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 733 (20/03/2019) - Cost £1

When the Dead Cannot Cry Out For Justice, it is the Duty of the Living To Do So For Them

"The announcement that only one soldier is to face charges in relation to the actions of the Parachute Regiment on Bloody Sunday is farcical. I don't expect this to lead to a conviction and, if there is a conviction, I don't expect this to result in any prison time. As with the inquests into the Birmingham and Guildford bombings, this exercise is designed to deflect attention. There has been no serious attempt, in any of these cases, to uncover the truth, nor to seek justice for the victims." Paddy Hill (Birmingham 6 / MOJO)

"The British state has a long and dishonourable tradition of denying its wrongs and, when that becomes unsustainable, delaying facing the issue for as long as possible. The passage of so many years has inevitably had its impact upon the process of justice – witnesses and soldiers present on Bloody Sunday have died, as have some of the bereaved". Gurdian Opinion

If the soldier is brought back to Northern Ireland to stand trial. It is more than likely that he will be tried in a Diplock court, a non-jury trial heard by a single judge. MOJUK stands strongly against Diplock trials. Diplock courts, in which serious criminal cases connected with the Troubles are tried by a single judge sitting without a jury, have been in operation since 1973. It soon became clear as the trials began, that defendants were treated unfairly, prosecutors had a field day with the way they presented evidence and judges bending over backwards to accept what was put before them. Many of the convictions under the Diplock court have been overturned as Miscarriages of Justice. John O MOJUK

Statement from the families of some of those who lost their lives on Bloody Sunday following the announcement that one soldier is to be prosecuted over the events in 1972.

"To deny people their human rights is to challenge their very humanity", said Nelson Mandela. We have walked a long journey since our fathers and brothers were brutally slaughtered on the streets of Derry on Bloody Sunday. Over that passage of time all of the parents of the deceased have died. We are here to take their place. Bloody Sunday was not just a wanton act carried out by a trained army against defenceless civil rights activists. It also created a deep legacy of hurt and injustice and deepened and prolonged a bloody conflict unimaginable even in those dark winter days of 1972. The full cost of Bloody Sunday cannot be measured just in terms of those who suffered that day but must also be measured in terms of those who suffered because of that terrible day.

We have just been informed of the series of charges: We, the families of those murdered and wounded in Derry on Bloody Sunday, today heard the decision by the PPS to charge just one British paratrooper for his murderous actions on 30 January 1972. This announcement is vindication of our decades-long campaign to clear the names of our loved ones and to bring those responsible for their deaths and injuries to justice. When the Bloody Sunday Justice Campaign was launched in 1992 we had three clear demands – to have the Widgery whitewash overturned and replaced by an independent inquiry; to gain a formal acknowledgement of the innocence of all our loved ones, and to prosecute those responsible. With today's news, we now achieve our third aim.

However, we have also faced the disappointing news that in some cases there will not be prosecutions, and we are mindful of those families who received that news today. We would like to remind everyone that no prosecution, or if it comes to it, no conviction, does not mean not guilty. It does not mean that no crime was committed. It does not mean that those soldiers acted "in a dignified and appropriate way. It simply means that if these crimes had been investigated properly when they happened, and evidence gathered at the time, then the outcome would have been different. We note the Saville Report's findings on the actions of soldiers that day, that all the casualties were either "the intended targets of the soldiers or the result of shots fired indiscriminately at people"; that no soldiers "fired in response to attacks or threatened attacks"; that no soldiers fired "in a state of fear or panic" and that soldiers opened fire "either in the belief that no-one in the areas towards which they respectively fired was posing a threat of causing death or serious injury, or not caring whether or not anyone there was posing such a threat". These are not the sort of comments levelled at innocent people.

The passage of time has made charges difficult in this case, and in other cases. But the passage of time should not be used as a form of blanket immunity to block proper investigations. Everyone deserves justice, including those whose loved ones were murdered by the British state. There can be no statute of limitations used to deny justice, no new laws to protect state killers. But, for us here today, it is important to point out that justice for one family is justice for all of us. We stand in full solidarity with those of us whose loved-one's death or injury has not been included in the announcement of prosecutions. We also stand in complete solidarity with the hundreds of families who have had to endure decades without an inquest, without a criminal investigation and who have been left to struggle for their basic human right to justice. We hope our campaign continues to be an inspiration to them.

Today's decision, although 47 years overdue, was necessary if we are to uphold the rule of law and hold perpetrators accountable for their crimes. However, we also say that the scope of the new police investigation was not wide enough, and we assert that the repeated failure to properly investigate the actions of those who planted nail bombs on the body of my uncle, 17-year-old Gerald Donaghey is unacceptable. The Saville Report left a stain on Gerald's innocence that this investigation could have removed, but it did not do so. We repeat our call for this injustice to be addressed. And while we as a group of families and individuals may have differing views on whether or not the soldiers who carried out the shootings should face jail, or how long they should spend in jail, we are all agreed that they should face the due process of the law. And they should do so in public. The very few British soldiers that were charged during the conflict here were named, and the same should apply to those being charged now. Killers should not benefit from anonymity.

We maintain that key individuals in the army, in politics and beyond, should also be held to account for their actions on that day and afterwards. This affront must also be rectified if justice is to be truly done, and seen to be done. If the police officer in charge on the day of the Hillsborough tragedy can face prosecution then so too can those who were in charge on Bloody Sunday. There cannot be one law for the military and political elite and one law for others.

Finally, there should be no further delay in dealing with the outstanding demand of the families of Bloody Sunday and the people of Derry. We call on all of those who will administer the next stage to move with all speed to bring this to a conclusion. We call on all involved to cooperate fully and not indulge in any more delaying tactics. We call on the Crown Prosecution Service to complete its process and reach a decision on whether or not anyone is to be charged with perjury in relation to their evidence to the Bloody Sunday Inquiry. We call on the Attorney General to investigate recent comments about these prosecutions made by prominent politicians, including the British Minister of Defence, and decide if they too broke the law. If they have, they should be charged. They cannot attempt to interfere in a judicial process just because they don't like it, or because their voters don't like it.

The dead cannot cry out for justice, it is the duty of the living to do so for them.

We have cried out for them for many years, and now we have succeeded for them.

Do not deny us justice any longer.

Guardian View on the Bloody Sunday Prosecution: Late But Necessary

It is now approaching half a century since Bloody Sunday, when British troops fired on civil rights demonstrators in Derry. The killings not only left families distraught but, as the brother of one victim observed on Thursday, deepened and widened the conflict in Northern Ireland. The Widgery tribunal of the same year compounded anger. It took more than 25 years, and the peace process, for the British government to commission another inquiry. In 2010 Lord Saville finally delivered his devastating report. A lengthy police inquiry followed.

Now one former paratrooper is to stand trial for the murder of two men, and attempted murder of four more. Prosecutors concluded that there was insufficient evidence to provide a reasonable prospect of convicting other suspects on similar charges, though some may yet face perjury cases.

The British state has a long and dishonourable tradition of denying its wrongs and, when that becomes unsustainable, delaying facing the issue for as long as possible. The passage of so many years has inevitably had its impact upon the process of justice – witnesses and soldiers present on Bloody Sunday have died, as have some of the bereaved. Relatives are profoundly disappointed that only one person is to be charged, despite their relief that there are charges at all, and will probably challenge the decision not to pursue other cases.

Their distress and anger has been fuelled by the carelessness, ignorance and crassness of British ministers – all the more alarming given the stresses that Brexit imposes upon a hard-won peace. Last week the Northern Ireland secretary, Karen Bradley, had to apologise for saying killings by security forces were “not crimes” and were carried out by people “fulfilling their duties in a dignified and appropriate way”.

The defence secretary’s response to this prosecution has been insensitive in the extreme. Gavin Williamson made no mention of the victims or families in his statement. He went on to say that the government is working on safeguards to ensure the armed forces are not unfairly treated and will “urgently reform the system for dealing with legacy issues. Our serving and former personnel cannot live in constant fear of prosecution.” A 10-year statute of limitations has been mooted.

The implications with regard to Iraq and Afghanistan are obvious. So is the message it would send to personnel in operations yet to come. That the state upholds the law, and especially that it addresses its own breaches, is not less but more important in highly charged contexts or full-scale conflicts. If it fails to do so promptly and transparently, it must address that too. To tackle old wrongs helps to rebuild trust and strengthen communities today. It also prevents future wrongs by reminding troops and those who command them of their responsibilities. This prosecution is both important and necessary.

Bloody Sunday: Defence Secretary Gavin Willamson Sparks Outrage

Politicians 'cannot attempt to interfere in a judicial process just because they don't like it, or because their voters don't like it.' Defence secretary Gavin Williamson has provoked condemnation from relatives and calls for an investigation after being accused of making “grossly inappropriate” comments about whether former soldiers should face prosecutions over their actions on Bloody Sunday. Relatives of some of the 13 people who were killed on Bloody Sunday have called upon the attorney general to investigate whether Mr Williamson interfered in the judicial process with remarks made six days before the decision was taken to prosecute “Soldier F” for two murders. Mr Williamson was also accused of insensitivity after his official statement, issued minutes after the decision to prosecute “Soldier F” was announced, made no mention of the 13 who died in the January 1972 shootings. Instead, Mr Williamson confirmed the Ministry of

Defence would pay Soldier F’s legal costs and added: “The MoD is working [on] a new package of safeguards … The government will urgently reform the system for legacy issues. Our serving and former personnel cannot live in constant fear of prosecution.”

Labour called this statement “grossly inappropriate”, while others contrasted the ex-fireplace salesman’s reaction with that of a former British soldier who grew up in Northern Ireland and won the military cross in Afghanistan. While Mr Williamson made no mention of those who died or their loved ones, Doug Beattie MC, now an Ulster Unionist Party member of Northern Ireland’s Legislative Assembly, wrote: “There are no winners here. Just victims. It’s important to remember their families today.” As the bereaved families expressed “terrible disappointment” that only one out of 17 ex-soldiers investigated would face prosecution, John Kelly, who saw his 17-year-old brother Michael die on Bloody Sunday, criticised Mr Williamson for his earlier comments about “spurious prosecutions”

Six days before Northern Ireland’s Public Prosecution Service (PPS) was due to give its decision on the Bloody Sunday soldiers, Mr Williamson had told the BBC’s Nick Robinson: “We need to give protections to service personnel to ensure we don’t have spurious prosecutions. “No-one in the armed forces wants to be above the law, but what we did need to do is ensure that they do have the protection so that they don’t feel under threat. It’s not just about Northern Ireland, but about Iraq and Afghanistan, conflicts before that and in the future.” Asked whether the new protections would make a difference to the expected Bloody Sunday prosecutions, Mr Williamson had replied: “Sadly, I don’t think that will come in time.”

Speaking at the Guildhall in Derry on Thursday, Mr Kelly said the attorney general should now decide if Mr Williamson or other politicians have broken the law. Mr Kelly said: “If they have, they should be charged. They cannot attempt to interfere in a judicial process just because they don’t like it, or because their voters don’t like it.” Mr Williamson faced further criticism over the statement he made after the PPS decision was announced. Shadow Northern Ireland secretary Tony Lloyd said it was “grossly inappropriate” to issue a statement focusing on soldiers’ rights minutes after bereaved families learned that one ex-paratrooper would be prosecuted for murder and 16 others would face no action. Social media users also contrasted Mr Williamson’s approach with that of former prime minister David Cameron. In 2010, after the Saville Inquiry found no soldiers fired in response to attacks, no casualties were posing a threat, and some were clearly fleeing or going to help others who were hit, Mr Cameron apologised on the government’s behalf, calling the army’s actions on the day “unjustifiable.” One Twitter user wrote of Mr Williamson: “He does realise the soldier has been charged with murder, not bunking off guard duty or the like. murder! Incredible statement, but in all honesty not unexpected.” Adam Lusher,Rob Merrick, Indpendent

Dennis Hutchings Begins Appeal Against Diplock Non-Jury Trial

Former soldier Dennis Hutchings has begun his appeal to the Supreme Court against a decision to try him in a Diplock Court. Mr Hutchings is due to be tried for attempted murder in connection with a fatal shooting in NI in 1974. A Diplock Court is a non-jury trial heard by a judge only. Mr Hutchings, 77, from Cawsand, Cornwall, has denied charges of attempted murder and attempting to cause grievous bodily harm. John Pat Cunningham, 27, who had learning difficulties, was shot in the back as he ran away from an Army patrol near Benburb, County Tyrone, in 1974. Mr Hutchings has made the case it was never his intention to kill or injure Mr Cunningham, but that he was firing warning shots to get him to stop.

Supporters from campaign group Justice for Northern Ireland Veterans clapped and cheered as the ex-soldier arrived at the court in London on Thursday morning. Mr

Hutchings thanked the supporters and said: "Victory for veterans, that's what we want." The former corporal-major in the Life Guards said he was "a bit nervous, obviously, although I don't think we will get a decision today". He said he was "reasonably confident" he would win his case, but added: "I just don't trust the system anymore."

Diplock court? The non-jury system was named after Lord Diplock, a former senior judge and Law Lord. During the height of the Troubles, he chaired a commission that examined proposed changes in the administration of justice in an attempt to deal with terrorist offences. The commission published its report in December 1972 and non-jury courts were introduced the following year. The introduction of Diplock courts was opposed by civil liberty organisations and both nationalists and republicans. At their peak, more than 300 trials per year were held without a jury. The government technically abolished the old Diplock courts in 2007.

However, the government gave the director of public prosecutions temporary power to decide that exceptional cases should be tried without a jury if he believed there was still a risk of jurors being intimidated. In court Mr Hutching's lawyer argued that in order to be subject to a non-jury trial: "The offence must have occurred due to political or religious hostility (directly or indirectly) and that cannot apply to the security services who were there to uphold law and order and so were not engaging in any such acts (directly or indirectly)." A lawyer for the NI director of public prosecutions said Mr Hutchings' contention that the shooting did not relate to "religious or political hostility" effectively "ignores the reality of the situation which prevailed in Northern Ireland in 1974". The Supreme Court reserved its decision.

Rematch: Paul Cleeland v CCRC - Judicial Review Given Greenlight

Since 1998, the CCRC has refused five applications to refer Cleeland's case to appeal - the fifth and current application was made by Folkestone and Hythe MP Damian Collins who believes his constituent's case could be "one of the last great miscarriages of justice from the 1970s". Paul Cleeland has been fighting to clear his name for decades Independent expert Dudley Gibbs has reviewed the case of Paul Cleeland, of Kent, who served 25 years for shooting Terry Clarke but always denied it. The report, commissioned by Cleeland's lawyers, precedes a judicial review of a Criminal Cases Review Commission (CCRC) decision not to allow an appeal. The CCRC could not comment ahead of the judicial review, which it is contesting.

Cleeland has always insisted he was at home with his wife when Mr Clarke was killed in Stevenage, Hertfordshire. The suspected gangland boss was shot with two rounds, one in the back and one in the front, outside his home in the early hours of Bonfire Night. About 10 hours later, parts of a gun were found nearby and the barrels contained two spent Blue Rival cartridges, jurors heard in 1973. Cleeland, a painter and decorator, had represented himself at a retrial that ended in a life sentence.

Mr Gibbs, who has worked on a series of papers on the case, was asked by Cleeland's defence team to review a pathology report from 1972. His latest report, produced in January, said: "Given that the shot size of the pellets in the body was No 7s, the No 6 shot in the Blue Rival cartridges found with the Gye and Moncrieff (G&M) shotgun did not kill the man." The forensic expert disputed an earlier study which he said had "assumed" all the pellets were No 6 shot. He concluded there was "a high probability that the murder weapon was different from the one cited" - but Cleeland's lawyer, Ricky Arora, said the report "proves beyond any doubt that the shotgun relied upon at trial did not kill Terence Clarke".

However, the BBC has seen the CCRC's grounds for contesting the judicial review, which said the scientific evidence never did make a link between the gun and the murder, and added:

"The evidence is unchanged." The CCRC document said: "There is no complete proof that the G&M gun fired the wadding found at the scene. However, the totality of the evidence does provide a link between the gun, the claimant and the murder." Cleeland's judicial review is due to be heard in April. For full background see: MOJUK: Newsletter 'Inside Out' No 699

How Smart Tech is Giving Ageing Prisoners a Lifeline

Sarah Johnson, Guardian: Around 17% of prisoners in England and Wales are over 50, and that number is projected to grow. Jim Lees woke up late one night needing to use the toilet. As he sat up in bed, he felt dizzy, then blacked out and fell to the floor. He remembers: "Everything went blank. I fell and was unconscious. I don't know how long I was out." When Lees [not his real name], 80, did regain consciousness, he couldn't get back up. "My foot wouldn't grip the floor. There was blood and urine everywhere. I just don't know what happened to me." It wasn't until 6am the next morning that he was found on the floor of his cell by prison officers. "We had checked him at 11pm and he was fine. When I came in in the morning, he was slumped, and had injured his head," says Mick Butler, custodial manager at HMP Wymott, in Leyland, Lancashire. Lees was taken to Preston hospital, where doctors discovered, and later removed, a cancerous tumour in his leg. He stayed for weeks, with a prison guard by his bed.

This was not the first time a man had been found collapsed on the floor in the morning. Prison staff were aware that situations such as these could have disastrous consequences, and taking prisoners to hospital was also a drain on resources, says Butler. "We needed a mechanism to let us know when someone had tripped or was in distress," he says. Mick Butler, custodial manager at HMP Wymott: 'We needed a mechanism to let us know when someone had tripped or was in distress.'

The prison approached Laura Hudson, a social worker at Lancashire county council, to find a new solution (local authorities have been responsible for prisoners' social care needs since the Care Act was introduced in 2015). Together they took the decision to install telecare – a support system that provides assistance at a distance to wearers of bracelets and pendants that contain information and communication technology and sensors. They can detect, for example, when someone has had a fall and alerts a call centre. Telecare is used by an estimated 1.7 million people across the UK, but this is the first system of its kind in a UK prison.

It was adapted for a custodial environment, for 11 prisoners at high risk of falls, seizures, heart attacks and strokes, and comprises bed sensors and a wrist-worn bracelet (pictured). There is a button on the wristband to call for help, and if people are out of bed for more than 10 minutes at night the sensor goes off. An alert is sent through to call centre operators who call the prison operations room, which contacts the prison officer on the wing by radio. They will go to investigate at night or ask carers to check during the day.

In prison, there is no requirement to look in on people at night. Doors are locked at around 8pm until the next morning. "Putting extra staff on the wing at night time was an extra resource we didn't have," says Butler. To open a door to see someone at night requires a minimum of three staff, he adds, when sometimes only six are on duty. Just days after it was installed in September 2017, the telecare system alerted staff to come to the aid of a prisoner having a stroke. The sensor alerted the control centre when he fell out of bed. A team of prison guards appeared and saved his life. Without telecare he could have died because checks in the morning may have been too late.

A third of HMP Wymott's 1,176 inmates are over 50. Across the prison population in England and Wales, the proportion of prisoners aged over 50 stands at 17%, according to the prisons and probation service. This age group is projected to grow from 13,376 prisoners in

June 2017 to 14,800 by the end of June 2021. With an increasingly older population behind bars comes a greater need for social care. Up to 90% of prisoners over 50 have at least one moderate or severe health condition, with more than half having three or more.

HMP Wymott has a reputation for caring for older male prisoners. As a result, it receives requests from prisoners all over the country who want to serve their sentence there. A dedicated re-ablement wing caters for 59 of the prison's most vulnerable older inmates. The prison operates a group that meets monthly to discuss issues related to older prisoners. Representatives from the prison's equality, health and resident units, HMP Wymott's senior management, NHS healthcare workers, Lancashire county council social workers and local charity organisations working within the prison all attend, as well as elected prisoners. It also runs a buddy system where younger men fetch meals for older prisoners, and there is an activities centre for older and disabled prisoners – run by two majors in the Salvation Army – which claims to have reduced the instances of visits to hospital and suicide attempts.

Telecare is the latest scheme they have introduced to care for their older prisoners. As well as saving lives, it has saved money. Before telecare, the council's adult social care team had carers working in pairs sitting outside the cell of a vulnerable older inmate. "They'd be sat outside a cell in tandem all night but they couldn't get through to the prisoner, [if they heard that anything may be wrong] because the carers had to call [for assistance]," says Hudson. "We were paying people £13.50 an hour to sit and watch these prisoners and they couldn't respond meaningfully. The cost was phenomenal and really eating into our budget," she adds. Telecare has saved Lancashire county council £172,000 in one year for six prisoners, according to Hudson. As a result, there are plans to replicate the project in three more prisons in the county.

Back in Lees's cell, he talks about when he first had telecare installed. "I was safe, if you know what I mean, and secure," he says. He remembers when he fell again and pressed the button on his wristband for help. When prison staff arrived, they found he had hit his head on a pipe and had a serious bleed on his leg. Recalling the incident, Butler says: "I can't say [if it saved Lees's life] though finding him early did make a huge difference." The Prison Service says that while it supports measures like telecare, it is up to NHS commissioners and local authorities to decide how best to meet the health and social care needs of prisoners who meet the eligibility threshold. Says a Prison Service spokeswoman: "This is a great example of the prison working with healthcare providers to overcome the challenges faced by our ageing prison population."

Government's Fracking Policy Ruled Unlawful

The High Court has ruled that key elements of the government's national fracking policy are unlawful. Environmental campaigning group Talk Fracking, represented by Leigh Day, brought a judicial review challenge of the government's National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), specifically the legality of adopting Paragraph 209a of the revised NPPF by the Secretary of State for Housing Communities and Local Government. The judicial review was heard in the High Court on 19 and 20 December 2018.

The legal case, brought by claimant Claire Stephenson on behalf of the group, argued that adopting Paragraph 209a was unlawful on the grounds that the government failed to take into account scientific developments which call into question the "low carbon" claims put forward in support of fracking and failed to carry out a lawful public consultation on the revision of the policy. Both of these grounds were found to have been made out by the High Court.Whereas a number of previous legal challenges have sought to overturn individual planning decisions relating to fracking sites, this case relates to the government's national policy on fracking. Talk Fracking argued that the recent revision of this policy instructs local councils that fracking is beneficial in tackling climate change, contrary to scientific evidence. A Written Ministerial Statement in 2015 made similar claims, and it is argued that the incorporation of that statement into the NPPF ignored key factors that have emerged since, such as a greater scientific recognition of the climate change impact of methane emissions released as a result of fracking.

In reaching his conclusions, the Judge stated: "67. What appears clear on the evidence is that the material from Talk Fracking, and in particular their scientific evidence as described in their consultation response, was never in fact considered relevant or taken into account, although…this material was relevant to the decision which was advertised, which included the substance and merits of the policy. On this basis it clearly was obviously material on the basis that it was capable of having a direct bearing upon a key element of the evidence base for the proposed policy and its relationship to climate change effects. As is clear from what is set out above, on the particular facts of this case the MacKay and Stone Report was an important piece of evidence justifying the validity of the policy in the 2015 WMS, and the need to avoid adverse consequences for climate change were an important aspect of whether or not to adopt the policy." The Parties will now make arguments to the Court about what the Government must do as a result of the ruling.

Talk Fracking also argued in their legal case that the decision to adopt Paragraph 209a was unlawful because the government failed to carry out a Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) and that changing the NFFP failed to give effect to tests set out by the Committee on Climate Change. Both of these grounds were dismissed by the High Court. However, in doing so, the Judge accepted that campaigners are entitled to raise climate change objections when local decisions about fracking are made, and councils will have to resolve those issues.

Claire Stephenson, who brought the claim on behalf of Talk Fracking, said: "We are delighted that the court has agreed in part with our arguments that the government's policy on fracking is unlawful. The government have continually sought to ignore public opinion on fracking, despite the overwhelming opposition on a national level. The lack of public consultation and the unbiased support for an industry, without any substantial underlying evidence, has been a cause for concern. The additional acknowledgment from the Judge, that climate change is a valid concern for campaigners and councils facing fracking planning applications, is a big win."

Joe Corre, founder of Talk Fracking, said: "It's fantastic news to be victorious this morning. I'm very pleased that the Court has clarified both that the Government has behaved irresponsibly and recklessly with our democratic rulebook. Their pretend consultation was a farce. This has now been exposed by us taking them to the Royal Courts of Justice. It has now also become clear, with guidance from the Court, that objections to fracking on the basis of its climate change impacts must be considered at a local planning level".

Rowan Smith, solicitor from Leigh Day representing Talk Fracking, said: "What is clear from this judgment is that the Government has to keep climate change science under review when formulating fracking policies in an open and transparent way. The 2015 statement that fracking supports a low-carbon economy was never consulted upon, and the Judge was critical of the way the Government, during last year's consultation exercise, tried to shoehorn that statement into national policy whilst brushing off public objections to the basis for doing so. It is clear what the Government must now do, namely hold a full review of its policy support for fracking, after a meaningful public consultation and properly considering the scientific developments Talk Fracking presented and all other related material."

Actions of Metropolitan Police Contributed to the 1997 Death Of Onese Power

Onese Power suffered fatal injuries during a dangerous high-speed Metropolitan Police pursuit in Kentish Town, London on 17 August 1997. An inquest in February 1998 returned an 'open verdict', leaving the family with more questions than answers. A fresh inquest has concluded that Onese Power died in a Road Traffic Collision, with the jury finding the duration and intensity of the pursuit contributed to his death. In a narrative conclusion they noted that, once engaged in the pursuit, the required ongoing assessment of risk by police officers was inadequate, given the escalation of risk, especially from Pathsull Road onwards. They also noted that this escalation was inadequately assessed by the pursuing officers and was not communicated to central command, meaning the pursuit continued. Although the jury concluded that there was 'insufficient evidence to determine if close proximity between the police car and Mr Power's bike in Royal College Street was a contributory factor to the collision', the evidence heard at the inquest made it clear that if the police had terminated the pursuit before Royal College Street, as the jury's conclusion indicates, this death would have been prevented.

Onese was a 51 year old father of three, who lived and worked in Shepherds Bush, London. His family describe him as a loving, protective and supportive family man, who was well known and well liked in the neighbourhood. The inquest heard evidence that Onese nearly came off his bike on several occasions when going over speed bumps on Pathsull Road prior to the collision. Additionally, the the police driver nearly knocked over a member of the public on a bicycle, but none of this was relayed back to the control room. In contrast to the original hearing, this inquest also heard evidence of Onese slowing down and a potential closing in of the pursuit car. This jury was directed that Onese was likely to be doing a maximum speed of 59 miles per hour (mph) about 70 metres from the collision, braking very hard to slow down to probably 32mph. The 1998 jury was directed that at the same 70 metre point he was travelling at least 72mph, which gave a completely false picture of the final seconds of the pursuit.

In December 2017 the original inquest conclusion was quashed by the high court and this fresh inquest was ordered. This came after the family spent over two decades battling for the truth, and with the assistance of a legal team funded by crowdjustice donations. Without legal funding at the original inquest, Onese's widow, Ann Power, represented the family on her own. In contrast, an experienced barrister acted for the police at public expense. Deficiencies in the first inquest included the police's refusal to disclose witness statements to Ann Power, denying her the opportunity to properly question officers on their identical accounts of the pursuit and collision. At the original inquest there were also failures to investigate marks on the police car which could have been caused by the impact with the motor bike. All these matters were fully explored at the second inquest.

Ann Power, the widow of Onese Power, said: "As far as I'm concerned, my husband was chased to his death. In the words of the police driver, 'The intention was for it to stop. However, that was gonna happen. I mean there was always the possibility that he would crash.' Make of that what you will."

Selen Cavcav, Senior INQUEST Caseworker, who has worked with the family said: "If it wasn't for the determination and tireless efforts of this family, the file containing the police's version of events of what happened would have continued to gather dust, never to be opened again. Twenty two years on, this inquest has provided the public an opportunity to scrutinise the circumstances of how Onese, who was described as a 'coloured man' by the police officer pursuing him, came to lose his life. These fresh findings highlight the importance of legal aid for bereaved families at inquests."

Youth Prison Put Inmates in Solitary Confinement for up to 23 Hours a Day

Harriet Sherwood, Guardian: A prison for young adults has been placed in special measures by the government after it was found that inmates were locked alone in their cells for up to 23 hours a day – a practice campaigners have described as de facto solitary confinement. Aylesbury Young Offender Institution in Buckinghamshire also kept some inmates in its segregation unit for up to three months at a stretch. The practice raised "significant concerns for their mental and physical wellbeing", said independent monitors.

Last week the Ministry of Justice placed the prison, which holds 440 inmates, mostly aged between 18 and 21, in special measures, in a bid to improve safety and living conditions. The move came after the Prisons and Probation Ombudsman upheld complaints on behalf of three inmates who had been segregated or locked in their cells. As a result, an internal review of Aylesbury's segregation unit has been carried out and the prison has formally apologised to at least one of the three prisoners.

The Howard League for Penal Reform, which made the complaints to the ombudsman, expressed alarm at the "systemic practice" of keeping young adults in conditions amounting to solitary confinement. It received almost 200 calls to its confidential line for young people in custody from prisoners at Aylesbury over a 12-month period to 25 January. Almost a third related to segregation.

Laura Janes, the league's legal director, said it had been "inundated with calls from distressed young adults isolated in their cells [at Aylesbury] for over 23 hours a day, often for weeks and sometimes months at a time". They described "feeling bored, frustrated and sometimes even suicidal", she said. "They often have no idea when their isolation will be brought to an end, adding to their sense of hopelessness. We have had to make numerous complaints and safeguarding referrals to the prison, which appears to be in a perpetual state of crisis. "It is well known that locking energetic young men in their cells for excessive periods of time can cause irreversible harm. It is unfair on them and the staff charged with their care, and does nothing to help prevent reoffending." The league said that telephone contact between prisoners and their families was being restricted as a result of the practice, prisoners were being forced to eat meals alone in their cells, and some were unable to shower for days. Last April, prisoners caused damage to a wing in a protest over lack of showers and time out of cells.

The most recent official inspection of the prison, two years ago, found that between 30% and 42% of inmates were locked in cells during the day. "Many young men received less than an hour a day out of cell, contributing to frustration and poor behaviour," said the report from Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Prisons. "Debilitating staff shortages" were a contributory factor in prisoners being locked up for long periods, along with high levels of violence. Some prisoners did not want to leave their cells because they felt unsafe, it added.

An Independent Monitoring Board report, published in January, said violence was rife in Aylesbury YOI. The prison contained "some of the most disruptive and challenging young men in the prison system", it said, with one in 12 serving life sentences. Across the country, 38% of young adults spent less than two hours a day outside their cells, said the chief inspector of prisons in his 2018 report. Prisoners should be unlocked for at least 10 hours a day, he added.

The ombudsman's investigation into "X", one of the Aylesbury prisoners whose case was taken up by the Howard League, found that he spent most of each day in his cell "without meaningful contact" after being segregated for his own safety following an assault on another inmate. "It appears that, at most, [X] had a daily half an hour out of his cell for association … and 20 minutes' shower time," said the report, which has been seen by the Observer. "This is unacceptable." A similar conclusion was found in the case of prisoner "Y".

In his report on prisoner "Z", who was held in the segregation unit for 12 weeks after assaulting a member of staff, the ombudsman said: "Segregation is the hardest form of imprisonment. It is accepted that for most prisoners, segregation has a negative impact on their emotional and mental wellbeing."

Last year, the British Medical Association, the Royal College of Psychiatrists and the Royal College of Paediatrics and Child Health said there was an "unequivocal body of evidence on the profound impact solitary confinement can have on health and wellbeing". There was "an increased risk of suicide or self-harm amongst those placed in solitary confinement".

Terms used to describe the practice included isolation, segregation, separation, or removal from association. "Regardless of the term used, we consider any individual who is physically isolated and deprived of meaningful contact with others for a prolonged period of time to be in solitary confinement," the organisations said.

The Howard League raised its concerns about Aylesbury YOI in a letter to the local MP, David Lidington. "It seems the prison is resorting to increasing use of punishment in a desperate effort to maintain control," the letter said. Inmates were suffering from "misery at being held for weeks on end in almost total isolation and inactivity". Lidington said: "Aylesbury YOI holds many of the most difficult young prisoners in the country, most of whom have committed serious offences, and the staff work with great professionalism in a very challenging environment. They have told me about the efforts that they are making to enhance safety and make possible more opportunities for education and work that offer prisoners a better chance of holding down a legitimate job after release, although it is clear that there is still more that can be done."

The Ministry of Justice said: "While we have placed Aylesbury in special measures, that simply means we have determined it needs additional support from the centre to drive improvements." It said the prison had "changed its approach to segregation in response to the [ombudsman's] recommendations. It has increased in-cell activity like education and now ensures that those in segregation can be involved in the physical education programme."

Chelsea Manning Jailed for Refusal to Testify to Grand Jury

Irish Times: Former US army intelligence analyst Chelsea Manning was jailed on Friday 8th March 2019, after a federal judge in Alexandria, Virginia, held her in contempt for refusing to testify before a federal grand jury. Ms Manning had appeared before the grand jury on Wednesday 6th but declined to answer questions in connection with what is widely believed to be the government's long-running investigation into WikiLeaks and its founder Julian Assange, citing her First, Fourth and Sixth Amendment rights under the US constitution. She returned to court Friday for a hearing and Judge Claude Hilton of the US District Court for the District of Virginia considered the legal arguments Ms Manning used to justify her decision to defy the grand jury subpoena. Ms Manning's communications team released a statement saying the judge said she would be detained until she either co-operated or the grand jury finished its term.

It is unclear exactly why federal prosecutors want Ms Manning to testify, although her representatives say the questions she was asked concern the release of information she disclosed to the public in 2010 through WikiLeaks. Ms Manning was convicted by court-martial in 2013 of espionage and other offences for furnishing more than 700,000 documents, videos, diplomatic cables and battlefield accounts to WikiLeaks while she was an intelligence analyst in Iraq. Former US president Barack Obama, in his final days in office, commuted the final 28 years of Ms Manning's 35-year sentence.

Chelsea Exposed US 'Bloodlust'

Judith Orr, Socialist Worker: Chelsea Manning used to be an intelligence analyst for the US army. Now, aged 25, she faces a lifetime in jail with no chance of parole. Chelsea faces 21 charges—all relating to his leaking of files about US military actions in Afghanistan and Iraq to the Wikileaks website. Her court martial began in Maryland on Monday 4th March 2019.

Chelsea does not deny leaking the materials, which include 500,000 battlefield reports from Iraq and Afghanistan in 2009 and 2010, she called the "War Logs". She was horrified at what she was seeing and reading about what the US was doing through her job. She wanted to provoke public debate about US actions in the wars. At a pre-trial hearing in February of this year she said, "I believed that if the general public, especially the American public, had access to the information contained within the [Iraq and Afghan War Logs] this could spark a domestic debate on the role of the military and our foreign policy in general as well as it related to Iraq and Afghanistan."

One of the leaks was a clip of video footage of a US Apache helicopter crew killing 12 people, including two Reuters journalists in Baghdad in 2007. One of the crew is heard referring to the casualities as "dead bastards". Chelsea said, "The most alarming aspect of the video to me was the seemingly delightful bloodlust the aerial weapons team happened to have." She compared it to a child "torturing ants with a magnifying glass". Chelsea is pleading not guilty to the most serious charge of "aiding the enemy". The prosecution claims that Chelsea "knowingly gave intelligence information" to Al Qaida because once it was online Al Qaida had access to it. Chelsea has suffered torture during his imprisonment since his arrest in Iraq in May 2010. For the first ten months she was kept in solitary confinement. She was denied meaningful exercise, social interaction and sunlight, and was often forced to stay completely naked.

United Nations investigator on torture, Juan Mendez carried out a 14 month investigation after complaints about Bradley's treatment. He concluded that Chelsea had suffered "cruel and inhuman" treatment. A judge has ruled that Chelsea will get a 112-day reduction in any jail sentence she receives because of this treatment. Professor Laurence Tribe, who was until recently a senior advisor to the US Justice Department, has also protested over Bradley's treatment. Tribe was a Harvard professor who taught president Barack Obama. Protesters confronted Obama about Chelsea's treatment at a fundraiser event in April 2011. Obama's response was that Chelsea "broke the law". No trial to confirm innocence or guilt had taken place at the time. As Chelsea faces his court martial, US troops still occupy Afghanistan and the crimes of US imperialism go unpunished. But Chelsea is standing firm. She described his feelings after sending the files to Wikileaks. She said, "I felt I had accomplished something that allowed me to have a clear conscience based upon what I had seen and what I had read about and knew were happening in both Iraq and Afghanistan every day.

Police Guilty of Gross Misconduct in Domestic Abuse Murder Case

Yvonne Roberts, Guardian: Police officers risk losing their jobs and pensions if they fail to properly investigate domestic abuse including stalking, harassment and coercive control following a landmark misconduct ruling. Sergeant Sidney Rogers, PC Adrian Brown and PC Christopher Moore – all from the Metropolitan police – were found guilty of gross misconduct earlier this month for their handling of events in the days before the killing of Linah Keza, 29, by her former partner. Each officer has received a final written warning and any further misconduct will result in dismissal.

David Gikawa, 38, stabbed Keza to death in her east London home in front of their two-year-old daughter in 2013. He was convicted of murder and jailed for life. The prosecution said during his trial that the "systems in place" failed to prevent the death of Keza, who had been

in frequent contact with police. The inquiry into the officers' actions followed an investigation by the Independent Office for Police Conduct. Gross misconduct findings against the police are rare. The inquiry panel heard that Rogers, Brown and Moore failed to properly assess the risk to Keza. Gikawa, who had been told that he could only go to Keza's flat accompanied by officers, was later allowed to go to her home without a police escort.

Keza, a former model who hoped to become a social worker, came to Britain from Rwanda in 2007. She met Gikawa in 2009 and endured four years of physical, emotional and psychological abuse before her death. Keza's family were disappointed the officers have not been sacked. Susan Asiimwe, a lawyer in Kigale and Keza's sister, who has adopted Linah's daughter, said: "We blame no one but David Gikawa for taking Linah's life. But Linah trusted the police and they let her down. "Although we are disappointed that no officer will lose his job, after six years of fighting we are grateful that there has been some individual accountability for the failure to protect her. We hope that Linah's case can be used as an example for change and learning so that something positive can come out of our terrible loss."

Commander Catherine Roper, of the force's directorate of professional standards, said: "We always look to learn from our mistakes made during investigations. We are continually working to improve our response to domestic abuse in all its forms. "We always expect the very highest standards of conduct and behaviour from our officers … when officers fall short of those standards, they can expect to be held to account."

Sophie Naftalin, solicitor for the family, said: "The Metropolitan police service has accepted that there were serious failings in Linah's case and that lessons will be learned. For these assurances to be meaningful they need to invest in the resources and training to ensure that officers on the ground understand how to assess risk and investigate the criminal offences in domestic abuse cases, such as harassment, stalking and coercive control."

How Can You Help Men Who Are Falsely Accused Of Sexual Abuse?

Let me ask you to do a thought experiment: Have you ever considered the possibility that you could be arrested in your own home in front of your family and friends and neighbours, held in a police cell, interviewed under caution, charged and bailed or remanded to appear in court, when you haven't actually done anything? and That your photograph, name and address, might appear in the local and national press and on TV, insinuating what an evil monster you are? and That having been released without charge or with all charges dropped, with your good name and integrity still intact (at least in the eyes of the law) you might be subjected to additional investigation by the social services and other agencies, where you may have no right of representation or comment? and That social services could force you to break off contact with your family and children? and Without proof, evidence, witnesses, or corroboration you could be convicted and sentenced to several years in prison when you haven't actually done anything?

Having thought about, how would you feel now if one or more of the above scenarios really happened to you? Empathy is key When trying to understand the psychology of what the falsely accused feel, you have to firstly put yourself in their position. The first step to helping them is to try to understand how people that seek our support feel. Some contact FASO regularly; others just occasionally. Some understandably feel they cannot cope and sadly feel suicidal. They tell us that sharing their stories with people who understand what they are going through can be cathartic, and they generally feel better because we know what they are going through. Families who phone for support for those in this situation feel helpless. They tell us that their loved ones withdraw and won't speak to anyone. They won't go out, see a doctor, or take up opportunities for support. The family member is often scared for the sanity of themselves and their loved ones, including children of course. Children cry. They can't understand why they can't see the accused person. We all feel the huge stress that false accusations bring.

The accused person can experience a huge range of emotions and mental health issues: extreme stress; feeling that no-one will listen despite having to repeat themselves constantly; often having a shaky voice which leads to tears of anger, frustration. Crucially they feel utter disbelief: why would someone make such heinous yet untrue accusations? Some of the thoughts we hear about are: ·What made them make an allegation that I am such a monster? Where did such a thought come from? My head is whirling; I feel sick; cannot concentrate; I can't eat or sleep. I am collapsing and feel suicidal! Where do I go? I won't go out as friends might believe the allegations. Where/who do I turn to? I am isolated from everyone. I have nowhere to live! My family is destroyed. My partner and children are crying for me as I am for them. Why is it taking so long to be investigated? How am I to manage in the court – what is it like? I don't understand what the barrister and solicitor are saying. I can't even get a lawyer as I can't afford it. Why can't all my evidence be used in court – I am told it is not allowed

There is no euphoric feeling if a not guilty vote by the jury is returned. It often takes months/years of heartache, maybe losing the family, costing the earth, losing a job forever with the trauma still within the individual. "No, I cannot get on with life", they say; "it will never be the same again". Note that the above issues are the reactions of those who are newly accused. The reactions of the falsely accused who are in prison is another matter. They have ongoing issues to deal with and more to come when they are released from prison.

False Allegations Support Organisation (FASO) has been operating now for 17 years. We are volunteers without any funding. We can offer a sympathetic ear, but we can't give desperate people the answers or practical support they want or need. We are not lawyers and cannot offer legal or counselling services. We can only perform a "sticking plaster" service of being a friendly, supportive ear and try to signpost people to other services that may be able to help. But those services are in very short supply in a broken criminal justice system. The UK government in 2000 estimated that there were around 120,000 false accusations annually. FASO sees just the tip of this very large iceberg, and the number of people who we cannot help is too overwhelming to contemplate.

California Governor to Place Moratorium on Death Penalty

Gabrielle Canon, Guardian: California's governor is set to issue a moratorium on capital punishment in the US's most populous state, providing a reprieve for hundreds of inmates sentenced to death. On Wednesday morning 13/03/2019, Gavin Newsom is expected to sign a new executive order that will put in place an executive moratorium on the death penalty, meaning 737 inmates awaiting execution in California will not be put to death during the governor's tenure. The order will also instruct the immediate closure of the execution chamber at the San Quentin state prison and will withdraw the state's controversial lethal injection protocol, according to a Newsom administration source. The governor's decision brings California in line with Colorado, Oregon, and Pennsylvania – all of which have governor-issued moratoria – and adds momentum to a national movement working to end capital punishment.

California has the biggest death row population in the country, with one in four US inmates on death row incarcerated in the state. Twenty-five of the death row prisoners have exhausted all appeals. "Symbolically it is very significant," Robert Dunham, the executive director of the not-for-profit Death Penalty Information Center, told the Guardian. "It tells us a lot about the state of the death penalty in

the United States when two of the five largest death rows in the country have moratoria on executions and one-third of everybody on death row is incarcerated in a state that has a moratorium." There hasn't been an execution in California since 2006, amid a years-long legal battle over the state's drug cocktail. Federal courts ordered a halt to executions until the California department of corrections and rehabilitation (CDCR) could ensure its lethal injection protocol was administered without risk of exposing inmates to excessive pain.

The CDCR issued a new protocol in January of last year, and that protocol, too, has faced legal challenges. With a judge's approval, however, executions could quickly resume in the absence of the executive order. "We're poised to potentially oversee the execution of more prisoners than any other state in modern history," Newsom said in an interview with the LA Times before issuing the moratorium. Newsom has long been a vocal critic of capital punishment. His administration argues that capital punishment has been a failure, pointing at pervasive inequality running through the US criminal justice system, the significant number of innocent people who have been wrongfully convicted, and evidence that the costly system doesn't increase safety.

A US Government Accountability Office study published in 1990 found a vastly increased likelihood of a death sentence when the defendant was a person of color and the victim was white. A 2005 study cited by the governor's office concluded it was three times more likely a conviction would result in capital punishment if the victim was white and not black. More than 60% of prisoners awaiting execution in California are people of color. Death row inmates are also much more likely to have a mental illness, brain damage or brain injury, or to be intellectually disabled. "There is a lot of literature and studies out there that show that the death penalty is a deeply broken system for a lot of different reasons," the American Civil Liberties Union staff attorney Shilpi Agarwal said. Newsom's executive order is set to regulate executions until he leaves office. But in order to have lasting impact, the reprieve should be used to find a more permanent solution, Durham says.

Californians don't have a strong consensus on capital punishment but have narrowly upheld it each time the issue has been put to a vote. Most recently, in 2016, voters passed Proposition 66, a measure designed to fast-track the legal process for executions, but rejected Proposition 62, an initiative that would have repealed the death penalty. "In a state like California, where no one has been executed for more than a decade, a moratorium with nothing more is largely symbolic," Dunham said. "If it is accompanied by other action, then we are looking at something more significant – it may provide some breathing space for the state to meaningfully address the huge systemic problems in its capital punishment system."

Not in the Public Interest to Put Sally Challen Through Another Trial For Murder.

Statement from James & David Challen: On Thursday 28th February our mother, Sally Challen, had her conviction for the murder of our father, Richard Challen, quashed in a landmark decision by the Court of Appeal in light of fresh evidence not available at the time of her trial. The three appeal court judges had the option of substituting murder with manslaughter. If they had it is highly likely our mother would have walked free that day. However, the Crown Prosecution Service insisted that Sally goes through a re-trial.

Sally is now 65 and has been in prison for nearly nine years. Prior to the offence itself, she had never committed a violent act or criminal offence and since she has been in prison, her record has been exemplary. As the sons of both our parents we know more than anyone about the coercive and controlling behaviour of our father towards our mother over a forty-year relationship and of the impact this had on her mental health. We have lost a father and we do not seek to justify our mother's action, but we believe the background circumstances are such that our mother does not deserve to be punished any further. It is within the power of the CPS to offer Sally the opportunity to plead guilty to manslaughter. They do this often in cases where men kill their partners. This would avoid a re-trial which will force not only our mother but both of us, as prosecution witnesses, to relive the events of the original murder trial. It is not only us but every one of Sally and Richard's surviving family as well as all the friends who knew them as a couple (some of who will be called as witnesses in a re-trial) that support our campaign for Justice for Sally. It is only the CPS support the re-trial. We are supported by Justice for Women (JfW) as well as every key domestic violence charity in the UK and many MPs. Below, JfW highlight a number of cases where the CPS show greater leniency to men with a history of domestic violence who have killed women. Sally has already served the equivalent of a seventeen-year fixed term sentence for manslaughter. A further re-trial will cost the public purse tens of thousands of pounds – it is simply not in the public interest to pursue this case against a woman who represents no danger to society. Stop CPS discrimination towards women: The CPS often offer reduced pleas to violent men, here are some recent examples: 1) Rhys Hobbs killed Andrea Lewis following a history of domestic abuse for which he showed little remorse. At his trial in 2016, the murder charge was reduced to manslaughter and he was sentenced to 8 years (increased on appeal to 12 and a half years). 2) Dean Jones, who had a history of violence, killed his partner Alison Farr-Davies, charged with murder, but allowed to pleaded guilty to Manslaughter. Sentenced to 13.5 years. 3) Jourdain John-Baptiste died following a fall from the seventh-floor balcony of her home. She has been heard arguing with her boyfriend and then screaming for help just before falling. Her boyfriend has not been charged with any offence despite advice from an independent prosecutor that there was sufficient evidence. The CPS are currently resisting a judicial review challenge of their decision - In the meantime, evidence has emerged recently of an alarming and dramatic drop in the prosecution of men for rape. In the last couple of years such prosecutions have fallen by 23%. We call on the CPS to end the blatant discrimination against women and to apply their Violence against Women strategy fairly and rigorously.

Kobiashvili v. Georgia Violation Article 6 § 1 (Right to a Fair Trial)

The applicant, Archil Kobiashvili, is a Georgian national who was born in 1973 and lives in Tbilisi. The case concerned his complaint about his conviction for drugs offences. Mr Kobiashvili was convicted in 2005 of buying and possessing heroin and sentenced to six years' imprisonment. A police report on a search of his person, statements by the two police officers who conducted the search and by two attesting witnesses who allegedly attended it laid the basis for his conviction. However, he stated throughout the proceedings against him that he had not been searched, either before or after his arrest, and that the substance allegedly found on him had to have been planted by the police. An appeal on points of law was rejected as inadmissible in 2006. Relying in particular on Article 6 § 1 (right to a fair trial), Mr Kobiashvili complained that his conviction had been unfair because it had been based on planted evidence. He also alleged that he had not been given an effective opportunity to challenge the search or the use of the evidence thus obtained in the proceedings against him. Violation of Article 6 § 1, Just satisfaction: EUR 3,500 (non-pecuniary damage)

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.