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 742 (22/05/2019) - Cost £1

Five Men Killed in Past Year After Being Deported From UK to Jamaica

At least five people have been killed in Jamaica since March last year after being deported from the UK by the Home Office, the Guardian has learned. The killings took place after the men were sent back to Jamaica – which has one of the highest per capita murder rates in the world – despite strict rules prohibiting deportations to countries in which an individual's life may be in danger. The government does not routinely monitor what happens to people who have been deported. But through interviews and archive research, the Guardian has verified the deaths of the five men and been told by other returnees that they fear for their lives The revelations will increase pressure on the Home Office to justify its resumption in February of deportation charter flights to Jamaica, after they were suspended following the Windrush scandal.

Some of the men had convictions for violent and drug-related offences. But Naga Kandiah, a public law solicitor at MTC & Co – which deals with many Jamaican deportation cases – said the government's human rights obligations were not dependent on past behaviour. "The Home Office's own guidance recognises the high level of crime there due to organised gangs," he said. "Nobody is saying that these men had not committed crimes, but it is a clear breach of human rights legislation to send them back to a country where their life could be in serious danger." Lawyers routinely use the European convention on human rights to argue deportation would pose a threat to life. The majority of murders the Guardian has identified involving people deported from the UK to Jamaica have occurred in the past three or four months. The victims definitively established are: Owen Clarke, 62, who was shot and killed by armed men on 23 February. Clarke, known as Father Fowl and Roy Fowl, was a music promoter and had been convicted of dealing drugs. According to Jamaican media, he was a leader of the British Link-Up Crew, a dancehall events business in the UK and Jamaica, which was allegedly a front for drug smuggling. Dewayne Robinson, 37, known as Little Wicked, was murdered on 4 March 2018. Alphonso Harriott, 56, known as Oney British and reportedly part of the same crew as Clarke, was murdered on 29 March. Paul Mitchell, 50, was fatally stabbed on 31 December in the grocery store at which he worked. Hugh Bennett, 48, a shopkeeper, was stabbed to death on 31 December. Last year, there were 1,287 murders in Jamaica, about 47 per 100,000 population. In contrast, there were 726 homicides in the UK in 2017-18 – 12 per million of the population.

According to the Home Office's guidance about Jamaica published in March last year, the Jamaica constabulary force is "underpaid, poorly trained, understaffed and lacking in resources". Organised criminal elements are prevalent and extremely active, the guidance states, and police only make arrests in 45% of cases, with a homicide conviction rate of 7%. Eighty per cent of murders involve firearms. Gracie Bradley, the policy and campaigns manager at the human rights organisation Liberty, said by putting deportees in danger, the government was adding an additional punishment to that imposed by courts. "It is incredibly disturbing that the government continues to pursue deportations at the expense of its human rights obligations, which stipulate that people must not be deported to situations where they face threats to their life, torture or ill-treatment," she said. "These worrying incidents further highlight why the practice of deportation post-conviction is a discriminatory form of double punishment that should be scrapped."

Some of the men on the February charter flight said they knew some of the murder victims. One deportee said he was ambushed in a shop days after arriving in Jamaica by a group of armed men he knew from when he previously lived there. "I believe I was targeted," he said. "I had had an altercation with one of those men when I was in Jamaica in 2012. A group of armed men ran into a shop I was in and they had high-powered rifles. A lot of shots were fired and another man died. I escaped into some bushes behind the shop and was lucky to survive. "I think that people who were on that February charter flight have been targeted. Everyone knew that charter flight was coming and people keep a lookout. I think that people deported from the UK are particular targets once they reach Jamaica." A spokeswoman for the End Deportations campaign group said: "It's sickening but sadly not surprising that people who the Home Office have deported have been killed. These deportations must be stopped immediately before more lives are lost."

A Home Office spokesman said: "We only return those with no legal right to remain in the UK, including foreign national offenders. Individuals are only returned to their country of origin when the Home Office and courts deem it is safe to do so. "Should the Home Office receive any specific allegations that a returnee has experienced ill-treatment on return to their country of origin, these would be investigated in partnership with the Foreign and Commonwealth Office."

How To Ensure Your Case Resists The Strike Out Test?

Duncan Lewis, Solicitors: The court has the power to strike out a party's statements of case (or any part of it) through its case management powers under CPR 3.4. This can happen when the statement of case does not disclose "reasonable grounds for bringing the claim". The court can exercise this power upon a party's application or on its own initiative. In practice, the courts use the power to strike out sparingly. The overriding objective, to deal with cases in a just manner and at proportionate costs, means that the courts will not easily entertain a strike out unless there is a very good reason to do otherwise. Strike out is a matter of the very last resort as there are other tools within the CPR to deal with defective pleadings rather than turning to the drastic strike out. The threshold for a strike out is necessarily a high one as it brings the case to an automatic end without the need for any further court order. Taking the necessary steps to avoid a case being struck off is an essential consideration in the litigation process.

If a statement of case does not disclose any legally recognisable cause of action it is deemed to fail under the ground that it "discloses no reasonable grounds for bringing or defending the claim". This ground essentially excludes from the litigation process statements of a case that are unreasonably vague, incoherent, vexatious, scurrilous or obviously ill-funded and other cases which do not amount to a legally recognizable claim or defence. This ground also covers cases where the case is unwinnable, and continuance of the proceedings is without any possible benefit to the respondent and would waste resources on both sides.

Claims which may fail the test to disclose a legal cause of action include those "which set out no facts indicating what the claim is about, those which are incoherent and make no sense, those which contain a coherent set of facts but those facts, even if true, do not disclose any legally recognisable claim against the defendant" (PD 3A 1.4).

On the other side, statement of case passes the test under CPR 3.4 by providing a coherent set of all the relevant facts which allows the courts and the other side to identify the actionable claim against the defendant, to which he can then respond to in the defence. Identifying a legal cause of action and particularising all the relevant facts is therefore crucial in commencing legal proceedings. The judgment of Master Shuman in in a recent case of Capita

Pension Trustees Ltd & Anor v Sedgwick Financial Services Ltd & Ors[2019] EWHC 314 (Ch) emphasises the importance of a clear and concise statements of case: -"18. The purpose of a pleading or statement of case is to inform the other party what the case is that is being brought against him. It is necessary that the other party understands the case which is being brought against him so that he may plead to it in response, disclose those of his documents which are relevant to that case and prepare witness statements which support his defence. If the case which is brought against him is vague or incoherent he will not, or may not, be able to do any of those things. Time and costs will, or may, be wasted if the defendant seeks to respond to a vague and incoherent case. It is also necessary for the Court to understand the case which is brought so that it may fairly and expeditiously decide the case and in a manner which saves unnecessary expense. For these reasons it is necessary that a party's pleaded case is a concise and clear statement of the facts on which he relies; …"

Litigants in person might easily fall into a trap of filing deficient pleadings. However, this can be addressed at the very early phase of litigation when the claim form is filed at court. As mentioned earlier, the power to strike out a case can be exercised by Judges acting on their own initiative at any stage of litigation including the day of trial and when filing a claim form at court. Therefore, when the court officers cannot discern any reasonable legal cause of action from the filed claim form, they refer the case to a judge for further consideration. The logic behind this is to dispose of cases with no legal cause of action as early as possible to save both parties from incurring unnecessary expenses as well as the courts' time when dealing with cases that are bound to fail from the outset. The notes to the White Book 2018, at paragraph 3.4.2 however reiterate that a claim should not be struck out unless the court is certain that it is bound to fail.

Therefore, where a statement of case is found to be defective, the court should consider whether that defect might be cured by amendment and, if it might be, the court should refrain from striking it out without first giving the party concerned an opportunity to amend it (Soo Kim v Young 2011 EWHC 1781 QB).

The deficiency in the claim form will be most likely raised by the court or pointed out by the Defendant in which case, the Claimant ought to make the necessary amendments to ensure that he has a valid and actionable claim. If the claim form is issued without any orders from the court with regards to a possible amendment, and it is the Defendant who raises the deficiency in the pleadings, it is worth considering whether the amendment is necessary and discuss this with the opposing party. The Claimant needs to be made aware that if an amendment application is made, then he will most likely bear the costs of such application. If the Claimant is adamant that the statements of case are clearly addressing what the case is about and it is the Defendant who insists on having the claim struck out for lack of clarity, the appropriate course of action would be for the Defendant to make a strike out application under CPR 3.4, and bear the costs if such application fails.

However, what is most likely to happen in this scenario if both parties remain silent on the issue of amendment until trial? In Donovan & Anor v Grainmarket Asset Management LLP [2019] EWHC 1023 (QB) Martin Griffiths QC, sitting as a High Court judge, disallowed a late application to amend by the Claimant because it was made shortly before trial and the judge found that the amendment application could have been made much earlier. The relevant balancing factors that the judge considered included history of amendment with an explanation for its lateness, the clarity of the proposed amendment, the prejudice to the resisting parties if the amendments are allowed, from considering whether the opposing party is being 'mucked around' to the disruption of and additional pressure on their lawyers in the run-up to trial, and the duplication of cost

and effort and whether allowing the amendments would necessitate the adjournment of the trial. It was pointed out that "if that prejudice has come about by the amending party's own conduct, then it is a much less important element of the balancing exercise".

The Donovan & Anor case provides valuable guidance on considering amendment applications indicating that such applications need to be made as early as possible to give the opposing party enough time to respond to the amended case. It is evident from case law that the courts enter careful deliberations when presented with strike out applications given their frustrating effects with an adverse costs order. Strike out decisions at trial are very rare and hence likely to be appealed leaving both parties having to incur further costs and requiring the courts to spend more time on a case that could have been ended in the usual way but for a hasty strike out decision, which clearly goes against the overriding objective. Each case depends on its own merits however it is always prudent to consider an amendment application if the claim form was filed without legal assistance. It is therefore important for litigants in person considering issuing claims in Court to ensure that their claim will not be susceptible to a strike out. Obtaining legal advice before hand is very crucial.

Joseph Mccann Hearing Held in Jail After Rape Suspect Refuses To Leave

Guardian: A judge has visited the alleged serial sex attacker Joseph McCann to conduct a hearing in prison after he refused to attend court to face a string of charges including allegations he tied up a mother and sexually abused her children. The 34-year-old is charged with 21 offences against eight alleged victims, aged between 11 and 71, across five police force areas over a two-week period between 21 April and 5 May. He is alleged to have kidnapped some of his alleged victims, three of whom are under 18, before sexually abusing them. During one alleged incident, McCann is said to have tied a woman up in her own home and committed sexual offences, including rape, against her 17-year-old daughter and son, 11.

Chief magistrate Emma Arbuthnot authorised the use of force to bring him before her after he refused to leave the cells at Westminster magistrates court on Wednesday. But in what is believed to be an unprecedented move, she convened a private hearing inside Belmarsh prison on Thursday. In an update to reporters in a makeshift courtroom at a nearby conference centre after walking into the jail an hour and 20 minutes earlier, Arbuthnot said the "shortish hearing" had been held in the prison's healthcare wing. She said McCann "turned his back on the court to begin with" and claimed the "officers stitched me up" before she remanded him in custody until a hearing at the Old Bailey on 23 May.

The hearing was told McCann, from Aylesbury, Buckinghamshire, was aware of the charges against him. They are eight counts of rape; four counts of kidnap; two counts of false imprisonment; two counts of engaging in non-penetrative sexual activity; two counts of sexual assault by penetration; one count of inciting a boy under the age of 13 to engage in sexual activity; one count of engaging in non-penetrative sexual activity with a girl aged 13 to 15; and one count of assault occasioning actual bodily harm. McCann was arrested near Congleton, Cheshire in the early hours of Monday morning, just over two weeks after he is alleged to have abducted a woman in her 20s in Watford before raping her in her home. Two other women, who are in their 20s, were allegedly separately snatched off the street in Chingford and Edgware, London, on 25 April before being raped in a car.

A string of other alleged offences are said to have occurred in Lancashire and Greater Manchester on 5 May, including the rape of a 71-year-old woman and the sexual assault of a 13-year-old girl. McCann is yet to enter pleas to any of the charges. The judge, plus lawyers, journalists, police officers and court staff, took taxis to Belmarsh, 15 miles away from Westminster magistrates court. The court crest was brought in a carrier bag.

Paul Cleeland v CCRC

Since 1998, the CCRC has refused five applications to refer Cleeland's case to the appeal court. Paul has been fighting his conviction since 1976. On 25 June 1973, nearly forty-five years ago, the claimant, Paul Cleeland, was convicted of the murder of Terrence Clarke, following a retrial before Geoffrey Lane J and a jury in the Crown Court at St. Albans. Since then he has pursued appeals against conviction and challenges to the decision of the defendant ('the CCRC') not to refer his case to the Court of Appeal. In each case, his purpose has been to establish that there are, at the very least, doubts as to the safety of his conviction.

On Friday 10th May judgement on his latest attempt was handed down and reads thus. The present claim seeks to quash the CCRC Final Decision, dated 24 May 2017, refusing to refer the conviction to the Court of Appeal Criminal Division. The basis of the claim is that the CCRC acted perversely or at least irrationally primarily in the light of new evidence from Mr Dudley Gibbs, a forensic scientist.

On 18 October 2018, permission was granted to bring the claim on the grounds that it was arguable that, in reaching its decision, the CCRC had given insufficient weight to Mr Gibbs's evidence. In summary, this evidence (contained in a number of reports) raised questions as to the expertise and reliability of a prosecution witness, John McCafferty. Mr McCafferty had given evidence in relation to three areas of the case: the gun that was said to have been used in the shooting of the victim, the ammunition that was said to have been used and the deposit of lead on the Claimant's coat which, the prosecution contended, might have been deposited in the course of discharging the firearm.

On 19 March 2019, the Claimant applied to amend and add a further ground of challenge, based on a further report by Mr Gibbs (dated 23 January 2019). In this report he advanced for the first time a contention that the cartridges, which the prosecution said had been used in the killing contained a different size of shot (No.6) to the size of shot found in and around the victim's body (No.7).

On 2 April 2019, the Claimant issued an application to amend the claim so as to reflect the contents of a report from Mr Gibbs dated 23 January 2019, in which he concluded that the size of shot found in the body of Mr Clarke was No.7 shot whereas the Blue Rival cartridges were No.6 shot. The basis of the application was that 'this is not simply evidence of a lack of scientific connection,' but evidence that is inconsistent with the discharge from the Blue Rival cartridges found near the G & M shotgun being the cause of death.

The origin of Mr Gibbs's January 2019 report was a reference in Mr Spencer's August 2000 report in which he records Mr McCafferty's selection of recovered shot whose weight was consistent with No.7 shot: No. 7 shot being lighter. Mr Spencer addressed this in his report and in a letter of 31 August 2000, in which he explained that he was of the firm opinion that the weight of the shot was in fact No.6 for reasons he gave. Mr Gibbs takes issue with these reasons and asserts at §6.7 of his January 2019 report: 'the shot found in the body [of Mr Clarke] was No.7 whereas the cartridges found with the [G & M shotgun] were No.6'

Quite apart from the unexplained delay of over 5 years in raising the point, there is an initial objection to allowing an application to amend within 2 weeks of the hearing: the CCRC has had no time to respond to it. That in our view is a complete answer to the point. It cannot be open to a person to challenge a CCRC decision on grounds of irrationality or illegality in circumstances where the CCRC has not been referred to the evidence in question. Accordingly, we refuse leave to amend.

We would, however, add that, although, a miscarriage of justice may be revealed by a small (and perhaps overlooked) piece of evidence, and although this is not an area in which a party is precluded from raising a point which could have been raised before, nevertheless we regard Mr Gibbs's approach to the present case as highly unsatisfactory. If there was substance in the point as a matter of scientific analysis, which we doubt, it could and should have been raised long ago.

Conclusion: In our view, the CCRC was fully entitled to rely on the decision of the Court of Appeal in 2002 and the decisions of the Divisional Court in 2009 and 2015 as setting out legitimate parameters for their consideration of the Claimant's application; and that they were also entitled to the view that in what was a circumstantial case, the evidence was such that even if Mr Gibbs's most recent evidence were accepted, there was no real possibility that the Court of Appeal would quash the conviction. The CCRC was also entitled to treat the arguments advanced since 2015 as substantially reiterations of points that had already been made to and considered by the Courts In our view, the CCRC's decision refusing to refer the case to the Court of Appeal cannot be characterised as unreasonable or as constituting an unlawful decision. It was, and had been, faced with a large amount of material from Mr Gibbs to which it had responded, and its overall conclusions were both sufficient and sufficiently expressed. For these reasons the application for judicial review must be dismissed.

Afterword: We would add one further point. As noted in R (Hunt) v. Criminal Cases Review Commission (above) and R (Charles) v. Criminal Cases Review Commission (above), it is important that the Courts do not allow the CCRC to be sucked into judicial review proceedings which necessarily detract from it fulfilling its important statutory role and impact on scarce resources. In the present case, permission was given at a renewed hearing, having only heard from the Claimant. In future, we would expect the CCRC to be given an opportunity to make representations at an oral renewal hearing before permission is given to bring judicial review proceedings against it.

Youth Service Cuts Add to 'Poverty Of Hope' and An Increase in Knife Crime

Justice Gap: There is increasing evidence of a link between cuts to youth services and the country's knife crime epidemic, according to a cross-party group of MPs. Research published by the all-party parliamentary group (APPG) on knife crime recorded that between March 2014 and September 2018, England and Wales had seen a 68% increase in recorded knife offences and, in the final year of that period, knife crime hit a new record of 42,790 offences. Many of the highest increases in knife crime had occurred in areas suffering the greatest cuts to youth spending. Almost nine out of ten councils that responded to the MPs enquiries had seen at least one youth centre in their area close. The report, which drew on responses from around 70% of the local authorities in England and Wales, highlighted a correlation between the change in the number of youth centres that remain open, supported and staffed, and the annual number of offences involving a knife. Overall cuts to the youth services budget also suggesteda similar trend. Wolverhampton and Westminster have been most affected by these cuts, with funding being reduced by 91% since 2014/15. In the last four years, the Metropolitan Police have seen a 47% rise in knife crime offences, whilst Cambridgeshire Police and Thames Valley have seen 95% and 99% increases respectively. Chair of the APPG, Sarah Jones, the Labour MP for Croydon Central, said: 'We cannot hope to turn around the knife crime epidemic if we don't invest in our young people… . Youth services cannot be a "nice to have". Our children's safety must be our number one priority.' Javed Khan, Barnardo's chief executive, said that the figures were 'alarming but sadly unsurprising'. He went on to say that taking away youth workers and safe spaces contributed to a 'poverty of hope' among young people. The government has said that these cuts are one example ofa 'range of factors' driving the increase in knife crime. A spokesperson stated that they are determined to tackle root causes in order to 'end this cycle of violence'.

Dutch Judges Halt Extradition to 'Inhuman' HMP Liverpool

The extradition from the Netherlands of a suspected drugs smuggler has been suspended over Dutch judges' concern about the state of a UK jail. The Liverpool Echo reported Dutch judges had refused to send the man back to HMP Liverpool due to fears over "inhuman and degrading" conditions. The Ministry of Justice said: "Since providing reassurances the court has postponed its decision." An MoJ spokeswoman said the judge wanted more information." We strongly refute the idea that any of our prisons provide inhuman or degrading conditions. There have been significant improvements since the inspections of Liverpool, Birmingham and Bedford prisons and neither our domestic courts nor the European Court of Human Rights has ever ruled that they are in breach of Article 3."A report by HM Inspectorate of Prisons in January described HMP Liverpool as "squalid".

Australia: Gangland Criminals Betrayed by Defence Barrister to Have Convictions Quashed

Scottish Legal News: A number of Australia's most notorious criminals are likely to have their convictions quashed because their barrister was a police informant, The Times reports. Nicola Gobbo, 47, one of the country's top defence lawyers, is the subject of a public inquiry that could see murderers and others freed. Ms Gobbo, who is the niece of Sir James Gobbo, a former governor of Victoria and Supreme Court judge, gave police more than 1,000 intelligence reports on her clients and their associates. Her evidence she believes helped bring charges against more than 350 people and topple a massive drug trafficking operation in Melbourne run by the Mokbel family, whose paterfamilias, Tony Mokbel, was one of her clients. The inquiry heard their relationship was more than the “normal lawyer-client relationship”. Mr Mokbel was extradited to Greece where he is serving a 30-year sentence for drug trafficking. Prosecutors have told at least 22 convicted criminals that they could have grounds to appeal. “Any conviction in any case where Gobbo played anything but a very minimal role in providing legal services is almost certainly going to be overturned,” Jeremy Gans, a law professor at Melbourne University, said. A police task force is also looking into Ms Gobbo's relationships with some officers, the inquiry heard. Neil Paterson, Victoria’s assistant police commissioner, told the commission: “There has been talk of inappropriate relationships, perhaps intimate relationships, with police members.” Ms Gobbo is in hiding.

HMP Garth - Still Too Much Violence, 60%of Inmates on Drugs

27 recommendations from the last inspection had not been achieved. Leaders and staff at HMP Garth, a training prison in Lancashire, were commended for their work to reduce drugs and violence since inspectors found it in 2017 to be one of the most unsafe they had seen. Peter Clarke, HM Chief Inspector of Prisons said: “It is pleasing to be able to report that in the space of two years [since January 2017] there had been significant improvements at the prison. “Although there was still too much violence, it had not risen in line with the overall trend across the prison estate, and credit is due to the staff at Garth for working hard to understand and contain it. There is absolutely no room for complacency, but there were some early encouraging signs of improvement. “As with many other prisons, the ready availability of illicit drugs drove much of the violence, and the scale of the challenge in this respect at Garth was daunting. Sixty per cent of prisoners told us it was easy to obtain drugs, 30% were testing positive for drugs and around a quarter had developed a drug habit since entering the prison.” Drugs and violence reduction strategies must be kept under constant review to maintain the progress.

Garth held just over 800 prisoners, the vast majority serving sentences of more than 10 years and presenting a high risk of harm. Around two-thirds had been convicted of serious violence and a quarter were convicted of sexual offences. The poor safety assessment in

2017, in a jail in which drugs and violence then dominated the men’s lives, led inspectors to make it subject to one of only a handful of announced inspections. By late 2018, safety had risen from a poor assessment to not sufficiently good. Respect rose to reasonably good and purposeful activity and rehabilitation and resettlement remained at that level.

Mr Clarke said: “My confidence that the prison can continue to make progress was strengthened by what I saw and heard during my meeting with the senior management team. It was very clear to me that they worked together in a highly collaborative way to address the serious challenges faced by the establishment. Members of the team, from whatever specialised function, were eager to contribute to what their colleagues were trying to achieve in their particular areas of responsibility. It was heartening to see this approach and to experience the obvious enthusiasm.” Although the assessment of respect had improved, there was serious concern about the high cancellation rate for external hospital appointments. Inspectors were also concerned about some weaknesses in managing the potential risks to the public posed by those few prisoners who were released from Garth.

Overall, Mr Clarke said: “The leadership of HMP Garth were keen to point out to me that there were early signs of improvement, and it was to their credit that what had been achieved was sufficient to raise our assessments in two of our healthy prison tests. Given the overall context in which establishments such as Garth have been operating over the past few years, this is an achievement that should not be underestimated. For the future, dealing with the twin scourges of drugs and violence will be the key to making further progress, and I hope that when we next inspect HMP Garth we will be able to report that the momentum we saw on this occasion will have been maintained.” Inspectors made 43 recommendations.

Parole Hearing Delayed

Sir Christopher Chope: To ask the Secretary of State for Justice, what steps are being taken to ensure that the probation reports required for the parole hearing of Liam Vare A9035AH scheduled for 10 May 2019 are available in time for that hearing.Edward Argar:The independent Parole Board had listed an oral hearing for the purposes of Mr Vare’s case on 10 May. However, on learning that a new offender manager had been appointed for Mr Vare, the Parole Board decided on 27 April to defer the oral hearing to allow the offender manager time to meet Mr Vare and to produce a report on him. The hearing has now been listed for the first available date after 24 June. The Board has directed that all outstanding reports be provided by 3 June. The Public Protection Casework Section, which oversees the delivery of the Secretary of State’s obligations in relation to the parole process, is liaising with the offender manager and others to ensure that the reports are indeed provided by 3 June. . . .

UK Private Jails More Violent Than Public Ones

Jamie Grierson and Pamela Duncan, Guardian: Private prisons are more violent than public jails, according to data analysis that raises questions over the government’s plans to pursue its prisons-for-profit model. In the year to September 2018, there were 156 more assaults per 1,000 prisoners in private adult prisons in England and Wales than in their publicly run counterparts. The total number of assaults in prisons for the year to September 2018 and the average number of prisoners within each establishment for the same period were provided to the shadow justice secretary, Richard Burgon, after two parliamentary questions.

In 96 publicly run adult jails, there was an average population of 64,905, with 21,420 assaults – or 330 per 1,000 prisoners. But in 14 privately managed adult prisons, there was

an average of 15,930 prisoners and 7,737 assaults – or 486 per 1,000 prisoners. Despite this, the Ministry of Justice (MoJ) plans to build more prisons for private operation. Two announced sites – HMP Glen Parva in Leicestershire and HMP Wellingborough in Northamptonshire – are to be privately run. Work on Wellingborough, which will hold nearly 1,700 inmates, is scheduled to start next month. Further analysis shows that despite comprising just 14 of the 110 adult prisons, private jails are disproportionately represented among the most violent prisons.

Labour is calling for an independent inquiry into the privatisation of prisons. Burgon said: "These figures will further fuel fears that privatisation is leading to corners being cut as private companies treat our prisons system as a money-making exercise. "The fiasco with G4S at Birmingham prison should have been the final nail in the coffin for private prisons. Yet the Tories are set to carry on regardless, with even more private prisons in the pipeline. The government should now halt those plans and establish an independent inquiry into the dangerous threat posed by privatisation in our prisons system. Labour has made it clear that in office, we will scrap privately run prisons. The Tories should follow Labour's lead and drop its ideological obsession with privatisation."

Private sector involvement in the running of jails is controversial. Last month, the government permanently stripped G4s of its contract to run HMP Birmingham, after an inspectorate found the jail to be violent and drug-ridden. However, given Birmingham was still privately run in the period covered by the data, it is included as a private jail for the purposes of the following analysis.

Three of the 10 most violent adult jails in the period – or 30% – were privately run. They were Birmingham, Doncaster and Peterborough. Looking deeper at the data, further evidence that private prisons are more violent emerges. Local jails house prisoners that are taken directly from nearby courts, either after sentencing or when on remand. They are also the most violent, with the greatest number of assaults. The number of assaults in these prisons in the year to September 2018 was 15,644 – 48% of the total. Within the 14 private prisons, five are male-only local jails. The private male local prisons had 701 assaults per 1,000 prisoners in the period, compared with 493 per 1,000 prisoners in the 28 publicly run male local prisons.

Currently, G4S, Serco and Sodexo run private prisons in England and Wales, all of which are in the running for the new jails at Wellingborough and Glen Parva, according to a written answer by the justice minister, Lucy Frazer. A number of the private jails have received praise from the prisons inspectorate, including G4S's HMP Oakwood, which was described as an "impressive institution" with "courageous leadership". John Whitwam, the managing director of G4S custodial and detention services, said: "G4S has invested heavily in innovative initiatives to reduce violence in our prisons, such as peer-led mentoring, family interventions and personalised management plans for men with complex needs, which are widely praised by independent inspectors. "HMP Oakwood and HMP Altcourse remain two of the top-performing prisons in the UK, and we are committed to working with the Ministry of Justice and other relevant bodies to continue this good work."

Wyn Jones, Serco's custodial operations director, said: "Serco runs prisons for the Ministry of Justice that hold prisoners convicted of serious offences, and to compare these with the public sector, which includes many lower security and open prisons, is neither fair, balanced, nor valid as it does not compare like for like. We have invested in many technological and cultural innovations over the last 20 years and our officers work extremely hard to address violent behaviour in prisons, which is a problem across the country." A spokesperson for Sodexo said: "Violence is a well-documented issue across all prisons and Sodexo prisons are not immune to this. Great care must be taken when interpreting comparative data – Sodexo run some of the largest, busiest and most complex prisons in the country, with challenging populations. "We successfully deliver a full regime at all our prisons, which provides extensive opportunities for interaction between prisoners and staff, which is in accordance with our contractual obligations. We constantly review our activities to respond to the frequently changing factors which drive violence."

An MoJ spokesperson said: "Tackling violence is a challenge not just in privately run prisons, but across the entire prison estate, and we are working together to find solutions. "The Ministry of Justice is spending an extra £70m to improve safety and security, and has recruited over 4,700 more prison officers since late 2016, when the government announced an annual increase of £100m in the prisons budget."

Guardian View on Private Jails: Flaws in the System

It should not be possible to make profits out of prisons. The power to lock people up, depriving them of their liberty and separating them from their families, is a responsibility that should be the preserve of the state. Yet a pro-market ideology has seen private companies become responsible for about one in seven of the UK's 92,000 prisoners – a proportion second only to Australia. Allowing companies to make money out of punishing people, which is what prisons are for, along with rehabilitation and public protection – was a bad idea when it started under John Major's government in the 1990s, and remains one today.

This is a point of principle, one based upon the idea, evidenced by international studies, that private investment would distort public policy against more lenient sentencing and discourage moves to prevent reoffending. An analysis of official UK prison data by the Guardian suggests there are also practical reasons to object to existing private prisons, and oppose the government's plans to build at least two more. Our report revealed that the level of violence in private jails is far higher than in public ones. This seriously undermines a key defence of private jails. Comparisons across the whole estate must be handled with caution. Some private prisons, including HMP Oakwood in Staffordshire, have been praised by inspectors. But the finding that assaults in private, male-only local jails are far more prevalent than in their public equivalents must not be brushed off by ministers. While the 28 public local men's jails – housing prisoners directly after sentencing or on remand – recorded 493 assaults per 1,000 prisoners in the year to September 2018, the five private jails of the same type recorded 701 – which is 42% higher.

To believe that nationalising prisons would solve all the extremely serious problems that now confront the sector would be a misjudgment, however. The spectacular failure of HMP Birmingham and its re-absorption into the state from contractor G4S put private prisons in the dock. Yet failures are mirrored at state prisons including Liverpool and Nottingham. In some instances, private-sector management practices and incentives may have contributed to making a bad situation worse. The appalling state of prisons is well documented: rising levels of violence, self-harm, squalor and drug-taking, and increasing numbers of prisoners spending too many hours locked in their cells. The main reason for the appalling state of many prisons is the toxic combination of overcrowding and cuts.

Between 2010 and 2015 prisons lost a quarter of their budget, and nearly 30% of their staff. The result is that many British prisons are literally falling to pieces, with long backlogs of repairs. While the overall decline in staffing levels has been reversed since a low point in 2016, thanks to £104m in increased funding, one in three officers were reported last year to have been in the job for less than three years. How private and public prisons compare with regard to staffing is obscure because staffing levels in private prisons are secret, a lack of transparency that is another reason to object to outsourcing.

Meanwhile the number of prisoners is expected to rise further. Violence is at record levels, with 33,803 assaults in the year to September 2018. Former prisons minister Rory Stewart promised to resign this summer if he had not made a "measurable difference" in 10 key prisons. Instead he was promoted. The justice secretary, David Gauke, is in the process of unravelling the disastrous part-privatisation of the probation service by his incompetent predecessor Chris Grayling. This should improve the overall situation, since effective supervision and community punishments are an essential component of a working criminal justice system. But sentencing policy and practice too will need to change before there can be any end in sight to the unfolding disaster in Britain's jails.

Neglect Contributed to Death Of Norman Dunwell - Observation Records Falsified

INQUEST: The jury into the death of Norman Dunwell has concluded that his death in a North London mental health unit was contributed to by neglect. They highlighted failures in general care and management after staff failed to carry out five separate hourly observations. Norman, aged 49, died sometime between 11pm on 30 November 2017 and 5am on 1 December 2017.

Norman is described by his family as being a kind hearted and loving man. He was detained under the Mental Health Act (s37/41) and resided on Fennel Ward, a medium secure unit, run by Barnet, Enfield and Haringey NHS mental health trust. He had been in the care of these services for over 10 years. At the time of his death, his discharge into supported accommodation in the community was being planned. Norman had a history of using the synthetic drug, known as 'Spice'. In August 2016, he collapsed on Fennel Ward, as result of smoking Spice in the early hours of the morning. On this occasion, hourly observations were undertaken. He was provided with emergency medical care and taken to Barnet General Hospital, where he recovered.

On 28 November 2017, Norman returned from unescorted community leave. He appeared to his named nurse to be under the influence of drugs and his leave was rescinded. Despite this, he was not subject to a body search, nor was his bedroom searched, to establish if he had brought any illicit substances back into the ward. Evidence was heard that Norman was last observed in bed at 10.56pm on 30 November. Despite Norman being on hourly observations in accordance with Trust policy, the staff failed to carry these out during the night. When he was next checked on at 5:11am hours he was collapsed on the floor of his bedroom, deceased. The paramedics from the London Ambulance Service were of the view that Norman had probably been dead for a few hours. The initial response from staff on duty was that he was seen alive, sitting up in a chair at 3am, yet CCTV footage showed no one had checked on him during this period. The inquest heard there were three staff on duty, two of whom admitted to having fallen asleep at different times. The records between midnight to 4am were falsified in relation to all 14 patients. The Trust admitted the failure to carry out observations and admitted that staff breaks were not managed by the nurse in charge.

Yvonne Dunwell, sister of Norman said: "Norman was a kind hearted and loving man, with a happy go lucky personality, charming, jovial, considerate to others, and believed in the rights of his fellow friends, with strong leadership, qualities. I am relieved that the jury has recognised the Trust's complete failure to carry out observations on Norman for five hours resulting in him being left to die in a wholly undignified way. Even though we know from the toxicology report that Norman took Spice, the hospital still has a duty to protect its patients and do all they can to protect life."

Natasha Thompson, caseworker at INQUEST, said: "This inquest has uncovered serious failings, lies and neglect by staff who had a duty of care to Norman. It is essential that key witnesses exercise candour to ensure a full and fair hearing, and to uncover any failings within the case. Without this, inquests are unable to perform their vital role. Without the CCTV evidence, such

failings of neglect may never have come to light. This case reinforces the need for increased pre-inquest scrutiny for deaths in mental health settings through independent investigations."

Fleur Hallett of MW Solicitors said: "It is shocking that in a medium secure unit, which caters for the most vulnerable individuals, health care assistants were asleep when they ought to have been carrying out crucial hourly observations, and the nurse in charge did not notice. Even when hospital staff (one of whom had been dismissed for gross misconduct) gave evidence at the inquest they continued to minimise their failings, despite the CCTV evidence."

HMP Lewes - Systematic Prison Service Failures

Treatment and conditions for men in HMP Lewes in Sussex declined over two years while the jail was subject to HM Prison and Probation Service (HMPPS) 'special measures.' The failure of special measures suggested a systemic failure within the prison service, according to Peter Clarke, HM Chief Inspector of Prisons. The prison was last inspected in January 2016, when inspectors found it to be reasonably good in respect and resettlement, and not sufficiently good in safety and purposeful activity.

Unfortunately, Mr Clarke said, "the findings of this inspection (in January 2019) were deeply troubling and indicative of systemic failure within the prison service. We found that in three areas – respect, purposeful activity and rehabilitation and release planning – there had been a decline in performance. "In the fourth area, the key one of safety, although performance was not so poor as to drag the assessment to the lowest possible level, it was undoubtedly heading in that direction. What makes the decline at Lewes even more difficult to understand is the fact that two years ago HMPPS put the prison into what it described as 'special measures'. I have examined the 'Improving Lewes (Special Measures) Action Plan' agreed with senior HMPPS management in August 2018. However, of the 45 action points in the plan, 39 had not been completed and the majority were described as requiring 'major development'." There were, Mr Clarke added, over 50 references to reviewing activity in the plan, "but a noticeable dearth of hard targets. The results of this inspection clearly showed that, far from delivering better outcomes, two years of 'special measures' had coincided with a serious decline in performance." Mr Clarke warned that unless HMP Lewes had strong leadership and a realistic action plan focused on delivering clear, measurable outcomes, it was highly likely that the use of the HMI Prisons Urgent Notification procedure would have to be considered at some point. Inspectors at Lewes found: Inspectors made 53 recommendations. 27 recommendations from the last inspection had not been achieved and 16 only partly achieved.

Safety – Since the last inspection there had been five self-inflicted deaths, and incidents of self-harm had tripled but there had been an inadequate response to recommendations by the Prisons and Probation Ombudsman (PPO). While levels of violence were broadly similar to 2016, assaults against staff had risen and a quarter of prisoners felt unsafe at the time of the inspection. One fifth of assaults were serious. Illicit drugs undoubtedly sat behind much of the violence. Despite this, devices to detect contraband and drugs had not been working since April 2018. Mr Clarke said: "I was told this was because of 'procurement' difficulties. If 'special measures' was intended to help the prison overcome this type of bureaucratic obstacle, it had failed."

Respect – Seventy-eight per cent of prisoners said staff treated them with respect and the atmosphere was reasonably calm. "This was an unusually high figure for this type of prison, and added weight to the notion that the problems at Lewes were not insoluble, but did require significant management intervention." There were "very real weaknesses" in health care in the prison.

Purposeful activity – Ofsted inspectors found "no clear strategy" for the delivery of learn-

ing and skills, and allocation to activities appeared to be a matter of luck. While time out of cell was good for those attending activities, it was not so good for those not attending, and inspectors found 40% of prisoners locked in their cells during the working day. Rehabilitation and release planning – A lack of leadership meant that there was weak strategic management, and the reducing reoffending strategy was out of date.

Overall, Mr Clarke said: “This was a very disappointing inspection… The detail contained in this report brings into question the utility of ‘special measures’, if a prison can decline so badly when supposedly benefitting from them for a full two years. It also validates the Inspectorate’s new Independent Reviews of Progress, which are specifically designed to give ministers a report of progress against previous inspection reports at struggling prisons such as Lewes. A new governor had taken up post shortly before this inspection, and she will need support from her own management team and from more senior levels in HMPPS if the decline at HMP Lewes is to be arrested and reversed.”

Phil Copple, HM Prison and Probation Service (HMPPS) Director General of Prisons, said: “After the previous inspection in January 2016, the staffing position at Lewes deteriorated and there were a number of disturbances. The prison clearly needed central support to tackle the challenges they faced. In January 2017, it was placed into special measures – a process that has successfully supported improvement at other prisons. Staff from other establishments supported the prison, and although there has been progress in some areas, it has not been as swift or as comprehensive as we would have hoped. Better recruitment meant we were fully staffed in 2018 which has helped to halt the decline. As noted by the inspectorate, assaults have fallen and self-harm has started to reduce too. Safety is the Governor’s clear priority. We are providing extra support from our central safety team to drive further improvements, and the prison has introduced x-ray scanners and netting to combat drugs. The establishment is well-placed to make further progress and will focus on the Inspectorate’s recommendations to do so.”

Releasing Suspects Under Investigation is Having 'terrible Consequences'

Government reforms to prevent people languishing for long spells under pre-charge bail may have resulted in thousands of suspects languishing in legal limbo instead, it has emerged. The London Criminal Courts Solicitors' Association is trying to gather hard data on how many suspects are being released under investigation since a 28-day time limit for police bail came into force in April 2017. The time limit, introduced through the Policing and Crime Act 2017, was welcomed. But the association said tight police resources meant it was unrealistic to complete many investigations within 28 days or seek a bail extension. The only workaround was to release suspects under investigation. As a result, suspects face uncertainty without time limits or constraints on the police. 'Very often if a decision to charge is made many months past the police interview the suspect has moved home and has lost contact with their solicitor. Postal requisitions do not reach their intended recipient and cause additional delays to the court system and extra work for the police,' the association said. There can be terrible consequences for whole families. For example, an individual under investigation for possession with intent to supply was released under investigation for an entire year. Because of this outstanding criminal matter, his family’s application for leave to remain was rejected. Others have had their electronic devices retained by police for over a year while under investigation with no access to important work documents.'

The association wants to know how many suspects are being released under investigation. It has been unable to obtain the information through official channels such as the government so is now surveying criminal defence practitioners. Over 100 responses have been received so far. Jon Black, LCCSA president, said some of the cases involve allegations of rape and fraud. There are also several examples where the investigation has taken around 18 months. Announcing the 28-day time limit for police bail in April 2017, then home secretary Amber Rudd said pre-charge bail was useful and necessary but in many cases was being imposed on people for many months, or even years, without judicial oversight. In March this year, the Centre for Women's Justice made a 'super-complaint' drawing together what it said were failures by the police to utilise four separate legal protections that exist for the benefit of vulnerable people experiencing domestic abuse, sexual violence, harassment and stalking. These included failure to impose bail conditions where suspects are released under investigation without bail.

It’s Not Prisoners But Prisons That Need Rehabilitating

London’s Newgate prison erected its gallows in 1783. It was estimated that the state killed around a thousand people there. Then, in the early 1900s, the decision was taken to make Brixton prison the new site for executions. A brick shed was built and a pit dug. The next thing to do was to erect the gallows. However, the locals of Brixton didn’t like this. They had already complained about the sight of prison vans going up and down Brixton Hill. Then it was announced that people would be hung by the neck at Brixton jail and The Shoreditch Observer reported that “the change may not be so favourably regarded by a suburb so famous for its middle-class respectability as Brixton.”

In the end, the gallows at Brixton were never used; in fact they may never even have been built. Instead executions took place at Wandsworth, Pentonville and Holloway. In 2019 the affluent are returning to Brixton. They buy one bedroom flats for a quarter-of-a-million pounds that are a kilometre from the building that incarcerates over 800 men. The middle-class - the people politicians seem most eager to keep happy - sleep within minutes of those not allowed to vote. What relationship will the respectable locals of today’s Brixton have to the prison on their doorstep?

I read The House on the Hill, Christopher Impey’s engaging and compassionate history of Brixton prison, whilst nursing an Oolong tea in one of Brixton Hill’s cafes. The man next to me stopped tapping on his MacBook keyboard when he saw what I was reading. He curled his lip and said ‘To me prisons are like sewers. I get that we need them, but I don’t wanna think about them for too long.’

Hearing that comment I found it easy to imagine the challenge Impey must have faced when composing his book. How do you write a book about prison that isn’t a total turn off? Many writers would solve this problem by glamourising the material, making the violence sexy or fetishising the lip-curling sewer-like aspects of the story. Impey, however, worked at HMP Brixton for National Prison Radio for nearly ten years and the intimate affection he feels for the setting, prisoners and staff comes through on the page.

There’s a dreary predictability to most prison stories. Poverty, addiction, child abuse and mental illness are what so often give shape to the lives of people in prison. So a two hundred page book about prison runs the risk of wearing the reader down with punishing stories before they reach the end. However, Impey’s stories range from sincere to comic. The book discusses suicide; it also tells of a war time prison inspector reporting of the “very bad smell” after inmates are confined to their cells for the weekend and given a diet of beans. The House on the Hill is rescued from cliche by Impey’s eye for the particular - there is one prisoner who kept a photograph of himself in his cell and another who does time for faking his own death.

Brixton prison has had an all-star cast of inmates. The Kray twins were held there at one point. In WWII Oswald Mosley and other Nazi sympathisers were detained. HMP Brixton

has hosted members of the IRA, two of whom shot their way out of the prison in 1991. Even the Cambridge philosopher Bertrand Russell did two spells for his activism as a pacifist. HMP Brixton is a core sample of twentieth century Britain. In its time Brixton prison has held most types of person: men, women, children, political prisoners and politicians. In the 1920s Brixton had its first transgender prisoner. She refused a medical examination upon arrival.

Over the last two hundred years, the prison has been home to the weird, the wonderful and the wounded. Amongst the most idiosyncratic characters Impey tells us about is Dando "the oyster eater." First convicted in 1831, Dando served several sentences in jail for repeating the same crime. He used to go into restaurants and down as many oysters as he could and then run off without paying the bill. In the 1820s, Brixton also had its fair share of grave robbers. As more people were training to become doctors, the going rate for a corpse was enough to motivate some to dig up bodies for cash. In the 1940s, serial killer John George Haigh was a Brixton prison. He killed victims and dissolved their corpses in sulphuric acid and poured the solution down the drain. Other jailers report that Haigh faced his death sentence with perfect equanimity though he was said to become very emotional when he lost the socks his mother had knitted him.

Progress? Despite this cast of sometimes tragic inmates, The House on the Hill is by no means a book of despair. To those who want to find evidence of moral advancement in the punishment system, The House on the Hill offers much confirmation. Impey documents how prisoners used to piss and shit in buckets in their cells and slop out once a day, whereas now inmates have toilets in their cells. The windows used to have bars on that made it very easy to attach a ligature with which prisoners hanged themselves. These days the prison has installed suicide-free windows. In the 1990s staff were said to return from their breaks smelling of booze. This no longer happens.

In the 1980s and 1990s, F-wing housed 250 men with psychiatric conditions. The security staff called this wing "Fraggle Rock" after the TV show about the muppets. A former officer who used to work on F-wing said "We'd bring in silly masks. We'd play tricks on the prisoners by knocking on their door, waking them up and they'd look out of the hatch and there'd be someone in a scary mask. Or we'd squirt water pistols through the door…" "Fraggle Rock" has since been closed down and reopened as G-wing. The "F" is missing from the alphabetical sequence - an attempt by the prison to shed its dark past.

Labour and the habit of industry have always been core to the lives of prisoners in Brixton. Two hundred years ago, the prison boasted a legendary treadwheel. In the summer months, prisoners would be forced to walk on the treadmill for up to ten hours a day. The power generated by the turning of the wheel turned the grinding stones that would produce the flour for making bread. The bread would be fed to inmates in the jail and surrounding prisons. Today Brixton has The Clink, a restaurant open to the public that is run by prisoners. Work is still salvation, but the type of work has become considerably more humane.

As much as Impey's book reassures the reader that things have gotten better, the prison system still suffers from lots of the problems that Brixton prison was suffering from many years ago. In 1821 Brixton jail was overcrowded; today two-thirds of UK prisons are overcrowded. In 2019, whilst vagrancy itself is no longer a crime, there's been a significant increase in the police giving fines for begging and criminal convictions for sleeping rough. In the 1800s, newspapers were bemoaning the good quality of food that prisoners receive, not unlike the prison-is-a-hotel style headlines you still see in the Daily Mail. In the past, inmates spent little time out of their cells. Some even saw association as an evil. Prison inspections today often find that staff shortages within jails mean it's not uncommon for prisoners to spend 18 hours a day in a cell. The House on the Hill shows us that for the last two hundred years there have been those who wanted to reform prisons. It also shows us that there have been those who seek to undo and counter such reforms with a punitive, tough-on-crime approach. The reformists tend to have their way until it is deemed that they have turned prison into a hotel. A tougher regime is then installed until the suicide rate gets out of hand. Then the reformists get their turn again. Progress is undeniable, but there's also a political back and forth here that is as circular as Brixton's infamous treadwheel. In his epilogue Impey describes the ways in which prison and having a criminal record can be ruinous to a person's sense of themselves and their opportunities. He says that it is not so much prisoners but prisons that need rehabilitating. To talk of rehabilitating inmates misses the point. The 're-' in rehabilitation supposes that prisoners had a well-adjusted life in the first place. "If there is a difference between people on each side of the prison wall", Impey writes, "it's that those within have been dealt a far less privileged hand." As Brixton continues to become a more privileged neighbourhood, Impey's message couldn't be more pertinent.

Privacy International Wins Supreme Court battle with Investigatory Powers Tribunal

Graeme Burton: Privacy International has won its five-year legal battle with the Investigatory Powers Tribunal (IPT), with the Supreme Court ruling today that the IPT can be subject to judicial review. The decision guarantees that when the IPT gets the law wrong, its mistakes can be corrected, Privacy International claimed after the Court revealed its decision, adding that it ensures that the UK's "spying tribunal" remains subject to the rule of law. The government had argued that the IPT should be excluded from judicial review on account of its importance to national security. Privacy International's case stems from the approval of the IPT that the UK government may use sweeping 'general warrants' to hack devices en masse, without any approval from a judge or even reasonable grounds for suspicion. The government had argued that it should be lawful for a single warrant to approve the surveillance of hundreds of thousands or even millions of devices simply by the approval of the relevant government minister. The IPT had agreed with the government. When challenged in the High Court by Privacy International, the government had argued that even if the IPT's interpretation of the law was completely wrong, the High Court had no power to correct the mistakes. The case was argued all the way to the Supreme Court, the UK's highest legal authority, which ruled in favour of Privacy International. "The legal issue decided by the IPT is not only one of general public importance, but also has possible implications for legal rights and remedies going beyond the scope of the IPT's remit. Consistent application of the rule of law requires such an issue to be susceptible in appropriate cases to review by ordinary courts," said Lord Carnwath delivering his judgement today. It would, added Caroline Wilson Palow, general counsel to Privacy International, enable the organisation to challenge the UK government's use of bulk computer hacking warrants. "Our challenge has been delayed for years by the Government's persistent attempt to protect the IPT's decisions from scrutiny," she said.

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.