been a major terrorist plot. According to The Sun, Bourgass had been 'unmasked as Osama bin Laden's master poisoner'. Unmasked how and by whom was not specified (as this certainly hadn't happened in the trial). What qualified him as 'master poisoner' when he hadn't actually succeeded in making any poison, was equally unclear.

The Mirror labeled Bourgass 'The Toxic Terrorist'. It went on to claim that 'the gang of men' was 'preparing for jihad in Britain', and planning to produce 'a poison which can kill 80,000 people with just ONE GRAM'. Again, where it got its information from was unclear. The Mirror reproduced a police photo of packs of AA batteries, torch bulbs and superglue, seized in the 2003 raids. They were most likely the result of Bourgass's frequent shoplifting sprees, but in the fevered imagination of a Mirror sub-editor were transformed into: 'Electrical components. Enough kit to make several explosive devices.' The ricin case shows that once media and political panic sets in, objectivity and common sense go out of the window. No claim is too loopy to be published, even by supposedly responsible media outlets. The risible report of 'soaring' gas mask sales (referred to above) appeared on the BBC website. Any editor giving that story even a moment's calm consideration would have spiked it as obvious nonsense (Not least because what kind of uncle, whose niece is in fear of al-Qaida assassins would sell her a gas mask, rather than just give it to her?)

Just as, if all you've got is a hammer, everything starts to look like a nail, if you've been scared out of your wits by claims of an al-Qaeda plot, every Algerian with a couple of packets of AA batteries starts to look like a bomber, and a handful of cherry stones starts to look like the raw ingredient for cyanide. But while gutless politicians like Blunkett may be casual about the importance of due process, the likes of Lawrence Archer and the rest of the jury had the courage to ensure justice was done. In the most difficult of circumstances, they put aside their own fears and prejudices, and managed to keep their heads, while all around were losing theirs. It is 10 years since the jurors delivered their verdict, but the 'ricin plot trial' remains the strongest argument I know for maintaining our jury system.

Kevan Thakrar: Faces Charges of Common Assault and Witness Intimidation

On Friday 22nd May 2015, Kevan will be in the dock at Manchester Crown Court to answer 'Charges of Common Assault and Witness Intimidation'. It is alleged he threw excrement in the face of a female prison officer. Originially charged in 2014, the Crown Prosecution Service (CPS) discontinued proceedings because, it said, it was no longer in the public interest to prosecute Thakrar. But at a judicial review of the case at the High Court, sitting in Manchester, the Prisoners Officers' Association (POA) union successfully argued for the case to be reinstated, describing the CPS decision as "ludicrous". [Messages of Support/Solidariy to]

Kevan Thakrar: A4907AE, HMP Wakefield, Love Lane,Wakefield,WF2 9AG

Hostages: 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 Romero Coleman, Neil Hurley, Jaslyn Ricardo Smith, James Dowsett, Kevan Thakrar, Miran Thakrar, Jordan Towers, Patrick Docherty, Brendan Dixon, Paul Bush, Frank Wilkinson, Alex Black, Nicholas Rose, Kevin Nunn, Peter Carine, Paul Higginson, Thomas Petch, 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, Ihsan Ulhaque, Richard Roy Allan, Carl Kenute Gowe, Eddie Hampton, Tony Hyland, Ray Gilbert, Ishtiaq Ahmed.

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 529 (14/05/2015) - Cost £1

Letter from Mother of Dano Sonnex

Dano is being mistreated badly by prison officers in the Close Supervision Centre (CSC) at HMP Wakefield....he has been there for just over 2 years. As you know Dano has Asperger's and complex mental health problems so you would think that the staff there would be more understanding ...all they do is make fun of him tell him that he is mad that his music is too loud (which it isn't) then placed on basic we know it isn't loud and we know that from another inmate there who says they are singling Dano out... he says also that Dano is being mistreated badly and he too has put in a complaint...this inmate has also been threatened by the CSC Governor to mind his own business otherwise he will remain in the CSC for longer....disgraceful that this is still happening....if you write a complaint to the no.1 governor it gets passed to the CSC governor and then you receive a standard letter back with just a few lines back saying 'that all his officers are extremely competent and specially trained to deal with challenging individuals and that they are treated in a decent and appropriate manner '.

Dano is under an 'Assessment, Care in Custody and Teamwork' (*ACCT) (suicide watch) as he is self harming quite regularly...they want to take him off it. The officers are that 'extremely competent ' that Dano has been left with razors in his cell and he is on a ACCT doc. at the moment. Dano has reverted back to Catholicism but is still being subjected to being ridiculed with "Hamdi Hamdi " and other names . Dano is told to say "please boss" by some officers if he asks for anything. Dano has a trial this year at Leeds Crown Court facing 5 charges of assault on staff at Wakefield....he too has been subjected to assaults by prison officers and is still being dealt with by officers who he is in conflict with.

He has been informed by Ruth Mitchell (head of healthcare) that he is being kept in isolation due to his crimes and that he will have to learn to live with his disorder (of which she can give him leaflets on how to live with Asperger's). How are you supposed to learn to live with it in the CSC in isolation and with seriously incompetent prison officers who taunt and ridicule you nearly every day as all that does is causes the psychosis and paranoia to fester and then the delusional paranoid psychosis rears it's ugly head and then he becomes unpredictable alongside this he suffer's with suicidal **ideation's and is regularly self harming the most recent incident he seriously injured his throat and wasn't seen by health care for 3 day's this is sheer NEGLECT on the part of the prison system.

HMP Wakefield want to medicate him with anti psychotic medication however tries to state there is nothing wrong with his mental health. Ruth Mitchell also tells Dano he should learn breathing exercises...what absolute nonsense and an insult to Dano....he is shortly to see the psychiatrist Dr. Yanson, who first referred him back to Broadmoor when he first arrived at Wakefield...only to be refused again and again by Broadmoor..Dano has been told because he is from the South sector he can only be admitted to Broadmoor who absolutely refuse to take him back...why can't he be referred to the other 2 remaining high security hospital's...Peter Sutcliffe is from the north sector but remains in Broadmoor in the south sector...same with the prisons he is held now in the north so what difference would it be with a hospital....doesn't make sense....there must 50 or so psychiatric reports on Dano....it is a daily battle at times to even

has his basic needs met on may occasions he is refused showers , exercise, phone....on many occasions his mail has been held back...legal paperwork opened..and outgoing mail not picked up for days...still waiting for family members to be cleared since 2013..telephone numbers to be cleared...not allowed to embrace on visits because of the bars...hundreds of miles from family who have to travel over 400 mile round trip to visit...he has to remain in these psychological torture units with is mental health reaching rock bottom which is so concerning for his welfare....the CSC units are a system of abuse and neglect. *Kathy Sonnex <kathy_sonnex@hotmail.co.uk>*

*ACCT: Any prisoner identified as at risk of suicide or self-harm must be managed using the Assessment, Care in Custody and Teamwork (ACCT) procedures. ACCT is a prisoner-centred, flexible care-planning system which, when used effectively, can reduce risk. The ACCT process is necessarily prescriptive and it is vital that all stages are followed in the timescales prescribed. The identification and management of prisoners at risk of suicide and/or self harm is everyone's responsibility. Good staff/prisoner relationships are integral to reducing risk. Other factors which are fundamental to reducing risk are regular participation in regime activities, positive family and peer relationships, and referral to appropriate specialist services such as mental health in reach. **Ideation may refer to: Ideation (idea generation), the process of creating new ideas; Suicidal ideation, a common medical term for thoughts about suicide ... You send Dano a letter of Solidarity:

Dano Sonnex: A7671AG, HMP Wakefield, Love Lane, Wakefield, WF2 9AG

Merseyside Police Pay-Out £28,000 for Assault on Night Clubber

John Siddle, Liverpool Echo: A clubber has won £28,000 compensation after a Merseyside Police officer allegedly punched him and threatened: "Do you want me to shoot you?". The 21-year-old sued the force, claiming he was attacked while in handcuffs and arrested as part of a "competition" between two patrol officers. He was 17-years-old when he was left with bruising, bumps and a chipped tooth in the alleged police van assault, in October, 2010. The force settled the case out-of-court but did not admit wrongdoing. The officer alleged to have been involved, PC Peter Locke, has since left the force, although his departure is unconnected.

Chris Topping, from city solicitors Broudie Jackson Canter, said their client – who has not been named – was detained while trying to protect a friend who had been attacked and abused outside Popworld in Wood Street. Mr Topping said: "He told the officer he had done nothing wrong and that they should speak to the person who had been abusive and aggressive. He was marched over to the side of the police van, handcuffed and told to sit down. PC Locke was talking to the driver of the vehicle and he said 'one nil to me'. It appeared that there was a competition going on."

According to papers served by lawyers at Liverpool County Court, the alleged victim claimed that he was then assaulted and left bleeding from the mouth, as well as suffering injuries to his head and back. The claim reads: "At some point during the journey, the van stopped. The claimant thought that he had reached the police station and stood up. However, he was pushed forward by PC Locke and fell over into the next row of seats in the van.'' The claim continued: "While he was face down in the seats, he heard the sound of a door opening, then was punched twice to the head. The claimant was pulled onto his knees and the position of the handcuffs was changed, so that the claimant was now handcuffed with his hands behind his back. PC Locke threatened the claimant, saying something like 'do you want me to shoot you?', which alarmed him, since PC Locke had a Taser gun."

The teenager was charged with being drunk and disorderly and assaulting PC Locke. But he was found not guilty in a youth court trial, with a judge concluding that he was "most

(ricin), wasn't 'here' (in the UK) at all: despite a barrage of scientific tests, no trace of poison had actually been found during the raids. Instead, the prosecution claimed that the police had uncovered a treasure trove of items which were intended to be used for making poisons and explosives. All five defendants, who were linked via the notorious Finsbury Park mosque, were involved to some degree in a terror plot, it was claimed.

No smoking gun: Unsurprisingly, the five's defence barristers put a different interpretation on events. In the main (and in a nutshell), the defence response to the allegations was that, either the supposedly incriminating items (a fairly mixed bag of things, including batteries, torch bulbs, castor beans and cherry stones) weren't incriminating at all, but were for entirely innocent purposes, such as in the latter case, making traditional Algerian herbal remedies; or, that the items were nothing to do with them personally, but belonged to Bourgass (described in court as the group's 'ringleader'). There was no 'smoking gun'; no single piece of evidence incontrovertibly proving that the five were working together with ill intent. Instead, the prosecution case was circumstantial, based on small strands of evidence which it sought to weave together into conclusive proof of guilt. The jury's job would be to carefully and calmly weigh every claim and counterclaim to determine where the truth might lie. To do this, the jurors would have to disregard the earlier screaming headlines, and focus solely on the evidence presented to them. They would similarly need to disregard the intense security surrounding the defendants, including armed police in the public gallery, and a helicopter escorting them to and from court. Remaining objective in that kind of heightened atmosphere would have been hard enough, even without the extraordinary intervention of the home secretary.

A few weeks into the trial, David Blunkett told the BBC: 'Al-Qaeda…will be demonstrated through the courts in months to come, to be actually on our doorstep and threatening our lives. I am talking about people who are … [going] through the court system.' Blunkett's comments were taken as a reference to the ricin case, and were unprecedented. For a home secretary to link defendants in an ongoing case to al-Qaeda, when no such claim was ever made in court, was highly prejudicial to their chances of getting a fair trial. Luckily for the defendants, if the ricin case showed our politicians and media at their worst, it also showed our jury system at its absolute best.

In April 2005, after five months hearing evidence and three weeks' deliberation, the jury filed back into court to deliver their verdict. The foreman, Lawrence Archer, a fifty-something telecoms engineer, stood up to read them out: Khalef, Sihali, Taleb and Feddag were acquitted of all charges. Bourgass, the alleged 'ringleader', was guilty of conspiring to cause a public nuisance. On the more serious charge of conspiracy to commit murder, the jury remained deadlocked and, two days later, were dismissed. (Unbeknown to them, Bourgass had previously been convicted of the murder of a police officer, so would be going to prison for a very long time, in any event.)

These were not the verdicts that the authorities had been hoping for, and the backlash against the acquittals was swift. Within days, Met commissioner Sir Ian Blair went on BBC television to say they showed it was time to look again at 'how the legal system deals with cases of this sort.' Charles Clarke, who was by then home secretary, also cast doubt on the acquitted defendants' innocence: 'We will obviously keen a very close eye on the men being freed today and consider exactly what to do in the light of this decision.'

Toxic terrorists: Flying in the face of any actual evidence, Peter Clarke, head of the anti-terror police, insisted that the trial had shown: 'This was a hugely serious plot because what it had the potential to do was cause real panic, fear, disruption and possibly even death.' Most newspapers took a similar line. They treated the string of acquittals as an irrelevant detail, and seized on the conviction of Bourgass on the public nuisance charge as proof that there had

in facilities, including but not limited to jails and prisons, in which people are institutionalized. It uses expert consultants to undertake comprehensive investigations, including onsite inspections, document reviews, and interviews with officials and prisoners. According to the Department of Justice website, if there are systematic civil rights violations, "we may send the state or local government a letter that describes the problems and that says what steps they must take to fix them. We will try to reach an agreement with the state or local government on how to fix the problems. If we cannot agree, then the Attorney General may file a lawsuit in federal court."

The Department of Justice currently has 30 pending CRIPA matters involving practices in state or local correctional facilities (almost all of the cases address a single facility), some but not all of which involve the use of force. Important as the work of the Special Litigation Section is, it does not have the resources to address rights violations in even a tiny fraction of the thousands of local jails and state prisons in the country. While private litigation and the Department of Justice have important roles to play to protect US prisoners, it is ultimately the responsibility of public officials to ensure that the men and women they confine, including those with mental disabilities, are treated humanely and with respect for their fundamental human rights. And it is the responsibility of elected officials to ensure that corrections agencies have the resources and political support they need to fulfill that mandate. The evidence marshaled in this report suggests that those responsibilities are too often ignored: prisoners with mental disabilities continue to suffer grievously and unnecessarily from the unwarranted and punitive use of force.

The Ricin 'Terror Plot' That Never Was *Fiona Bawdon, Justice Gap*

In January 2003, news broke in the British media that anti-terror police had raided a 'Ricin factory' in north London. The headlines could not have been more alarming. The Sun: 'Ricin near Bin pal's home' ('The poison factory used to make deadly ricin is just 200 yards from the lair of one of Osama bin Laden's henchmen…'). The Daily Mail: 'Ricin assassin on the run.' The entire Daily Mirror front page was taken up with a skull and crossbones superimposed on a map of the UK, with the headline: 'IT'S HERE' ('Deadly terror poison found in Britain'; 'Where is it? How much is there? Who has it? And can we cope?' 'Full shocking story, pages 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 & 7.')

Elsewhere in the media, it was reported that gas mask sales had 'soared'. The manager of an army surplus shop was quoted as saying: 'My niece lives in London and she and her husband took gas masks down there. People are worried about the tube.' A few days later, the Independent claimed the finds in north London were being linked to a Europe-wide 'network of terrorist assassination squads', intent on carrying out 'random killings using exotic poison… designed to maximise panic and fear.'

When five of the men arrested as a result of the raids appeared at the Old Bailey in September 2004, expectations were running high. The so-called 'ricin plot trial' was the first major UK terror case since the 9/11 attacks on America. Lawyers predicted that the defendants could face up to 30 years in prison if convicted. There seemed little doubt that the police had broken up a major terrorist network and the revelations in court were likely to be as shocking as they were terrifying. When the case actually began, however, it was an anticlimax. The accusations against Mouloud Sihali, David Khalef, Sidali Feddag, Mustapha Taleb and Kamel Bourgass, although undoubtedly serious, bore little relation to the more alarmist headlines at the time of their arrests. Earlier charges of manufacturing a chemical weapon had been dropped; there was to be no mention in court of al-Qaeda or Osama bin Laden; no suggestion of a big international conspiracy. Crucially, despite the Daily Mirror's striking front page, 'It'

unimpressed" with the officer's evidence. The civil claim was then launched, with solicitors claiming that PC Locke "fabricated allegations" and "was charged in order to deflect attention from the unlawful conduct towards him."

Mr Topping said his client had suffered a "long and difficult battle" to secure compensation. He said: "No-one would expect to be the victim of the police when on a night out – rather, we expect them to protect and look after our young people. What happened to this young man was a life-altering experience and one which caused him and his family a great deal of anguish. He faced the ordeal of criminal proceedings and then even when these ended it took a great deal of time and effort to obtain justice. The payment of compensation is a recognition of the appalling behaviour of the police."

A spokesman for Merseyside Police said: "We carefully considered this civil claim, including a full examination of the facts by the force's legal team. The force can confirm it sought advice and a settlement amount was negotiated before the case was considered by the courts. Merseyside Police is absolutely committed to providing the best possible policing service it can to the communities it serves and expects its officers and staff to demonstrate the highest levels of integrity and professional standards."

Sheku Ahmed Tejan Bayoh - Dies in Police Custody *Herald Scotland*

Race awareness campaigners have called for an independent inquiry into the death of a man in police custody in Fife. One close friend of Sheku Bayoh said the tragedy after police were called to his home in Kirkcaldy had been a "shocking" incident. The 32-year-old died after being arrested by police following an incident at the property but police have refuse to discuss the circumstances surrounding his death as an independent investigation is under way.The karate enthusiast who was known as "Sheik" to friends had been detained by police in the town's Hayfield Road in the early hours of Sunday morning. He died in custody shortly afterwards. A female police officer had to be taken to hospital after being injured in the incident. Local rights group, Fairness, Race Awareness and Equality Fife (FRAE), said an independent inquiry is needed as "the full facts have to be found".

Greater Manchester Police Criticized Over Death in Custody

An Independent Police Complaints Commission (IPCC) investigation into the custody of a 17-year-old who committed suicide two days after being released found failings in staff performance and evidence of a concerning culture within a Greater Manchester Police (GMP) custody unit. Joseph Lawton had been arrested on suspicion of drink driving in the Hazel Grove area of Stockport at approximately 1.45am on 9 August 2012 and taken to Cheadle Heath police station where he was detained until 8.20am when he was released on bail to appear at Stockport Magistrates' Court. He died on 11 August.

The IPCC reviewed custody records, interviewed police officers and examined CCTV images of Joseph in the Cheadle Heath custody unit and spoke with Joseph's family. It was concerning to the IPCC that inappropriate comments were made by staff completing a shift change handover, including some that mocked Joseph's situation. After checking other handovers during the same period an unprofessional conversation between custody staff about an unconnected female detainee, that officers described as 'banter', was identified.

The IPCC felt that the comments indicated the existence of an inappropriate and unprofessional culture of male bravado within Cheadle Heath custody suite. A number of other areas of poor practice including failings were also identified. While it was not felt that the comments

amounted to misconduct it was recommended that four Sergeants be dealt with by way of unsatisfactory performance proceedings. The legislation in place at the time of Joseph's detention meant that 17-year-olds were treated as adults, which meant he did not automatically qualify for the support and help of an appropriate adult at the police station.

The officers complied with the Police and Criminal Evidence Act (PACE) Code C as it was at the time but it has since been changed after a legal challenge supported by Joseph's family. The new law, which was also supported by the force and the Association of Chief Police Officers (ACPO) improves the arrangements for 17-year-olds held in custody. A complaint from Joseph's family that CCTV footage was not secured in a timely manner during the initial Greater Manchester Police investigation was upheld. The IPCC also upheld complaints that the force had given the family conflicting information about CCTV footage and transcripts.

An IPCC learning report that includes advice on improving CCTV, risk assessments, compliance with the changes following the court judgement on how 17-year-olds are to be treated in custody, visits to detainees and supervision has also been sent to the force. The force has told the IPCC it has accepted the recommendations and implemented a number of improvements as a result of this and other recently concluded IPCC investigations of custody cases. The IPCC will continue to test the implementation of these improvements in any further custody referrals received from Greater Manchester Police.

James Dipple-Johnstone, the IPCC Commissioner for Greater Manchester, said: "Joseph's family have been through a traumatic experience. While we cannot know what the outcome would have been if Joseph's family had been given information about his detention this investigation has found areas for improvement around how Joseph was looked after by police and also how the force responded to the family's complaints at a time of crisis. I hope the learning taken from these events helps ensure that other families do not experience such problems in future and is some small measure of comfort for them." The IPCC recommendations from this investigation and others have been shared with Her Majesty's Inspectorates of Constabulary (HMIC). Two investigation reports, the learning report, and a foreword written by Mr Dipple-Johnstone have been published on the IPCC website.

Relatives of Ulster Loyalist Violence Begin Landmark 'Collusion' Case

Henry McDonald, Guardian: Relatives of more than 100 victims of Ulster loyalist violence have begun a landmark legal action alleging members of the security forces in Northern Ireland colluded in the murders of their loved ones. Their groundbreaking case in Belfast's high court centres on the so-called Glenanne gang, a unit of the Ulster Volunteer Force based around the Co Armagh village during the 1970s. It is alleged the Glenanne UVF unit had strong links to British soldiers and police officers during the Troubles, and helped set up many of its victims. Among the families of the victims were relations of the Miami Showband, a pop group from Dublin who were murdered on their way back towards the Irish border in 1975. Three members of the Ulster Defence Regiment were eventually convicted for their part in the attack. Through the legal team the families allege that the security forces were fully aware of planned attacks carried out by the Glenanne gang during the Troubles.

Belfast high court on Thursday heard a statement from a senior investigating officer from the historical enquiries team – a police unit set up to investigate the unsolved killings of the Northern Ireland Troubles. He told the court that he had compiled a draft report into collusion between loyalist paramilitaries and security force members in mid-Ulster in the 1970s. The officer said it was 150 pages long and 80% complete. He said he had submitted it in 2010 and, so far, has had no explanation as to why it has been shelved.

sound and comprehensive use of force policies; effective training for and supervision of staff on the proper use of force; special provisions to protect prisoners with mental disabilities from unnecessary force; strict compliance with reporting policies; effective supervisory review of all use of force reports; thorough investigations of questionable use of force incidents; and meaningful disciplinary measures for staff who violate policies and procedures.

Abuse is Not Inevitable: Corrections facilities differ significantly in their conditions of confinement and the degree to which inmates are treated with respect. The misuse of force is more likely in facilities that are overcrowded, have abysmal physical conditions, and lack educational, rehabilitative, and vocational programs for inmate. Force is also more likely where custody staff are too few in number relative to the number of prisoners, are poorly paid, are poorly trained in inter-personal skills and conflict resolution, or are poorly supervised. In some facilities—for example the New York City jail on Rikers Island—a culture of violence has taken hold and persisted for decades. Staff have used force to assert their power and to punish prisoners who displeased, provoked, or annoyed them, and they have done so with impunity. The malicious infliction of pain became an affirmative strategy of control. In such facilities, even if senior officials did not condone the abuse, they took few steps to end it. They abdicated their responsibility to enforce use of force policies and to hold accountable staff who violate them.

Our research leaves no doubt that unwarranted or malicious use of force against men and women with mental disabilities is more prevalent in more violent facilities in which all prisoners are at heightened risk of abuse. It is more prevalent in facilities which rely on force instead of mental health treatment to respond to rule-violating behavior that is symptomatic of a clinical condition. And it is more prevalent in poorly managed facilities: a badly run jail or prison will almost always have more instances of force against inmates, including those with mental disabilities, than one which is well-run.

An isolated instance of unnecessary force can occur in any correctional facility. But when corrections officials fail to establish and enforce a commitment to minimize the use of force, patterns of abuse can emerge. Good use of force policies in and of themselves are not enough to prevent such abuse. Effective leadership is required to ensure policies are reflected in practice. Leadership is essential in any institution, but is particularly important in jails and prisons because they are operated as hierarchical organizations subject to a quasi-militaristic chain of command and there is little external pressure for the humane treatment of prisoners. Without leadership determined to minimize the use of force and to promote prisoner well-being, the best use of force policies can be a dead letter.

Litigation cannot be counted on to ensure appropriate use of force policies and practices. When individual prisoners sue corrections agencies because of staff abuse, they typically seek monetary damages or protection for themselves as individuals and not facility-wide remedies that would require agencies to change their policies and practices. While a class action case may result in court ordered or court-approved protections for prisoners, such cases are enormously expensive, time-consuming, and rare. Moreover, even when the plaintiffs in a class action prevail or secure a desirable settlement agreement, it may take years and even decades before the mandated changes are fully implemented.

In addition to private litigation, the Department of Justice can also mount investigations and bring cases to protect prisoners from abuse. Pursuant to the Civil Rights of Institutionalized Persons Act (CRIPA), 42 U.S.C. § 1997a, the Special Litigation Section of the Civil Rights Division of the US Department of Justice (Special Litigation Section) reviews conditions and practices

delusions have impaired their connection with reality. An inmate may resist being taken from his cell because, for example, he thinks the officers want to harvest his organs or because she cannot distinguish the officer's commands from what other voices in her head are telling her.

Correctional officers and jail deputies (also referred to as "security staff" or "custody staff" in this report) are rarely taught how to recognize the symptoms of mental illness and to understand how they can affect behavior. Custody staff are also rarely trained in and required to use verbal de-escalation techniques or to seek the intervention of mental health staff before resorting to force against inmates with mental disabilities. Force can be the staff response to misconduct even when it is symptomatic of a mental health condition, even when that condition prevents the prisoner from being able to comply with staff orders, and even when skilled verbal interventions might obviate the need for force.

Mental Health Services: Many prisoners with mental disabilities are not receiving mental health treatment that could promote recovery, ameliorate distressing symptoms, and increase their skills and coping strategies to better handle the demands of life behind bars as well as, once they are released, life in the community. Deficiencies in correctional mental health services are pervasive across the country. Because of funding shortages and lack of political support, corrections agencies lack sufficient numbers of properly qualified mental health professionals. Inmates are often not properly diagnosed, do not have timely access to mental health professionals, and do not receive care based on individualized treatment plans. Treatment is often limited to medication and typically does not include other effective therapeutic mental health interventions and psychiatric rehabilitation programs. In the absence of robust mental health services, some corrections agencies use solitary confinement and force as the default response to the behavioral symptoms of mental illness.

Inmates diagnosed with mental illness are disproportionately represented in the isolation units to which prison officials send their more difficult inmates. The harsh conditions of being held alone in a cell 23 hours or more a day with little or nothing to do, coupled with the paucity of mental health treatment characteristic of such units, can lead to an increase in symptoms, more episodes of psychosis, and further misconduct. Experts say that use of force is more common in solitary confinement units than elsewhere in correctional facilities.

Use of Force Policy and Practice:

Prison and jail staff interact with prisoners on a daily basis and around the clock. Some respond professionally and even with compassion and sensitivity to prisoners who have mental health problems, including when they are behaving erratically or breaking the rules. They may try to calm an agitated prisoner locked in his cell or give him time to "cool down." They refrain from force unless there is no alternative. Such responses, however, are unlikely absent carefully constructed and effective use of force policies, training programs, and supervisory and accountability systems. Even when policies clearly limit the use of force to situations in which serious danger is imminent or a significant disruption must be addressed, staff may turn much too quickly to force, use more than is needed, or use it for punitive purposes. As evidenced in recent class-action litigation challenging the constitutionality of excessive use of force against prisoners with mental illness and Department of Justice investigations, patterns of unwarranted and abusive force, including against prisoners with mental health problems, arise from serious deficiencies in use of force policy and practice. Experts consulted for this report believe such deficiencies are widespread.

In jails and prisons across the country officials fail to ensure one or more of the following:

Chicago Agrees to Pay $5.5M to Victims Of Police Torture in 1970s and 80s *Guardian*

Chicago approved an unprecedented deal on Wednesday 6th May 2015, to compensate victims tortured in police custody in the 1970s and 80s under the regime of a notorious former police commander, in an attempt to close a dark chapter in the city's history. A historic package of reparations will be paid out to living survivors, in the first gesture of its kind in America.

The city council voted to award a total of $5.5m to help survivors, almost all African American men, who were mistreated in a long episode of police brutality that ran throughout the 70s and 80s under Jon Burge. The funds will be used to pay up to $100,000 per individual for living survivors with valid claims to have been tortured in police custody during Burge's command. The package also provides for a public memorial and access to services including counselling and free tuition in city colleges for both survivors and their immediate families. It was passed unanimously by the city council on Wednesday. Mayor Rahm Emanuel had previously said the decision's aim was, belatedly, to "bring this dark chapter of Chicago's history to a close" and called Burge's actions a disgrace. "To the victims, to the families, to the entire city: this is another step, but an essential step in righting a wrong – removing a stain on the reputation of this great city," Emanuel said.

From 1972 through 1991, Burge and officers under his command tortured more than 100 African Americans, largely in impoverished sections of Chicago's South Side, in a systematic regime of violence and intimidation. Men in custody were subjected to electric shocks, burns and mock executions, among other brutal acts, predominantly in order to extract confessions. Burge ran a group of rogue detectives known as the Midnight Crew who led the violence. There are allegations that officers used suffocation on those in their custody and forced men to play "Russian roulette". Burge was fired in 1993 but was never charged with crimes directly stemming from the violence before the statute of limitations ran out. He was convicted in 2010 of obstruction of justice and perjury, in relation to a civil lawsuit alleging that he tortured citizens. He subsequently served four and a half years in prison before being released in 2014, and continues to draw a police pension.

Members of Chicago's justice movements said they were inspired by the historic reparations decision but expressed caution borne of decade's worth of false dawns for changing Chicago policing. Prexy Nesbitt, a former adviser to Chicago's first black mayor and himself a survivor of police brutality, called the reparations "a statement to the world" that would "contribute to a better racial climate and very needed reconciliation in the city of Chicago." But Nesbitt noted warily that Chicago has for years substituted large cash payouts – victims of police abuse received more than $50 million in 2014 alone – for structural reform. "Reparations are only meaningful insofar as they change the nature of policing in black and brown and poor white communities in Chicago. That's what needs to happen," Nesbitt said.

Some of the cases settled Wednesday date back to when former Chicago mayor Richard Daley was a local state prosecutor and violent crime in the city was on the rise. Two members of the city council, aldermen Howard Brookins and Joe Moreno, drew up the original ordinance for reparations in 2013 that was passed on Wednesday. One of its primary aims, they had said, is for the city to take official action in order to help bring a sense of closure to the individuals affected by Burge, who are unable to file their own civil lawsuits because time has run out on the relevant statute of limitations.

Pressure has mounted on Emanuel to confront police violence as reports in the Guardian about a secretive Chicago police facility known as Homan Square collided with activism around the Burge torture regime during his mayoral runoff election. Even after serving prison time for

perjury – though never a day for the torture itself – Burge has remained defiant. On February 9, in Florida, Burge was confronted once again by his old legal nemesis, attorney Flint Taylor, for a deposition in one of the sprawling torture cases his police legacy spawned. Burge pled his Fifth Amendment rights against self-incrimination to bat away all of Taylor's questions. But as the deposition wore on, the transcript records, Burge found himself with something else to say. "Did you participate in any way in – in the – in any form of physical abuse of Jackie Wilson on February 14, 1982?" Taylor asked. After some procedural clarification, Burge responded: "I'll exercise my Fifth Amendment rights, even though I would like to say you're a liar."

Nesbitt, 70, drew inspiration from the new youth-led protest movements nationwide calling for an end to racialized police brutality that the US can face its past and ongoing injustices at home and abroad. "It sends a message to the world that there is a growing populist movement, especially from young people - black, brown, white, all colors -- that we're not going to take this brutal treatment of our citizens anymore. Whether it's slavery, lynching, the killing of Vietnamese peasants or drone warfare, it's saying we deplore, can't stand and will protest brutal treatment by the US government and police officials."

Ongoing Fiasco Of Privatised Court Interpreting Services

Three years after Capita took on a Ministry of Justice contract to provide interpreting services in courts and tribunals, recent cases and an independent review have demonstrated that it is still failing, with serious consequences. Court translation: On average, 700 requests are made to the courts in England and Wales every day for the use of an interpreter to assist foreign language speakers and the hearing impaired. The provision of such services is a requirement under the UK's obligations under European human rights law, the common law and to ensure justice and fair trial standards for all parties. According to the latest Ministry of Justice (MoJ) statistics, its outsourced contractor Capita Translation and Interpreting (TI) fails to send interpreters to court in over thirty cases a day, reflecting a 'success rate' of under 95 per cent. The contract stipulates a success rate of 98 per cent.

The absence of an interpreter means hearings are inevitably adjourned and delayed, sometimes leaving defendants unnecessarily held on remand. Less commonly, one of the parties steps in to translate for another, or a friend or relative attempts to facilitate communication. But the ability to interpret is not equivalent to the ability to speak a foreign language. Particularly in complicated court settings, the service needs to be provided by qualified and experienced professionals. Framework agreement: Until 2012, the service was provided by independent qualified interpreters booked directly by the courts from a regulated national register. In August 2011, in order to provide greater efficiency and cost savings, the MoJ signed a framework agreement, worth £168 million, for the provision of legal interpreting services for foreign languages and deaf users across the justice system (police, prisons, etc.) As part of this agreement, in October 2011, the MoJ signed another £90 million five-year contract covering mainly the courts and tribunals*.

The agreement was made with Applied Language Solutions Ltd (ALS), a small private language service provider. But before the courts contract took effect on 30 January 2012, ALS was acquired by Capita, a giant in public service outsourcing. Capita had no prior experience in the languages sector, yet in its own words: 'Our Framework Agreement with the Ministry of Justice for the provision of language services makes us one of the largest providers of public sector interpreting services operating in the UK.' The agreement has been described by politicians as a 'car crash' and 'nothing short of shambolic', and has been subject to inquiries by the National Audit Office, the parliamentary Public Accounts Committee and the Justice Select Committee.

other means. Force is also used when there is an immediate security need to control the inmate, but the amount of force used is excessive to the need, or continues after the inmate has been brought under control. When used in these ways, force constitutes abuse that cannot be squared with the fundamental human rights prohibition against torture or other cruel, inhuman, or degrading treatment or punishment. Unwarranted force also reflects the failure of correctional authorities to accommodate the needs of persons with mental disabilities.

There is no national data on the prevalence of staff use of force in the more than 5,000 jails and prisons in the United States. Experts consulted for this report say that the misuse of force against prisoners with mental health problems is widespread and may be increasing. Among the reasons they cite are deficient mental health treatment in corrections facilities, inadequate policies to protect prisoners from unnecessary force, insufficient staff training and supervision, a lack of accountability for the misuse of force, and poor leadership. It is well known that US prisons and jails have taken on the role of mental health facilities. This new role for them reflects, to a great extent, the limited availability of community-based outpatient and residential mental health programs and resources, and the lack of alternatives to incarceration for men and women with mental disabilities who have engaged in minor offenses.

According to one recent estimate, correctional facilities confine at least 360,000 men and women with serious conditions such as schizophrenia, bipolar disorder, and major depression. In a federal survey, 15 percent of state prisoners and 24 percent of jail inmates acknowledged symptoms of psychosis such as hallucinations or delusions. What is less well known is that persons with mental disabilities who are behind bars are at heightened risk of physical mistreatment by staff. This report is the first examination of the use of force against inmates with mental disabilities in jails and prisons across the United States. It identifies policies and practices that lead to unwarranted force and includes recommendations for changes to end it.

Mental Disability and Misconduct: Most jails and prisons are bleak and stressful places in which few prisoners are able to engage in productive, meaningful activities. Staff seek to ensure institutional safety and smooth operations through regimentation, control, and an insistence—backed up by discipline and force—on unquestioned, immediate prisoner obedience to rules and orders. Prison is challenging for everyone, but prisoners with mental disabilities may struggle more than others to adjust to the extraordinary stresses of incarceration, to follow the rules governing every aspect of life, and to respond promptly to staff orders. In the trenchant words of Professor Hans Toch, people with mental health problems behind bars can be "disturbed and disruptive," "very troubled and extremely troublesome."

Prisoners with mental disabilities misbehave and are sanctioned for disciplinary infractions at higher rates than other prisoners. Nationwide, among state prisoners, 58 percent of those who had a mental health problem had been charged with rule violations, compared to 43 percent of those without such problems. In New York City, for example, inmates with mental health problems represent 40 percent of the jail population but are involved in 60 percent of all incidents of misconduct. Some prisoners with mental health conditions engage in symptomatic behavior that corrections staff find annoying, frightening, and provocative, or which, in some cases, can be dangerous. For example, they may refuse to follow orders to sit down, to come out of a cell, to stop screaming, to change their clothes, to take a shower, or to return a food tray. They may smear feces on themselves or engage in serious self-injury—slicing their arms, necks, bodies; swallowing razor blades, inserting pencils, paper clips, or other objects into their penises. Sometimes prisoners refuse to follow orders because hallucinations and

lawyer in front of his family is one of the most controversial killings of the Troubles. At the time, the UDA unit responsible for his death had within its ranks in West Belfast at least 29 activists who were working as agents for numerous branches of the security forces.

Barry Macdonald QC, the senior counsel for the Finucane family, said: "He was identified by state agents, including particular police officers and army officers as suitable for assassination, and he was shot dead at the behest of state agents in front of his family in a particularly brutal fashion." In December 2012, a report by lawyer Sir Desmond de Silva confirmed agents of the state were involved in the murder and that it should have been prevented. However, his report concluded that there had been "no overarching state conspiracy". The Finucane family have rejected the de Silva report as a sham and a whitewash.

In the high court, the family's barrister said Finucane's murder was a stain on any liberal democracy and that the decision to reject a public inquiry was based more on costs and political fallout than the need to establish the truth. Macdonald said that the breaking of a commitment to hold a statutory probe into allegations of state involvement in the killing was "morally and legally indefensible". He said: "This case is one of the most notorious of the Troubles and it's notorious for good reason. The available evidence suggests agents of the state devised and operated a policy of extra-judicial execution; the essential feature of which was that loyalist terrorist organisations were infiltrated, resourced and manipulated in order to murder individuals identified by the state and their agents as suitable for assassination. other words, a policy of murder by proxy, whereby the state engaged in terrorism through the agency of loyalist paramilitaries. It's difficult to imagine a more serious allegation against a liberal democracy founded in the rule of law." The barrister quoted an email from the Cabinet secretary, Sir Jeremy Heywood, in which he said he could not think of an argument to defend not holding a public inquiry, the court heard."This was a dark moment in the country's history – far worse than anything that was alleged in Iraq or Afghanistan," Macdonald said. "I cannot really think of any argument to defend not having a public inquiry. What am I missing?"

US: Callous and Cruel Use of Force Against Inmates with Mental Disabilities

Human Rights Watch: Across the United States, staff working in jails and prisons have used unnecessary, excessive, and even malicious force on prisoners with mental disabilities such as schizophrenia and bipolar disorder. Corrections officials at times needlessly and punitively deluge them with chemical sprays; shock them with electric stun devices; strap them to chairs and beds for days on end; break their jaws, noses, ribs; or leave them with lacerations, second degree burns, deep bruises, and damaged internal organs. The violence can traumatize already vulnerable men and women, aggravating their symptoms and making future mental health treatment more difficult. In some cases, including several documented in this report, the use of force has caused or contributed to prisoners' deaths.

Prisons can be dangerous places, and staff are authorized to use force to protect safety and security. But under the US constitution and international human rights law, force against any prisoner (with mental disabilities or not) may be used only when—and to the extent—necessary as a last resort, and never as punishment. As detailed in this report, staff at times have responded with violence when prisoners engage in behavior that is symptomatic of their mental health problems, even if it is minor and non-threatening misconduct such as urinating on the floor, using profane language, or banging on a cell door. They have used such force in the absence of any emergency, and without first making serious attempts to secure the inmate's compliance through

An ongoing boycott by the vast majority of qualified and experienced court interpreters, following the cut in standards and pay the framework agreement entails, has meant the contract target of 98 per cent of fulfilled assignments has never been met. The MoJ has had the option throughout of terminating this contract which has never been performed according to the terms agreed. It has chosen instead to defend the agreement and its partnership with Capita TI consistently. The latest MoJ statistics, with the 'success rate' going from 'from 90.1% in 2013 to 94.6% in 2014' provide it with some vindication: the service has improved and complaints have fallen.

Courting criticism: The courts tell another story. In 2014, the MoJ alleged £27 million of savings had been made through the framework agreement, but that does not include the costs occasioned through retrials, individuals being held unnecessarily on remand, and delays. In February 2015, Sir James Munby, president of the family division, ordered Capita to pay costs of almost £16,000 when a Slovak interpreter was not provided on seven occasions in the same adoption case, describing the situation as a 'truly lamentable state of affairs'.

Old BaileyIn March, a war crimes prosecution brought under universal jurisdiction laws, concerning the torture of two individuals by an army officer in Nepal in 2005 during the civil war there, only the second of its kind in the UK, had to be adjourned until later this year when no Nepalese interpreter attended the Old Bailey. The previous day at the same court, a Somali-speaking defendant accused of murdering his sister had his case put back to June, as the lack of an interpreter meant he could not enter a plea.

Where are we now? While the MoJ and Capita TI, in the latter case as a profit-driven enterprise, insist on highlighting the quantitative gains of the framework agreement, the problems experienced by service providers – interpreters – and users – courts, lawyers, complainants and defendants – are almost always qualitative. Now in its fourth year, the arrangement is having a tangible impact on the administration of justice in the courts.

In response to critical parliamentary reports, in January 2014, the MoJ commissioned an independent review into quality arrangements under the framework agreement. The findings were published in November 2014. The report, by consultancy group OptimityMatrix, found that fewer than half of the interpreters employed by Capita TI held adequate or acceptable interpreting qualifications (usually certification from an interpreting body or a university degree). The linguists interviewed also felt that there is a 'perceived lack of focus on both qualifications and experience in the procedure' of selecting interpreters. The report recommended more emphasis on qualifications and experience in hiring, and continuous professional development for interpreters. It also called for regulation of the profession, even though such a recommendation fell outside the scope of the review. This is perhaps indicative of how far and tangibly standards have fallen since 2012.

The MoJ published its response in December 2014, maintaining its claim that 'we have seen dramatic improvements over the last two years and we are continuing targeted work and investment to further improve performance to deliver value for the taxpayer'. It did not accept most of the report's recommendations. PIFJWith the framework agreement due to be retendered this year, to take effect when the current agreement expires in October 2016, representatives of the umbrella group Professional Interpreters for Justice (PI4J) met the MoJ in February to discuss what progress could be made following the recommendations in the Matrix review. Stating its desire 'to work with interpreters' representative bodies', the MoJ held a workshop with representatives of PI4J on the procurement system.

Prior to this, in late March, PI4J sent an e-mail to the Crown Commercial Services stat-

ing that it: 'cannot support any arrangements or FWA [framework] which does not fully take into consideration all our submissions in respect of minimum professional qualifications for Public Service Interpreters (PSI) and BSL/English Interpreters, Deaf interpreters and Sign Language translators, mandatory NRPSI/NRCPD/SASLI registration, and independent regulation and quality and performance auditing. Without these safeguards, access to justice will be denied and human rights and race relations will be jeopardised. Robust standards need to be set and vigorously enforced in order to protect the public and those we serve, which include many vulnerable people, victims and witnesses in the community and justice sector. They must be afforded equal access to the highest levels of linguistic support.'

On 25 March, PI4J launched a manifesto which included the following demands: the use of qualified interpreters; full consultation with the interpreting profession; sustainable terms and conditions to be offered to interpreters; independent auditing of quality and performance, independent regulators; and minimum levels of interpreter qualification.

Sidelined: Interpreters are not an accessory but an essential part of the court system. The MoJ has failed consistently to engage effectively with professional interpreters. In 2013, following the publication of a critical report by the parliamentary Justice Select Committee, the MoJ responded by holding a meeting with interpreter representative bodies and offered interpreters a new package with a pay increase and marginally higher travel allowance. It effectively varied the terms of the framework agreement and ploughed almost £3 million more into it, but the qualitative issues remained unaddressed. The new package was broadly rejected by interpreters. Professional interpreters are renewing their call for the current framework agreement to be scrapped unless radical improvements are made in a new tender and framework agreement. Court interpreting is a vital public service and not a consumer product. Profits can be recuperated but the sharp decline in quality may be a permanent loss with a severe impact on the rights of the vulnerable.

Aisha Maniar is a freelance translator and human rights activist. She is not an interpreter.

Inquest Into Death Of Rubel Ahmed at Morton Hall IRC Opens

26 year old Rubel Ahmed was found hanging in his room at Morton Hall Immigration Removal Centre on 5 September 2014. A few days earlier he had been informed of the Home Office's decision to remove him to Bangladesh on 8 September 2014. He was pronounced dead on 6 September 2014. Rubel had been detained at Morton Hall since 21 July 2014 in conditions described by Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Prisons as "austere", where "detainees were inappropriately locked into their rooms at night". He was one of many immigration detainees held in former prisons. A parliamentary inquiry into the use of immigration detention in the UK, which published its report in March this year, expressed concern that immigration detainees are "increasingly being held in prison-like conditions", a practice which "would appear to contradict the Home Office's own policy of maintaining a relaxed regime". Rubel and his fellow detainees were regularly locked in their rooms for long periods during the evening and at night.

Rubel's family heard of his death around 8.00am on 6 September 2014 via a fellow detainee. Despite their desperate attempts to contact Morton Hall and pleas for confirmation of Rubel's death they were told by staff at Morton Hall that they should contact the Home Office's press office. The Home Office confirmed Rubel's death by telephone around 2.00pm that day. The circumstances of his death were confused causing further distress to his family.

Aktarun Miah, Rubel's cousin, said: "An optimistic and warm hearted individual, Rubel's

the NCA was proposing been provided to the justices they still would inevitably have granted the applications. I do not accept that. Very possibly they might: but that is not the point. In any case, even if it were so, that still does not deprive this court of the power to withhold from the NCA any advantage arising by reason of its conduct.

In the circumstances of this case, therefore, it would in my view be wrong to permit the NCA to gain any advantage of any kind arising from its conduct. It is true that in some cases where there has been found to be an invalid warrant the Administrative Court has been prepared to permit the investigating authority in question to apply to the Crown Court under section 59, retaining and making use of the materials seized (or at all events copies) for that purpose. After all, that is the underpinning rationale of the section: and in this regard one must not overlook the important fact that very often – I am talking generally, not necessarily by reference to this case – the authorities are dealing with unscrupulous individuals whose concern may well be to frustrate, not advance, the interests of justice and who may be only too ready to destroy incriminating materials. But here this was no technical breach on the part of the NCA: on the contrary, at almost every stage of issue and execution there was a profound and sustained misuse of and/or lack of understanding of the warrant process.

It was rightly accepted by Mr Bird that there is (as the case of Kouyoumjian illustrates) no principle that in cases of this kind the Administrative Court must always permit the matter to be resolved by the Crown Court under the section 59 procedure, letting the investigating authorities make use of the seized materials (or copies) for that purpose. A section 59 application, actual or proposed, will always, I accept, be a highly material factor in this regard; but the Administrative Court nevertheless retains a discretion in such circumstances as to the relief which it thinks appropriate to grant or withhold. In the present case, and given its rather extreme circumstances, I would direct the delivery up of the entirety of the seized materials and copies, and any lists or extracts or other product derived therefrom. If that has the consequence of hampering, or even rendering unviable, any contemplated section 59 application then that is a consequence which the NCA has brought upon itself.

On the question of the lawfulness of the arrests, I agree that the claimants' challenge fails. There were ample grounds for suspecting the relevant claimants of criminality (money laundering): and the reasons for the arrests were made sufficiently clear to those claimants at the time. That there were perceived collateral advantages and motivations for the NCA in making the arrests and removing the suspects from the building and thereafter detaining them does not of itself invalidate the arrests. Overall, I am in agreement with the judgment of Hickinbottom J and with the orders which he proposes. The parties are to lodge an appropriate minute of order accordingly. The parties are also to lodge written submissions on any outstanding matters of dispute arising from the orders made, and on costs, if such matters cannot be agreed. http://www.bailii.org/ew/cases/EWHC/Admin/2015/1283.html

Pat Finucane Murder 'Caused By British Infiltration Policy' *Henry McDonald, Guardian*

The murder of Belfast lawyer Pat Finucane was part of British state policy to infiltrate, manipulate and direct terror groups during the Northern Ireland Troubles, Belfast high court has heard. Paramilitary organisations such as the Ulster Defence Association which murdered the solicitor were able to carry out "extrajudicial executions" for the state, a lawyer representing the Finucane family said on Monday. The Finucanes began high court action on Monday to challenge a decision by the British government not to hold a full independent inquiry into the 1989 killing. The murder of the

prohibit the NCA from using the material or anything derived from the material for the purposes of this investigation or for any other purpose. Justice Hickinbottom:

Lord Justice Davis: In recent times there have been increasing numbers of challenges, some of them very high profile, in the Administrative Court to the obtaining and/or execution of search warrants by police or investigating authorities. Some such challenges are unfounded. Others are all too well founded. Regrettably, many of the challenges raised are directed at the woefully inadequate preparation of the applications to the court for the issue of the warrant: sometimes, one suspects, because of the apprehension – entirely misplaced – on the part of the police or investigating authorities that such applications are in essence matters of routine, in effect requiring no more than a rubber stamp of approval from the courts. If, as regrettably also sometimes happens, those applications then do not receive the close scrutiny from the courts which is needed, trouble can ensue.

The present case is just about a paradigm example of (a) lack of understanding of what was required for the applications; (b) lack of preparation and deployment of the information needed for the applications; (c) lack of sufficient scrutiny by the justices; and (d) lack of regard at the stage of execution as to what the warrants actually permitted. It is, to my mind, rather remarkable that as at January 2015 an organisation such as the NCA could have been so ill-informed as to the required processes. When one then adds into the mix the fact that the NCA had formed a very astute and (in Mr Bird's word) "audacious" strategy on the back of the contemplated searches and arrests one can at least understand the allegation that there was here manipulation, in bad faith, of the entire search warrant system. Indeed it is difficult not to have concerns that those involved may have been working on, as it were, the basis of a presumption of guilt and the basis of a perception that, when dealing with presumed or suspected sophisticated criminality, the ends justify the means. Courts of law, however, cannot be expected to work on such bases.

For the future, in complex matters of this kind authorities such as the NCA would be very well advised to consider taking legal advice (internal or external) in advance of their applications for warrants. They would also be very well advised to bear in mind that many defendants in such cases will thereafter – as in this case – be giving the closest scrutiny to the validity of the warrants and will be well resourced to raise legal challenges. At all events, laxness in this context cannot readily be tolerated when one compares and contrasts the very careful preparation routinely given to, and close scrutiny undertaken by the courts of, applications made without notice for search orders in civil cases. Considering the totality of the evidence and in agreement with Hickinbottom J, I have nevertheless reached the conclusion that bad faith is not made out in this particular case, whatever justifiable criticisms may be made both as to the obtaining of the warrants and thereafter as to the way in which they were executed: which, among other things, went well beyond what the justices had actually authorised. Indeed, this even, according to the evidence filed, culminated in wedding rings and other personal jewellery of the suspects' wives being seized when the private residences were searched.

That said, in my view in the present case the conduct of the NCA both in the manner of obtaining and in the manner of executing the warrants was sufficiently egregious, albeit falling short of bad faith, as to justify depriving it of any advantage or benefit whatsoever derived from such warrants. Justice so requires. And if such a decision operates to have something of a deterrent effect hereafter on ill-prepared or ill-executed applications, and to modify any mindset of police or investigating authorities that they can always expect to be permitted to fall back on section 59 of the 2001 Act, then so much the better.

Mr Bird submitted that had all the relevant details and had all the information as to what

swift departure has left an ever expanding hole in all our lives. We are constantly reminded of his absence and the lives of his close family have been changed forever. We now cherish Rubel in our memories. We are anxious to learn as much as possible about the circumstances surrounding Rubel's death at the inquest. We hope that lessons may be learnt so that another family can be spared what we have had to endure."

Clare Richardson, the family's solicitor, said: "Our clients have been given cause for real concern about the conditions in which Rubel was held before his death. They hope that the Home Office and Ministry of Justice will approach the inquest with open minds, willing to learn from the evidence they hear so that practices can be made safer and more humane for all those affected by immigration detention in the future."

Deborah Coles, co-director of INQUEST said: "The culture of locking up immigration detainees in prison like conditions has been the subject of repeated criticism. Rubel's experience is sadly not unique. There have been a number of reports documenting the impact of immigration detention on a detainee's mental and physical well being with detrimental results".

INQUEST has been working with the family of Rubel Ahmed since September 2014. The family is represented by INQUEST lawyers Group members Clare Richardson of Bhatt Murphy Solicitors and barrister Una Morris of Garden Court Chambers. The family ask for privacy whilst the inquest is ongoing and will not be speaking to members of the press until it is concluded. Source: "Anita Sharma" <anitasharma@inquest.org.uk>

Sam Hallam: Seven Years in Jail for a Murder he Did Not Commit *Jon Robins, Independent*

"I used to get really angry. But now, I say to people I feel more angry than I did then," says Sam Hallam, who spent more than seven years in jail for a murder he didn't commit. A teenager when he was sentenced to life in 2005 for a gang-related murder in north London, Mr Hallam always protested his innocence. "I look back on my time in prison and realise I was just living day to day," he tells me. "Only now can I see how much I missed." Three years ago, the then 24-year-old emerged from the Royal Courts of Justice where, moments earlier, Lady Justice Hallett had announced that he could leave, a free man. Newspaper photographs caught a seemingly joyful moment: a grinning Sam Hallam – his arm firmly gripped by his mother, Wendy – walking down the court steps doused with the champagne of well-wishers. It is not how he recalls the day. "It was just overwhelming. I was in shock. I was scared," he admits.

Mr Hallam was 17 when he was convicted of the murder of a trainee chef who died after being stabbed. Hours before his release, he left HMP Pentonville in a prison van, with no idea what was about to happen. He had been transferred from an Oxfordshire prison the previous day, and hadn't been allowed to take anything other than a bar of soap and a few essentials because, he was told, it was "an overnight stay". "As we were leaving court, I asked my mum there if there were going to be people outside. She said: 'Oh, no.' The whole day was a blur." He is speaking ahead of a critical High Court test case this week in which he – together with another notorious miscarriage case, Victor Nealon – will challenge a new law introduced last year to cut compensation for almost all justice miscarriage victims.

Mr Nealon, whose case has also been championed by this paper, spent 17 years in prison before his attempted rape conviction was overturned on DNA evidence. Taken together, their cases reveal an appalling catalogue of errors made by the criminal justice system. Shockingly, the Ministry of Justice has refused the two men compensation. The Antisocial Behaviour, Crime and Policing Act 2014 restricts compensation to those who can demonstrate their innocence

"beyond reasonable doubt". Mr Hallam is baffled, like many, by the apparent reversal of the legal principle of innocent until proven guilty contained in the 2014 Act. The legislation, says Justice, the UK based human rights campaigns organisation, "offends the right to the presumption of innocence and makes an award of compensation almost impossible to achieve".

Lady Justice Hallett described the killing of a trainee chef, Essayas Kassahun, as "yet another tragic example of gang violence". No forensic evidence linked Mr Hallam to the crowded murder scene. A Thames Valley Police investigation quizzed 37 witnesses. Nobody saw him. Under cross-examination, the main witness who placed him at the fight told the court she was "just looking for someone to blame on the spot, really". The evidence that exonerated Mr Hallam was on his mobile phone. Photos revealed he was in a pub with his dad that night.

Paul May, who campaigned to free the Birmingham Six and backed Mr Hallam's cause, says: "Sam's case was probed in minuscule detail by the Criminal Cases Review Commission, in a 15-month inquiry by Thames Valley Police, by the CPS, which dropped the case against him, and by the Appeal Court, which swiftly quashed his conviction. Even the Met issued an unprecedented apology when he was freed. The only people who still question Sam's innocence are the Ministry of Justice." The case for his innocence is stronger even than for the Birmingham Six, he adds.

Mr Hallam hasn't spoken publicly since his release in May 2012. Three years later, how does he feel? "It's up and down," he says. He has a girlfriend, Renee. The couple, who have an 11-month old baby, Thierry, have known each other since childhood, but only got together after his release. They live together in Renee's flat in Stoke Newington, north London, a short distance from the tight-knit Hoxton community the pair grew up in. But as Mr Hallam puts it: "It is like a whole new life to me."

He hasn't worked since his release, other than brief stints on a building site and in Marks & Spencer. What would be his ideal job? "I don't know. I know I should know, but I don't have a clue. These things take time. It will happen when it happens."

"Sam's doing a lot better than he was. He went through a stage where he was really down. Obviously, what's happened to him is hard to deal with," says Renee. Starting a family has helped. "Sam's really, really great with Thierry. That's because he's a big kid – technically, they're the same age," she teases. He found prison hard. "When I first went there, I just hated it," he says. "But you can't do time as long as I did without in some way making it normal. You can't spend every day just dwelling on it, dreading the next day."

He enjoyed the widespread campaigning support of the working-class Hoxton community, including Ray Winstone. The actor's nephew is a friend of Mr Hallam. Was he aware of their campaigning? "Oh yes, they used to send me the photographs, press cuttings and newsletters. I don't know what I'd have done without them. I don't know if I'd have coped." He recalls turning 21 in prison. "They had a birthday party for me outside the prison. Everyone came down in an open-top bus. It absolutely poured down." He couldn't hear them or see, but adds: "I knew they were there."

Baby Thierry takes his name from Thierry Henry – Hallam is a keen Arsenal fan – but is also a tribute to his own father, Terry, who took his own life in 2010 as a result of the stress caused by his son's predicament. Hallam has still to come to terms with that and has yet to visit his father's grave. "It will happen when it happens," he says. This week's legal challenge is about more than "compensation". "Money cannot make up for what happened. It is more about recognising the harm done," Hallam says. Renee agrees. "There has to be some recognition of what happened. Everyone just shrugged their shoulders and said, 'Well, you're out now. You should just be happy."

both counts. It is good that prisoners will be allowed to receive books again. As to whether it will be a big sales boost for us, I'm not sure, but it will be interesting to find out."

Sam Husain, c.e.o of Foyles, said: "The rules are that people sending in books aren't allowed to handle them, so if they brought them to the till, we would then have to take them back and get a new one to send to the prison. So we have decided to make it an online-only function, and we will know the book is going to a prison because of the delivery destination given by the buyer. It is actually quite straightforward. We were invited to be involved, I received an email from the MoJ." He added: "The reversal of the book ban is to be welcomed, it is something the Booksellers Association has campaigned hard on." An MoJ spokesperson told The Bookseller: "We had certain criteria to choose a retailer. They had to have a large number of shops and a large online presence and a wide range of books and cover a wide geographical area. For issues of security, we relied on retailers to have an established track record of sourcing and supplying books using a recognized courier service."

New measures were brought in in November last year in England and Wales, preventing prisoners receiving parcels unless under "exceptional circumstances". In December, after a series of high profile protests form authors and campaign groups such as English PEN and the Howard League, The High Court gave its ruling after the case was brought by Barbara Goron-Jones, a life sentence prisoner at HMP Send. Publishers Association chief executive Richard Mollet said: "It's about time that the government has reviewed its policy which had placed restrictions on prisoners receiving books. Access to books plays a vital role in increasing literacy levels amongst prisoners; aiding rehabilitation and increasing job prospects when released. This is something that the Government should be supporting not preventing."

Judges Slam National Crime Agency - Orders All seized Materials Returned

Queen On The Application Of Claimants: (1) Satish Chatwani (2) Jawahar Chatwani (3) Bhasker Tailor (4) Rakesh Tailor (5) Rashmi Chatwani (6) Daksha Chatwani (7) Hansa Chatwani (8) Shilpa Chatwani (9) Raksha Tailor (10) Pravina Gulabivala - and -(1) The National Crime Agency (2) Birmingham Magistrates' Court

Mr Justice Hickinbottom: Introduction - On 28 January 2015, the First Defendant ("the NCA") arrested and detained the First to Fifth Claimants; and executed search warrants, issued by the Second Defendant ("the Magistrates' Court"), at six premises at which those Claimants lived or worked. In this judicial review, the Claimants challenge both the arrests and search warrants.

The claim gives rise to two issues for this court, namely: i) The lawfulness of the arrests. ii) The NCA concedes that the search warrants were unlawful; and accepts that the warrants should be quashed, and the entries, searches and seizures made under their authority should be declared unlawful. - The issue that remains is limited to whether, despite that unlawfulness, the court should in its discretion allow the NCA to retain the material seized – or any copies or schedules of that material – pending its proposed application for an order under section 59 of the Criminal Justice and Police Act 2001 ("the CJPA"), which enables an agency that has obtained material from an unlawful search to apply to the Crown Court to retain it.

Conclusion: For those reasons, I would refuse the judicial review insofar as it challenges the arrests, and allow it insofar as it challenges the search warrants. In terms of relief, subject to submissions in respect of the precise order, I would declare the relevant warrants unlawful; order the NCA to deliver up the seized material, and to deliver up or destroy all copies, schedules and other work product derived from the seized material; and, subject to further order,

Liverpool fans two years later in 1989 – as Alastair Morgan puts it, 'a Murdoch/police distortion of the truth'. He says: 'The Hillsborough inquiry shone a spotlight on that. The whole country has been astonished. In Daniel's cases, it's exactly the same, possibly worse.'

A strand of decency: Earlier this year the family and their supporters accused the Met of blocking the inquiry. 'It is extraordinary that a case involving police corruption has taken nearly two years to yield even a single document. Even for the Met it is a remarkable state of affairs,' the Labour MP Tom Watson told the Guardian. The panel is chaired by Baroness Nuala O'Loan who, as first Police Ombudsman, has looked into thousands of cases and many involving police collusion with loyalist paramilitaries and the police handling of the Omagh bombing.

Is her inquiry finally making some headway? Apparently so, Morgan reports that the 'disclosure issues' with the Met appear to have been overcome. There is now a team of 27 currently ploughing through some 750,000 pages of documentation relating to the murder. 'Every single document has to be put on an electronic document management system manually,' says Morgan. 'It's an enormous task and probably still ongoing.'

Alastair Morgan pays tribute to Theresa May (although he quickly adds he is 'no Tory'). 'I was astonished that a Conservative Home Secretary would give us the opportunity. I am grateful to her for doing that – she had the guts to take on the police as well. There is a strand of decency there.' Alastair Morgan Finally, does he ever think anyone will be convicted for the murder of his brother? 'I am not holding my breath,' he says. 'In strict legal terms, the case has been so fouled up because of corruption. I know who killed Daniel. I have no doubt there was police involvement in his death but I'm not going to spend my life waiting for that to be revealed. As well as seeking justice for Daniel, my motivation has been to show what the police have done and latterly the News of the World.

Booksellers Given Role in Prison Book Delivery

The government has relaxed the prison book ban, but said inmates can only receive parcels from four named booksellers – Waterstones, Blackwell's, Foyles or WH Smith. The prison book ban was relaxed from 31st January, The Bookseller understands, following a High Court ruling that the ban, brought in in November 2013, was unlawful in December.

A Ministry of Justice spokesperson said the new rules on sending in books to prisons were to "Ensure the protection and safety of prisons. There never was a specific ban on books and we remain clear that we will not do anything that would create a new conduit for smuggling drugs and extremist materials into our prisons," the MoJ spokesperson said. "In order to ensure the protection and safety of prisons, we have put in place a new system which will mean books can be sent in via an approved retailer, either online or in high street shops. Prisoners also have access to the same public library service as the rest of us, and can buy books through the prison shop. We remain fully committed to rehabilitation through education and have rolled out schemes such as the Shannon Trust National Reading Network, which includes peer mentoring to improve reading levels."

Retailers have welcomed the relaxation of the book ban, with Waterstones m.d James Daunt saying: "Common sense has finally prevailed." Gareth Hardy, head of commercial at Blackwell's, meanwhile, said being approved as one of the four main retailers was "all very last minute. We received a letter from the Ministry of Justice last week saying that from the 31st January friends and family are allowed to buy books and send them on, but only through approved retailers and asking if we wanted to be part of it," he said. "It is good news on

Campaigners Accuse Met Police and Mental Health Trust of Racist Cover-Up

Paul Gallagher, Indpendent: A mental health trust and the Metropolitan Police have been accused of trying to cover up alleged racism towards patients during an extraordinary night when 48 officers – some in riot gear – were deployed to deal with disturbances in a ward of vulnerable adults. Campaigners have spent three years trying to uncover what happened at the River House facility at Bethlem Royal Hospital, part of the South London and Maudsley NHS Foundation Trust, on 1 October 2012.

Several days of disturbances escalated into a riot, the ringleaders of which were four patients, three black and one white. They had placed staff under siege which required police intervention before control could be regained. The Met sent in 48 officers, including armed and dog units. More than 20 officers entered the ward including several Tactical Support Group (TSG) officers in "strict, compact riot formation" armed with Tasers, shields, visors and batons.

An independent report into the disturbances commissioned by the trust said: "According to staff statements, the police, after entering the unit, ignored the request of staff to treat Patient C (a white patient) the same way as they had treated the three black patients. Staff state that the police made no attempt to coordinate their actions with [hospital] staff as is standard practice during a siege, to gain information and to help them plan their strategy in order to minimise disruption to the unit."

Police, assisted by hospital staff, escorted the three black patients (Patients A, B and D) to solitary confinement, handcuffing two of them. Officers also placed a clear plastic cover over Patient B's head preventing him from moving his head and shoulders. "He was initially ignored by police until several promptings by staff," the trust report said. Patient C, the only white patient of the four, was not handcuffed and allowed to stay in the television lounge despite staff insisting to police he was also "a significant player in the disturbance" and that being left on the ward could lead to another disturbance – which it did.

Immediately after police left, around 3:00am, another patient, E, demanded an explanation as to why Patient C had remained on the ward. The report said: "Patient E believed that there was a racial motive which led to staff assisting the police to place three black patients in supervised confinement, while a white patient was treated more favourably." Despite explanations, Patient E became increasingly agitated and hostile and threatened to kill staff and patient C. "This led to a second siege when staff lost control of the ward for a second time. Police assistance was required again before staff could regain control of the clinical area," said the report. Eleven officers returned and "dealt with the situation promptly". By 5am full control was restored.

A 111-page report was completed in May 2013 and a summary published that August. An "unreadable" version was only made public in May 2014 following Freedom of Information requests made by David Mery on behalf of the charity Black Mental Health UK. Almost all the allegations of racism and the patients' ethnicity had been censored. Mr Mery appealed and the trust was forced to publish the report again earlier this year detailing the accusations of racism as well as Scotland Yard's refusal to engage with hospital staff. Around 30 pages remain completely redacted. A paragraph initially redacted said: "It took eight weeks to secure material from the Metropolitan Police. Requests for further and better particulars have been unsuccessful, despite reminders on matters which were explored at interview with an inspector from Bromley borough police."

Mental health campaigners say it was only luck that prevented staff or patients being injured that night. The Met Police had previously been heavily criticised for their actions at the same hospital in September 2010. Then, Olaseni Lewis, a 23-year-old Kingston University postgraduate student, died after being forcibly restrained by up to 11 officers while seeking help as

a voluntary patient. Five years on his family are still waiting to hear when an inquest into his death will be held. Addressing the 2012 incident, Mr Mery told The Independent: "The cover up, with the trust releasing conflicting statements and deliberately attempting to avoid the release of its investigation report (and still refusing to name its authors), and the Metropolitan Police losing its own report, demonstrate that neither organisation is keen to take responsibility for what happen and ensure that it won't happen again. "Surprisingly, there doesn't appear to have been a specific investigation into the racist behaviour described in the report. NHS trusts and police forces should have an obligation to publish reports into serious incidents publicly, promptly and in their entirety. However, the police have lost the incident management log for what they have classified as a critical incident."

The police have said they were concerned that the staff on the ward that night were unaware of any contingency plan other than to call them on such an occasion. Operation Metallah, a new way of the Met to work with the mental health trust, was launched a few months later. Mr Mery said: "The tactics that resulted in the deployment at a mental health unit of armed officers, dog units, and TSG officers

Daniel Morgan Murder: 'The More I Discovered, the Worse it Got' *Jon Robins, Justice Gap*

Daniel Morgan was a private eye who was found murdered in a south-east London car park with an axe embedded in his head in 1987. His brother Alastair Morgan has now spent nearly three decades fighting to uncover the truth about his brutal killing. So far, there have been five police investigations into this notorious murder but nobody has stood trial. In March 2011, the prosecution of five men, including a former police officer, collapsed at the Old Bailey with the then acting Met commissioner Tim Godwin acknowledging the force's 'repeated failure… to accept that corruption had played such a significant part in failing to bring those responsible to justice'. "Sometimes I'd step back and think: "God Almighty, how did I do it. How did I continue?"' he tells Jon Robins "The more I discovered, the worse it got and I'd think to myself "I can't stop. This looks even worse than I thought."' Alastair Morgan

This month marks the two-year anniversary of the panel inquiry set up by Theresa May into Daniel Morgan's murder. Progress has been slow. The Liberal Democrats, in their 2015 manifesto published last month, promised to get to the 'full truth about corrupt practices in parts of the police and the press' by ensuring that the inquiry was 'completed expeditiously' and called on the second part of the Leveson Inquiry – to investigate crimes committed at News International and other media organisations – begin as soon as the hacking prosecutions are completed. Daniel Morgan was a partner in a private detective agency called Southern Investigations. After his death, his business partner, Jonathan Rees was kept busy working for the News of the World supplying illegally gained confidential information often through his links with a network of corrupt police officers. According to the Guardian journalist Nick Davies (in his book Hack Attack: How the truth caught up with Rupert Murdoch) in one year alone (1996/97) the paper paid the agency more than £166,000. The family has long claimed that the murder was an execution with the aim of silencing Daniel who was about to expose high level corruption in the Met.

Not Just 'a Police Corruption Problem': Unsurprisingly then, Alastair Morgan hopes that the momentum following Leveson for press reform continues under the new government. 'The media barons can see their power under threat. They are desperate,' he says. 'Circulation figures are falling and there are more questions about the integrity of the press than I have ever seen in my lifetime. We need change.' The election coverage – and the vilification of Ed Miliband – has 'redoubled'

his commitment to campaign for press reform, he says. The relatively recent furore over phone hacking – and the degree to which it has exposed the relationship between bent coppers and some journalists – has cast the murder in a different light. It also explained a lack of enthusiasm over the years on the part of parts of the press for a shocking story of police corruption.

Alastair Morgan, now 66 years old, was born less than a year before his brother. He recalls the second discredited outside inquiry in 1989 by Hampshire Police into the murder ('… they just whitewashed the question of police involvement'). 'I knew something was going terribly wrong with the case then,' he says. 'I knew it would have terrible consequences but I did not know what they would be.' He could not understand why the tabloid media showed zero interest in his family's campaign. For years, it was the local Welsh press who alone reported on the case. 'I'd never go to the Sun but the Mirror and others just didn't have any interest. At the time, I thought it was just a police corruption problem. I had absolutely no idea of the Murdoch link and the fact that the Mirror Group was also using Southern,' Morgan continues. 'My position for many years was the police had covered up their involvement in a contract murder and, not only that, all indications were that my brother was going to blow the whistle on police corruption. Why couldn't the press see how important this was? That baffled me.' Alastair Morgan

The truth about the relationship between Daniel Morgan's business partner and the NoW only began to emerge post-2000. Alastair Morgan cites Graeme McLagan's expose of Southern Investigation (here), as well as an 'attempt to derail the investigation by a bunch of journalists' from the now defunct Sunday red top. As was revealed in the Leveson inquiry, the NoW placed the officer heading up the investigation into the murder, former detective chief superintendent David Cook, under surveillance. It was suggested by the tabloid that their reporters were after a 'kiss-and-tell' story about Cook's affair with the Crimewatch presenter Jacqui Hames. In fact, the couple were married and, as Alastair Morgan has pointed out, a Google search would have revealed the status of their relationship. 'I didn't know anything about any of this for years. It was only Leveson that began to join the dots up,' he says.

A distortion of the truth: How helpful were New Labour in the family's pursuit of the truth? Absolutely hopeless, says Morgan. In 1997, the then Home Secretary Jack Straw wrote to his MP Chris Smith saying that the Met had told him 'that there were some allegations that a senior officer was involved in the murder, but these were all thoroughly investigated at the time and proved to be incorrect'. The family and their lawyer – Raju Bhatt of Bhatt Murphy – sent a submission, backed by 83 MPs, to David Blunkett when he became Home Secretary in 2004. 'We couldn't even get to see him. We ended up with Hazel Blears who just grinned at us. It was like talking to a brick wall.' Blunkett, who reached a settlement with News International over his own phone hacking claims, now advises the company on 'social responsibility'. 'Frankly, that disgusts me,' says Morgan.

When the family finally got to meet a home secretary in the flesh, it was Theresa May. At the end of 2011, May proposed a Hillsborough-style panel of inquiry. 'We had to decide whether to continue with the fight for a full-blown judicial inquiry backed by legal powers or take this opportunity,' recalls Morgan. Raju Bhatt, a human rights lawyer who specialises in actions against the police, was on the Hillsborough panel. 'We had been going on for more than 25 years at this point. I thought let's go for it,' Alastair Morgan says. 'There had been a judicial inquiry into Hillsborough [the Taylor report in 1990] but that only went so far. The Hillsborough panel was a far more successful operation. Frankly, we were just tired.' There are, of course, striking common themes between the murder of Daniel Morgan and the disaster that claimed the lives of 96