquests into three people killed by offenders under supervision, a move that is expected to expose systemic flaws in the probation service.

The problems are blamed on former justice secretary Chris Grayling's reform programme, which saw some probation work outsourced to eight private providers, who were given responsibility for running 21 community rehabilitation companies working with low and medium risk offenders. "Since the private contracts were let there have been staff cuts of up to 30%, offices have been merged and the quality of supervision has fallen sharply," said Harry Fletcher of the Victims' Rights Campaign.

Ian Lawrence, general secretary of the probation union, Napo, said there was a "clear correlation" between the increase and the reforms, which he blamed on increased workloads, low morale and chronic staff shortages which have left the National Probation Service with more than 1,000 vacancies. "There will be further serious offences whatever system you run but we think the fragmentation of the service has been a serious factor in the increase in SFOs," he said. A ministry of justice spokeswoman said the reforms "had extended probation supervision to around 40,000 extra offenders each year" and therefore "analysis of the number of offences does not provide a like-for-like comparison".

The Observer has learned that any lapses in the supervision of serious offenders are set to be examined in court following a decision to reopen inquests into the deaths of three people who were killed by offenders under supervision. As a result, previously confidential documents, including serious case reviews and risk assessments, will be shared with the victims' families. Alex Malcolm, five, died in 2016, after being attacked by Marvyn Iheanacho who was in a relationship with his mother. Iheanacho had been convicted of attacks on previous partners and children. A condition of his supervision was that he was not to be left alone with a child. Lisa Skidmore was raped and murdered in 2016 by Leroy Campbell, a registered sex offender who was under supervision on probation. A review revealed that six weeks before he killed Skidmore, Campbell had told his probation officer he was having feelings that were "troubling him" and mentioned rape. Conner Marshall, 18, was beaten to death by David Braddon in south Wales in 2015. Braddon, who had taken a cocktail of drugs and alcohol, had missed eight separate probation appointments in the weeks leading up to the attack. The coroners have agreed to resume the inquests so that lessons can be learned to prevent future deaths and because, it is argued, the state may have failed in its duty to safeguard the right to life.

Amid signs the system is struggling, the government is ending the contracts for the eight private providers two years early and reducing the number of community rehabilitation companies from 21 to 10. It is also spending £22m improving support for ex-offenders. Saville Roberts accused the government of "wilfully wrecking the humanitarian principle of rehabilitation" and called for more probation services to be returned to government control. A coalition comprising the probation trade unions, the Probation Institute, the Howard League, the Centre for Crime and Justice Studies, and the Centre for Justice Innovation have written to the justice secretary, David Gauke, urging him not to rush into retendering the contracts until a thorough review of the probation service has been conducted.

Man Confined to Psychiatric Hospital no Proper Legal Representation Or Court Hearing

In judgment in the case of Čutura v. Croatia (application no. 55942/15) the European Court of Human Rights held, unanimously, that there had been: a violation of Article 5 § 1 (right to liberty and security / persons of unsound mind), of the European Convention on Human Rights. The case concerned a court order to keep the applicant in a psychiatric hospital where he had been placed after it had been found in the criminal proceedings that he had uttered threats in a state of mental derangement. The Court found in particular that the applicant's court-appointed lawyer had been passive and ineffective and that the domestic court had failed to compensate for the lack of effective legal representation. The procedural requirements necessary for keeping the applicant in hospital had therefore not been met and there had been a violation of the Convention. The Court's examination of the case mainly concerned the proceedings which had led to the applicant being kept in hospital under a court order for a further year, which was also the subject of the Constitutional Court's examination in June 2015. It applied the general principles for involuntary confinement in a psychiatric hospital set out in the case of M.S. v. Croatia (no. 2). The Court noted that although Mr Čutura had used a particular lawyer of his own choice in the initial criminal trial, the domestic courts had appointed a new legal aid lawyer in the proceedings on his involuntary hospitalisation. The second lawyer was, for reasons unknown, soon replaced with a different one. Furthermore, that third lawyer had acted as a passive observer in the proceedings on extending Mr Čutura's involuntary confinement: the lawyer had not addressed the applicant or the judge during the meeting at the hospital with the judge; had not attempted to contact the applicant or his family; and had not made any submissions on Mr Čutura's behalf during the later hearing. Although well aware of the lawyer's passive attitude, the courts had failed to ensure that the applicant was represented in an effective manner. That was despite the fact that they were under an enhanced duty of supervision when it came to people with disabilities. There was also no evidence that the judge had informed the applicant of his rights or given any consideration to his taking part in the hearing, although there had been no valid reason for excluding him. In addition, the court had not involved the family, which had previously opposed extendingMr Čutura's confinement. The Court held that the national authorities had failed to meet the procedural requirements necessary for extending Mr Čutura's involuntary placement in hospital and there had therefore been a violation of Article 5 § 1.

Hostages: Sally Challen, 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, Glen Cameron,Warren Slaney, Melvyn 'Adie' McLellan, Lyndon Coles, Robert Bradley, John Twomey, 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 Knapp, William Kenealy, Glyn Razzell, Willie Gage, Kate Keaveney, Michael Stone, Michael Attwooll, John Roden, Nick Tucker, Karl Watson, Terry Allen, Richard Southern, Jamil Chowdhary, Jake Mawhinney, Peter Hannigan.