would have to struggle to pay for their own representation, even if exonerated, and advice centres close down. Perhaps if he and his colleagues had listened to the legal professions and implemented other ways of making savings there might not be so much anger, but at £225,000, we clearly have the most expensive civil servants in Europe."

A Legal Aid Agency spokesperson said: "The chief executive's take home pay increased by a third of one per cent last year. His terms of employment have not become more generous. "The apparent change in overall remuneration is due entirely to a new estimate of pension benefit value. Each year, the consumer price index and other information is used to calculate a best estimate. However, these fluctuate from year to year - indeed the estimate for 2014/15 is only marginally higher than the estimate for 2012/13."

Kalief Browder Paid 'Terrible Price' For Solitary Confinement

Jamiles Lartey, Guardian: Writing a concurring opinion in a supreme court ruling that reinstated a California man's death sentence, Justice Anthony Kennedy on Thursday invoked the recent death of a young man who spent three years in jail without trial to make another point: the use of solitary confinement "exacts a terrible price". Kalief Browder, a 22-year-old Bronx man who spent three years confined at Rikers Island without a trial, died by suicide on 6 June after long battles with depression and paranoia which began during his incarceration, during which he spent long stretches in solitary confinement. In his concurring opinion on the case of Davis v Ayala – in which the justices reinstated Hector Ayala's conviction and death sentence for a California murder – Kennedy wrote that the plight of prisoners often goes unconsidered by legal scholars and policy-makers in discussions that "simply concentrate on the adjudication of guilt or innocence".

Kennedy cited a New Yorker profile of Browder as part of a "growing awareness in the broader public of the subject of corrections and of solitary confinement in particular". Browder was just 16 years old when he was arrested in 2010 on suspicion that he had stolen a backpack. His name became synonymous with dysfunction and cruelty in New York's criminal justice system when the New Yorker's Jennifer Gonnerman published a story on his protracted legal saga in a November 2014 piece for the magazine. Browder told Gonnerman that he was still dealing with the traumatic effects of his incarceration many months after his release in June 2013, describing himself as "mentally scarred".

Although US citizens are constitutionally guaranteed the right to a speedy trial, many defendants are held for extremely long periods of time due to loopholes which can pause what is commonly referred to as the "speedy trial clock". According to a New York City criminal court report, the average wait time for a trial in New York in 2013 was 594 days. On Wednesday, two New York State lawmakers introduced Kalief's Law, which would attempt to remove some of these loopholes from the state's trial proceedings.

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 535 (25/06/2015) - Cost £1

Thames Valley Police Squeaky Clean Again

Five police officers who changed their accounts of a stop and search carried out on a man who later died have been cleared of misconduct by a disciplinary panel. Thames Valley officers DS Jason Liles, DC Richard Bazeley and PCs Kate Granger, Chris Pomery and Howard Wynne admitted deleting aspects of their initial statements, including references to use of force, from accounts subsequently provided to the Independent Police Complaints Commission (IPCC) of their encounter with Habib "Paps" Ullah, a 39-year-old father of three.

Almost seven years later and after two inquests into his death a misconduct hearing took place in Newbury, from 4th to 15th June 2015. This is only one of two public misconduct hearings under the old regulations. In future all such hearings will be held in public after the directive that the Home Secretary's decision last year. Family of Habib Ullah said: "We are disappointed about the outcome of this Hearing but it does not reduce our desire to keep fighting for answers and justice. In our view it was clear that those officers brought the Thames Valley Police Service into disrepute and that the decision not to discipline officers in any way was not an appropriate one in our view. That the officers were exonerated of all wrongdoing goes against the IPCC investigation and the serious failings that were raised at both the Hearing and the previous inquests.

The family are pleased however that the misconduct hearing of the officer's involved in Habib's death took place in public. Whilst we still have grave reservations about the role of the IPCC in the whole investigation it is nevertheless a significant step to have this hearing take place in front of us in the manner that it has. However the whole disciplinary misconduct process is questionable when officers are not challenged adequately about their conduct and the process of writing their statements, There are still many questions to be asked about why on the night that Habib died there was no Post Incident Management in place straightaway and we are still not clear about what happened in the immediate aftermath of his death and the role of senior officers such as the now Chief Constable Frances Hapgood and the Police Federation. There are still question marks about the legal firm that the police used and the advice that they were given about their statements. Also with all the talk about restoring 'confidence in the complaints' system it needs to be remembered that this is an employment process and we are still hugely concerned that we and many other families are still being failed by the Crown Prosecution Service and the legal system when it comes to getting justice"

Deborah Coles, Co-Director of INQUEST, said: Given 'the breathtaking changes' to the police officers accounts it is astonishing that senior police officers hearing this case have found no misconduct. We can fully understand family and public frustration that once again it appears that the system for holding police to account has failed to deliver justice and accountability. This decision brings the police disciplinary system into disrepute. "

Marian Ellingworth, family's solicitor, said: 'It has been a long and painful battle for my clients. I am continuing to advise them on the legal remedies available to them. There remains serious concerns of the officer's conduct. It was the officer's suppression of details in their statements that made the whole process so long drawn out and painful for the family. '

Serious Failures By Crown Prosecution Service to Present Materials

This court has had to consider for the second time within the last two months serious failures by the prosecution in relation to the provision of material which led a judge to bring the case to an end. In the first case, Boardman [2015] EWCA Crim 175 the court upheld the decision of the Crown Court judge to refuse to allow evidence to be served late in circumstances in which it was clear such a decision would lead to the prosecution discontinuing the case; the failures in that case in relation to the provision of evidence had been grave and in disregard of clear directions of the court. In the present case, the failures in relation to disclosure had, as will appear, been grave and led to the trial being stopped on the eighth day on the direction of the judge. The judge had subsequently stayed the proceedings as an abuse of the process of the court. In this appeal the prosecution seeks leave under s.58 of the Criminal Justice Act 2003 (CJA 2003) to appeal against that stay.

Events immediately before and during the trial: Shortly before the trial was due to start Mr Lumley QC was instructed on behalf of Daryl S. He took the view that primary disclosure was incomplete. He made requests to the prosecution for documents and information which were properly required to be disclosed. As a result of those requests, on the first day of the trial the officer in the case was asked to attend. He came with three boxes of material which neither counsel nor the CPS had seen. Counsel for the prosecution, Mr Bennett, required the officer in the case to prepare a revised schedule of unused material based on material in the possession of the police. This resulted in a revised schedule containing over 25 further items (items 25-50). Although the revised schedule was expressed as being complete, it was not.

Conclusion on the balancing factors: In our judgment there is a very strong public interest in these grave offences being tried and the complainants having their allegations determined at trial. The documents that were not disclosed were of the limited materiality which we have explained; that is to be contrasted with the failure in Boardman to serve evidence. On the other hand the conduct of the CPS and the North Yorkshire Police force has been reprehensible; the sanctions which a court can impose on them to secure adherence to basic principles of justice lack proportionality. Nonetheless a fair trial is possible and a lack of proper compliance with the Criminal Procedure Rules by those representing Daryl S before November 2014 played its part in what happened. Balancing these considerations, we have concluded that on this occasion it would not be in the interests of justice to stay these proceedings on the basis that their continuation would undermine public confidence in the administration of justice. We have every sympathy with the position in which the judge was placed; we fully understand his robust and justified condemnation of the CPS and the North Yorkshire Police, but after reviewing all the circumstances and looking at other considerations to which the judge did not refer, we consider that on this occasion the proceedings should continue. We set aside the stay. We trust that the judgments of this court in Boardman and in this case will receive the closest study by all Chief Crown Prosecutors and all Chief Constables. There should be no recurrence of failures of this kind by either the CPS or any police force. http://www.bailii.org/ew/cases/EWCA/Crim/2015/662.html

Early Day Motion 131: IPCC Report on Orgreave

That this House strongly condemns the decision of the Independent Police Complaints Commission not to launch a full and comprehensive investigation into the behaviour of South Yorkshire Police at the Orgreave Coking Plant on 18 June 1984; believes there is no time limit to justice and furthermore that mining communities up and down the country deserve the truth; and calls for a wider public inquiry covering not only the policing of Orgreave but of the entire country during the 1984-85 Miners' Strike.

Fashioning Weapons in Jail - Now a Punishable Offence

Andy Richardson, Birmingham Mail: An HMP Birmingham inmate accused of fashioning a knife from pieces of plastic and razor blades has become the first prisoner charged under a new law clamping down on weapons behind bars. John Garrett, 28, has been charged with possessing an offensive weapon in prison and will appear before Birmingham magistrates on July 6. His case is believed to be the first of its kind since the Serious Crime Act (2015) came into force last month, making it illegal to possess a knife or offensive weapon in prison.

Previously, prison custody officers could confiscate weapons but, as anyone behind bars was not deemed 'in public', police were powerless to charge them with an offence. Det Insp Nick Dale, said: "This new legislation is a really useful tool and closes a loophole that previously allowed violent inmates to possess weapons without fear of prosecution. "Anyone now caught with an offensive weapon in prison faces the prospect of having another four years added to their sentence."

West Midlands Police set up a permanent team at the Winson Green prison in 2012 to stem the flow of drugs, mobile phones and other contraband being smuggled inside – many via perimeter wall 'throw-over' offences. G4S Director for HMP Birmingham, Pete Small, added: "This charge sends a powerful message to prisoners who persist in using violence or manufacturing weapons that they face an extended stay behind bars. "We want a safe environment which helps prisoners to turn away from crime and, while we have always been able to confiscate weapons, this new law allows us to work with the police to pursue serious sanctions in court."

Head of Legal Aid's Pay Rise An 'Insult' To Solicitors *Owen Bowcott, Guardian*

A pay rise of more than 10% for the head of the body that oversees legal aid has been described as an insult by solicitors whose fees have been slashed on his watch. Matthew Coats, the chief executive of the Legal Aid Agency (LAA), saw his combined salary, bonuses and pension benefits rise from between £195,000 and £200,000 in 2014, to between £220,000 and £225,000 this year. The figures are revealed in the LAA's annual report, which shows that, while his basic salary was more than £140,000, he received up to £15,000 in bonuses and £65,000 in pension-related benefits. According to the report, Coats' remuneration covers both his roles at the LAA and the Ministry of Justice, where he is director-general of corporate services. The sharp increase coincides with growing militancy among criminal legal aid lawyers, who are balloting this week on whether to stage mass walkouts in protest at cuts to their fees, which have fallen by 17.5% in the past year. They warn that the reduction will result in defendants receiving inadequate representation and in more miscarriages of justice.

Last week, the MoJ decided to continue with the latest round of cuts to criminal legal aid fees, reducing by two-thirds the number of contracts for duty solicitors attending police stations and magistrates courts. Jonathan Black, president of the London Criminal Courts Solicitors' Association, told the Guardian: "This is an insult to those members of the profession who work late nights in police stations at reduced rates and who are facing job insecurity. "As solicitors consider ... taking the most drastic of all steps to ensure that access to justice is not completely destroyed, the MoJ once again excel themselves by insensitively announcing the pay increase of £20k to the chief executive of the LAA, Matthew Coats, whose [income] will now reach an eye-watering £225,000 per annum. We are told that the austerity measures mean that everyone must experience cuts ... No legal aid lawyer should earn more than the prime minister [but] Mr Coats' salary equates to the salary of 10 solicitors made redundant as a result of the recent cuts. He has marshalled through a policy that means many ordinary middle earners

That points to a more general observation. Although the number of British Muslims who have travelled to northern Syria and Iraq is substantial (700, according to the most recent official estimate), it isn't disproportionate. They get noticed because their facility with English makes them effective propagandists – terrifyingly so, in the case of the murderous "Jihadi John" – but Muslims from several other countries have actually been more likely to go there. Norwegians have been twice as enthusiastic, and rates are even higher in Belgium, Ireland, Denmark and (at the top) Finland.

As that unlikely list implies, forces other than faith are at play. One of them is the dynamic that draws young men elsewhere towards gangs: some reports indicate that foreigners fighting with Isis often come from families where fathers were abusive or absent. Growing up in isolated immigrant communities, they might be more likely to view the group's macho hierarchy as a force for stability.

The group's appeal to women – thought to comprise more than one in six of all foreign recruits – reflects similarly contingent factors. Finland hasn't earned its place in the vanguard because its small Muslim population consists of psychopaths, but because an unusually high number of female Finnish converts have pledged allegiance to Isis – and though their motives can't be known, they're probably not entirely pious. Isis blogs and Twitter accounts (which are numerous) are filled with questions from women curious to meet and marry fighters – because an eagerness among good Muslim girls to hook up with bad jihadi boys is a strong part of the group's appeal.

For all Isis's talk of submission to God, its attractiveness, therefore, owes little to humility or self-denial. Although bloggers forewarn potential arrivals of hardships – squat toilets and a lack of contact-lens solution are two they have flagged up – the promise of personal liberation is ubiquitous. A 26-year-old Malaysian doctor who posts under the name Bird of Paradise happily tells female readers that they'll live rent-free in a room of their own, pay no bills or taxes, and receive a monthly stipend.

A Londoner calling himself Paladin of Jihad is even more effusive. Ordinarily inclined to post doggerel, slangy hashtags or jokes about rape, his descriptions of Isis-land are lyrical. On arriving, he recalls, a stranger with a smile in his eyes hugged him in the light of a full moon, making him feel that "at long last, I 'belonged' to something, to a project, to a cause". Reflecting on that cause makes Paladin feel even better. "You don't have to fear the [non-believers], you don't have to hide yourself nor your beliefs … [instead, you have] the freedom to finally be yourself and be who you're supposed to be."

None of that is exactly convincing. Isis punishes a lot more behaviour than it permits, and the happiness it apparently brings some people has been paid for by thousands of refugees, rape victims and corpses. Narcissism can obscure such things, however, and that also helps explain the group's persistent appeal to outsiders. Whatever precisely turns out to have spurred the most recent departures from Dewsbury and Bradford, the organisation offers a way of escaping stifling familial expectations, the low-level racism of wider society, and communal customs that many British Muslims themselves don't value. In exchange, it promises a godly cause – the defence of victimised co-religionists – that draws similarly passionate people from all over the world. Troubled young men thereby imagine a land where they can start anew, commanding respect as upholders of God's law. Unhappy women dream of attaining happiness for the first time – or the second or third, if husbands they take are lucky enough to achieve martyrdom. The fantasies ignore a very vicious reality, of course – but as long as thwarted personalities imagine that Isis can make them true, people will kill and die in their pursuit.

Lifting the Curtain on Our Most Secretive Court *Christabel Mccooey, Justice Gap*

Journalists have long called for the 'controversial and secretive Court of Protection', which makes decisions on behalf of some of Britain's most vulnerable people, to open up to public scrutiny. The court is one of the few tribunals left in which there is an automatic presumption that the media and public cannot attend proceedings, the Mental Health Tribunal is another.

Slowly and inexorably, progress is being made largely as a result of a shocking catalogue of cases. For example, that of Steven Neary, a young autistic man unlawfully deprived of his liberty by the London Borough of Hillingdon in a care home. 'Few would doubt that vast improvements have been made within the court since it has started to be subjected to a modicum of public scrutiny,' wrote Jerome Taylor in the Independent in May 2012.

Following a study by researchers at Cardiff University (Transparency in the Court of Protection (PDF) amendments to the Court of Protection Rules 2007 are due to come into force next month which will allow information from the court to be communicated in a tightly limited range of 'specified purposes', such as making applications to the European Court of Human Rights and obtaining healthcare or counselling. 'There is no doubt that restrictions on the ways that Court of Protection cases are reported by the media are necessary to protect the privacy of those involved, but the current rules are not fit for purpose,' the report's author Lucy Series told the Daily Mail).

In a case called Re X – addressing concerns that life-changing decisions were being made about vulnerable people – the Court of Appeal stressed that those without mental capacity 'should always be directly involved in court hearings about their personal liberty.' The Law Society said it launched the challenge to new stream-lining procedures in the court because, whilst recognising the 'resourcing pressures', they argued that 'fundamental rights of patients to participate in legal proceedings about their liberty were at risk.' 'Anyone facing court proceedings which concern their liberty must be able to participate effecting in or be legally represented at those proceedings,' said the Society's president Andrew Caplen. 'There is no doubt that restrictions on the ways that Court of Protection cases are reported by the media are necessary to protect the privacy of those involved, but the current rules are not fit for purpose,' the report's author Lucy Series told the Daily Mail (here). That paper had investigated 'the secret imprisonment of Wanda Maddocks' after she had tried to get her father out of a care home when she believed his life was in danger.

Maddocks had herself been jailed for contempt of court. The committal hearing was in 'open court' but the media was not told – nor did Maddocks attend. She later told the press she had been 'jailed in secret'. Following the furore over that case, guidance was issued by the lord chief justice, and president of the family court reminding judges that it was 'a fundamental principle of the administration of justice in England and Wales that applications for committal for contempt should be heard and decided in public, that is, in open court'. The authors complained of 'very variable reporting' of cases by the 'mainstream media'. On the one hand, there were 'many examples of accurate and responsible media reporting of cases' and, in particular, the publicity in the Neary case which 'seems likely' to have been 'a factor behind growing awareness of the need to refer welfare disputes to court'. However they also flagged up instances of 'highly inaccurate reporting' (e.g., the case of Alessandra Pacchieri, an Italian woman who underwent a caesarean operation against her will following an order of the Court of Protection. A mix of problems come before the court, which was established under the Mental Capacity Act 2005, from 'run-of-the-mill' decisions about wills and property, to complex and controversial decisions about refusing treatment, whether a person should be sterilised or have their life terminated. In light of its far-reaching powers, its 'secretive' approach has been criticised by its own president, Sir James Munby, who has long supported moves towards greater transparency

in order to address 'the charge that we are a system of secret and unaccountable justice'.

The Cardiff study drew on a roundtable discussion in September last year which included judges, lawyers, journalists, and researchers. They came to the 'unanimous agreement' that there were serious shortcomings with current arrangements for media access'. 'In particular, the need to apply formally to attend the hearing was costly, and could have a chilling effect on reporting cases.' Everybody agreed that the arrangements in the courts for media attendance should be brought in line with the family courts where the press need not make an application to attend however the court has powers to exclude on specific grounds.

Unsurprisingly, the principle of 'open justice' was unanimously supported by experts in the Cardiff study and found to be 'an essential feature of the rule of law'. However, unlike national security arguments which overshadow criminal and immigration cases, the key question is whether, due to the inherently sensitive subject-matter of the court's cases, the confidentiality and privacy of those involved in its processes should override any general need for open justice. 'The idea that anyone should be able to apply to have someone effectively locked up for any amount of time without the press, and through the press the public, being able to scrutinize what is going on, is surely contrary to good sense and open justice.'

One lawyer observed that people were brought to the court, often against their will, to have intimate details about their circumstances aired before the judge. He found that 'almost without exception' families found it an invasion of privacy for lawyers to read about their private lives, let alone the general public. Whilst transparency was important, there was 'a price to be paid', he added. A 'media circus' could place families under 'unbearable pressure' with the consequence that 'everyone loses sight of what matters, which is the best interests of that person'. The report cited the story of Ashya King, a young boy with cancer, and the ensuing 'media frenzy' following revelations that his parents had been arrested after removing him from hospital to try an alternative treatment overseas. The chief exec of the University Hospital Southampton recalled: 'The switchboard and patient support services were overwhelmed with calls from irate members of the public; our press team were besieged by the media… through all of this we still had thousands of patients who needed care and treatment.' One journalist reported that his news editor did not understand what was meant by Ashya being made 'a ward of court'. 'Nobody knows how the system works because they cannot get in,' they journalist said.

Other journalists pointed to numerous instances where families and parties to cases in the court actively welcomed and sought publicity to express their feelings about the process,, such as Steven Neary and the Labour politician, Manuela Sykes, who campaigned on social justice and gender issues, as well as the treatment of the elderly in care homes. After Sykes herself developed dementia she was forcibly admitted to a care home under a deprivation of liberty authorisation, which she found deeply distressing. Sykes expressed a 'strong wish' for her situation to be reported and for her to be named. Although her specific rights in relation to publicity were not discussed, Judge Eldergill stated: 'She has always wished to be heard. She would wish her life to end with a bang not a whimper. This is her last chance to exert a political influence which is recognisable as her influence.'

Under current laws, those individuals who want the public to hear about their case are faced with contempt of court proceedings and potentially prison if they go to the press. A number of the Cardiff experts were of the view that 'almost nothing was known' about what those subject to proceedings actually thought about allowing greater public and media access to the court.

The United Nations Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (CRPD) has been effective in highlighting ways in which disabled people can be discriminated against in the court process. In one case involving a man detained under the Mental Health Act, the Mental

so much as serving the American desire for British Islamists to be taken out of circulation.

It might well seem that delegating the disposal of ex-Britons to the US would be vulnerable to legal challenge – but it probably isn't. In the same month that the home secretary asked MPs to extend her powers over citizenship, the Court of Appeal drastically reduced the judiciary's right to oversee any contribution Britain might make to US-led military operations. In response to a Pakistani who blamed GCHQ for guiding the drone that killed his elderly father, Lord Dyson held that a respect for foreign governments precluded further investigation: otherwise, he argued, facts might be ascertained and conclusions expressed that 'would be seen as a serious condemnation of the US by a court of this country'.

The decision pretends deference, but it's disingenuous. Actions taken by another government often have reverberations that merit legal scrutiny here – as, indeed, the Supreme Court recognised when it noted Vietnam's failure to observe its own citizenship laws. And Dyson's reasoning obscures a growing recognition that even in wartime, arbitrary violence is wrong. The British military vaunts its strict rules of engagement, but if our courts have to look away whenever a friendly country is involved in the fighting, the only legal safeguards will be the ones enforcable in the courts of that country – and in the US, to take the case in point, judges have denied themselves the power to examine even the targeted killing of American citizens. Suspicious seeming ex-Brits stand no chance.

So what? Hasn't everyone deprived of British citizenship in recent years done dubious or violent things; didn't most of them put themselves in the wrong place at the wrong time? Perhaps, but citizenship isn't ordinarily forfeit on proof of bad conduct, and for good reason. Many governments would like to rid themselves of unwanted residents, and those that countenance statelessness threaten to increase rather than reduce the problems associated with any who are poorly integrated. Their efforts are also wrong in principle. Citizenship, Hannah Arendt said, is 'the right to have rights'. Citizenship isn't a transient privilege, but an ancient status on which legal order is built. If individuals are accused of wrongdoing, they should be brought to trial, not issued a notice by the Home Office that cuts them loose and exposes them to unregulated and potentially lethal action by another country.

Want to Understand the Appeal Of Isis? Think Like A Young Muslim Outsider

Sadakat Kadri, Guardian: Defections by British citizens to Islamic State typically inspire an entire cycle of reactions. Security-minded commentators demand tougher measures to restrict travel and suppress online propaganda. Others argue that clampdowns are counterproductive, and urge mosques and families to take the lead. The families themselves, while expressing bafflement and grief, turn the spotlight back on to the authorities, attributing their loved ones' estrangement to either state surveillance or (confusingly) to inadequate attention by the state.

The arguments are divisive but important in view of the lives blighted and threatened. Attempts to fix blame risk blurring a fundamental issue, however: why individuals up sticks and go to a war zone in the first place. The three sisters missing with their children from their Bradford homes, like the 17-year-old Dewsbury boy who reportedly detonated a suicide bomb in Iraq last week, doubtless thought they were fulfilling an Islamic duty, but devoutness alone explains little. All lived in deeply traditional Muslim communities, and though such places nurture some insular forms of behaviour, the abandonment of husbands and suicidal murder aren't among them. As with many previous extremists, Isis's latest British recruits seem to have been maladjusted misfits: estranged from co-religionists rather than bound to them.

Soon after Theresa May became home secretary in May 2010, the Home Office lost its tussle with Abu Hamza, but she was determined to be more effective in her attempts to remove citizenship – and to do it more often. In her first six months in the job, she issued five revocation notices – as many as had been issued over the preceding 37 years – and the rate has accelerated steadily. By early 2013, she had moved against 32 more individuals, including at least five born in Britain. But last October, another inherited case got her in legal trouble. Hilal al-Jedda entered the UK in 1992, seeking asylum from Saddam Hussein's Iraq. He was granted British citizenship in 2000. In 2004, he was detained by British forces in Iraq on suspicion of terrorist offences and held without charge for three years.

Shortly before his release in 2007 the then Labour home secretary Jacqui Smith notified him that his citizenship was being removed. Home Office lawyers resisted his subsequent appeal by contending that he was still entitled to Iraqi nationality and could reapply for that if he wanted. The Supreme Court was unpersuaded. Al-Jedda argued that he shouldn't be put in the position of having to ask Baghdad to take him back. The judges agreed: whatever Iraq's response might be, it was Britain's actions, not al-Jedda's failure to act, that threatened him with statelessness.

None of this stopped May issuing an order to deprive al-Jedda of citizenship a second time. But the Supreme Court's refusal to speculate on the future attitude of a foreign state spurred her to rewrite the rules. She told MPs in early 2014 that the court's 'disappointing' decision had made it necessary for her to ask Parliament for further powers. The outcome was section 66 of the Immigration Act 2014, which gives the home secretary the power to reverse the granting of citizenship if a reasonable reading of another country's laws suggests the individual could gain nationality there. The new powers could have been even more sweeping. May initially wanted the right to denaturalise British citizens without regard to statelessness. But section 66 is far-reaching enough. May had already shown herself ready to strip citizenship from dual nationals born in Britain. Now, so long as there is a chance of their gaining dual nationality, naturalised citizens will be at risk.

All the revocations that May has issued so far have survived judicial challenge, and an authoritative Supreme Court decision in March suggests that the legal wind is finally behind her back. An unusually large panel of seven judges, convened because of the importance of the case, upheld her withdrawal of citizenship from Minh Quang Pham, an alleged al-Qaida activist born in Vietnam. The judges ruled that Vietnam's refusal to have him back imposed no obligation on the home secretary. The only fault they (implicitly) found was with officials in Hanoi, because Minh's right to citizenship was clear under Vietnamese law, yet was being ignored.

If citizens can be forsaken on the off-chance that another country will take them on, who bears responsibility for the ones who end up with no nationality at all? The evidence so far suggests that, one way or another, it will be the US. Minh was extradited there even before the result of his appeal was known, and the Americans have taken on at least three more ex-Britons. One was spirited from East Africa to Manhattan by FBI agents, who swooped in soon after May declared him un-British. Two other Londoners didn't get that far: after being stripped of citizenship, Bilal el-Berjawi and Mohamed Sakr were killed in Somalia by US drone strikes in early 2012.

The Home Office strongly denies that it is co-ordinating the withdrawal of citizenship with the US Justice Department and the CIA, yet all but two notices of revocation on national security grounds have been served while their subjects were abroad, and both GCHQ and a facility at RAF Marham are permanently engaged in supplying the US drone programme with real-time intelligence. It may be that some of May's decisions on citizenship aren't promoting the public good of this country

Disability Advocacy Centre was able to intervene, pointing to Article 13 CRPD which obliges states to guarantee 'effective access to justice for persons with disabilities on an equal basis with others'. Pointing also to article 6 of the European Convention on Human Rights, guaranteeing the right to a fair trial, the judge in the case said that 'a patient should have the same or substantially equivalent right of access to a public hearing as a non-disabled person who has been deprived of his or her liberty, if this article 6 right to a public hearing is to be given proper effect'.

The role of the media as a positive force – an educator of the public and a corrective to miscarriages of justice within the trial process – emerged as a central theme from the Cardiff discussions. One of the journalists cited the Roy Meadows scandal, in which Professor Meadows' 'expert evidence' was relied upon to prosecute multiple women for murdering their infant children. Following publicity highlighting the flaws of the evidence, and the subsequent quashing of the convictions of Sally Clark and Angela Cannings, the Criminal Cases Review Commission reviewed other cases and similarly found the convictions to be 'unsafe'. 'If this had not been a criminal case, where Meadow's claims received public scrutiny and were widely discredited, then experts might still be making such pronouncements today',' the journalist said.

Following the roundtable discussions – and in a surprising show of co-operation between lawyers and journalists – all participants agreed that the automatic exclusion of media attendance at the Court of Protection must end. This would avoid the 'chilling effect' of media exclusion whilst enabling the court to restrict the sharing of sensitive information where warranted, thus balancing the need for transparency with privacy. This could signal an important step towards ensuring that decisions made about some of society's most vulnerable people are adequately scrutinised, challenged, and indeed applauded, where necessary.

Cost of Violence Hits $14 Trillion in Increasingly Divided World *Magdalena Mis, for TRS*

The cost of violence around the world reached a record $14.3 trillion in 2014, equivalent to the combined economies of Brazil, Canada, France, Germany, Spain and the United Kingdom, a global security report said on Wednesday. The divide between the most and least peaceful regions deepened with many Middle Eastern and African countries sinking further into violence, according to research by the Australia-based Institute for Economics and Peace (IEP). Syria ranked as the least peaceful country in the 2015 Global Peace Index, while Libya saw the most severe deterioration. Iceland remained the most peaceful The (cost of violence) has been largely associated with the increase of deaths in conflict, the ongoing economic consequences of conflicts in the countries where they're occurring and also the increased cost associated with the displaced people. The cost of supporting refugees and internally displaced people (IDPs) has increased by 267 percent since 2008 to $128 billion as the numbers of uprooted people topped 50 million -- the highest level since World War Two. However, it is expenses related to the military, police forces and dealing with homicides that have had the highest impact on costs, accounting for more than 68 percent of the total, said the study.Despite conflict in the Ukraine, Europe continues to experience historic levels of peace, with a decrease in homicide rates and the withdrawal of forces from Iraq and Afghanistan. But Iraq, Syria, Nigeria, South Sudan and Central African Republic have all become more violent than a year ago, according to the index of 162 states. The intensity of conflict has increased dramatically, said the study, with the number of people killed rising to 180,000 in 2014 from 49,000 in 2010. Middle East and Northern Africa are the world's most violent regions overtaking South Asia, which ranked worst in last year's study which covered 2013.

Former Police Officers Jailed for Sex Offences Have Pensions Reduced

Ellie Cullen, Nottingham Post: Two disgraced former police officers will still receive part of their pensions – despite having been jailed for sexual misdemeanours. Nottinghamshire Police and Crime Commissioner Paddy Tipping has revealed that former Inspector Russell Dew and former officer Simon Jones will see their pensions reduced, but not slashed completely. Dew was jailed for six years in 2011 after he admitted sexually touching a 13-year-old girl, while Jones was jailed for two years in 2012 for having sex while on duty with two victims of crime. Dew will have 60 per cent of his pension forfeited, while Jones will see a 50 per cent cut. Mr Tipping said: "We took the view that these were serious offences which have been dealt with seriously by the courts. I didn't work on the Jones case, as my deputy did and told me about it, but I did on the Dew case. "He was convicted of sexual offences against children and went to prison. There was a full hearing about his pension, and he had his chance to make a case."

When an officer is convicted of a crime, the police force can apply to the Home Secretary to decide whether the offence was "gravely injurious to the interests of the State" or "liable to lead to serious loss of confidence in the public service". If the Home Office confirms this is the case, the force's crime commissioner can decide on the level of reduction to the pension, which comes from employer contributions, after allowing the officer to put forward their representations. Guidance states the maximum amount forfeited should be 65 per cent – as a person's own contributions to the pension pot cannot be cut. Mr Tipping added: "We need to recognise the balance of the needs of the officer's family with the wider public concern."

Dew pleaded guilty to five charges of sexual activity with the teenager in Newark. He had joined Nottinghamshire Police in 2002 and became local area commander for Hucknall in 2008. Jones, who was based at Worksop police station, admitted two counts of misconduct in public office in 2012, having had sex with two crime victims – one while he was on duty. Jonathan Isaby, chief executive of the Taxpayers' Alliance, said: "Taxpayers will wonder whether it's appropriate for convicted criminals to receive a still-generous police pension when they're convicted of such heinous crimes. "These pensions should be treated as a privilege not a right."

Wang Yam - Murder Trial Made Headlines - Despite Their Being Nothing to Tell!

David Connett, Guardian: It was a murder trial which made headlines, despite there being so little of the story to tell. The brutal killing of an elderly, frail reclusive millionaire author battered to death in his north London mansion was considered by two juries, who both heard the case in secret. But the mystery surrounding the murder of Allan Chappelow has persisted since police officers discovered the 86-year-old's badly decomposed body beneath an enormous pile of book proofs in his home close to Hampstead Heath in June 2006. The full details of the case are still to emerge, after the former Home Secretary Jacqui Smith took the rare step of intervening in a criminal case on the grounds of national security. Government lawyers issued a public interest immunity certificate (PII), which forced large parts of the case to be heard in secret.

Now Britain's highest court has decided it will examine the case again, raising the possibility the full details may finally be revealed. The prosecution claimed it would sooner see Wang Yam, the man convicted of Mr Chappelow's murder, walk free than risk national security secrets being revealed. Yam, who has always denied the charges, is the grandson of a close associate of Chinese leader Chairman Mao and the son of a Chinese Red Army General. He came to Britain in 1992 via Hong Kong, and was granted asylum in the UK after claiming he took part in the Tiananmen Square protests.

nally displaced every day, representing a four-fold increase in just four years, the aid agency said. "I believe things will get worse before they eventually start to get better," U.N. High Commissioner for Refugees Antonio Guterres said at a news conference in Istanbul.

UNHCR said Syria, where conflict has raged since 2011, was the world's biggest source of internally displaced people and refugees. There were 7.6 million displaced people in Syria by the end of last year and almost 4 million Syrian refugees, mainly living in the neighbouring countries of Lebanon, Jordan and Turkey. The number of Syrian refugees has overtaken the number of Afghan refugees for the first time, the report found. "Even amid such sharp growth in numbers, the global distribution of refugees remains heavily skewed away from wealthier nations and towards the less wealthy," UNHCR said.

UNHCR said there were 38.2 million displaced by conflict within national borders, almost five million more than a year before, with wars in Ukraine, South Sudan, Nigeria, Central African Republic and the Democratic Republic of the Congo swelling the figures. Of the 19.5 million refugees living outside their home countries, 5.1 million are Palestinians. Syrians, Somalis and Afghans make up more than half the remaining 14.4 million refugees, UNHCR said. It also noted that more than 1.6 million people sought political asylum in a foreign country last year, a jump of more than 50 percent compared to the previous year - largely due to the 270,000 Ukrainians who submitted asylum claims in Russia.

While many conflicts have erupted or reignited in the past five years, few have been conclusively resolved. Just 126,800 refugees were able to return home in 2014, the lowest number in 31 years, UNHCR said. Guterres said the responsibility to protect Syrian refugees should not be lie solely with Turkey, Jordan and Lebanon, and called on the European Union and other parts of the world to open their borders to refugees. "It is important... for people to be able to have the chance to move into those countries without having to force themselves in the hands of smugglers and traffickers, who exploit them in a miserable way," he said.

Short Cuts - Removal of British Citizenship *Sadakat Kadri, London Review of Books*

The removal of citizenship has been used as a penalty for disloyalty only rarely in Britain. A handful of spies with dual nationality were denaturalised during the Cold War, but the last case in the 20th century was in 1973. Change came slowly even after 9/11: only five people were stripped of British citizenship by Labour home secretaries, and the emblematic bogeyman of the era, the hook-handed Abu Hamza, repeatedly dodged moves to annul the Britishness he had gained through marriage. He didn't manage to elude extradition to the United States, where he has now been jailed for life, but for what it's worth, he remains notionally a British subject.

The obstacle to swifter executive action is the rule against statelessness. Originating after the Second World War, it reflected a belated concern about the removal of citizenship from Germany's Jews in 1935. With the consequences of postwar decolonisation also at issue, the UK helped draft two treaties aimed at limiting the freedom countries had to abandon their residents. The rule counterbalanced a new power given to the home secretary in 2002 to withdraw citizenship from people who had 'seriously prejudiced' vital national interests.

The criterion was broadened under the Immigration, Asylum and Nationality Act 2006, which made it possible to withdraw citizenship whenever it was 'conducive to the public good'. Even in Abu Hamza's case, the rule wasn't challenged: the government argued instead that it wasn't relevant, because the preacher remained Egyptian. The judges weren't convinced: on the evidence they'd heard, Egypt seemed to have disowned him.

A Justice System That Fails Children Ultimately Fails Society

Gabriela Knaul, UN Rapporteur: The treatment of children in judicial proceedings around the world, both civil and criminal, is not satisfactory and often "unacceptable," the UN human rights expert on the independence of judges and lawyers said today and called on countries to develop justice systems that are sensitive to the needs of children. "Every day throughout the world, countless children suffer adverse consequences at the hands of justice systems that disregard or even directly violate their fundamental human rights," she noted. "Not only do children face the same obstacles as adults to access justice, but they also encounter challenges and barriers linked to their status of minors.Children still count among the most vulnerable to human rights violations and other types of abuse," Ms. Knaul said, calling on States to develop justice systems adapted to their needs and rights. "Justice must be child-sensitive; it needs to respect, protect and fulfil the rights of children and take into account their best interests."

Despite the quasi-universal ratification of the Convention on the Rights of the Child, the report notes that children still count among the most vulnerable to human rights violations and other types of abuse, and Ms. Knaul said "it is unacceptable that children who come into contact with the justice system are often victimized or re-victimized. For this reason, the importance of child-sensitive justice – justice that respects, protects and fulfils the rights of children – cannot be overemphasized," the expert said in her report. "An administration of justice that fails children ultimately also fails society." According to the report, "between 1 March 2014 and 28 February 2015 inclusive, she sent a total of 117 communications alleging violations of human rights in the context of her mandate to 54 Member States. Of these communications, 86 were urgent appeals and the remaining 31 were letters of allegation. Every day throughout the world, countless children suffer adverse consequences at the hands of justice systems that disregard or even directly violate their fundamental human rights," Ms. Knaul said. "Not only do children face the same obstacles as adults to access justice, but they also encounter challenges and barriers linked to their status of minors."

Ms. Knaul called on states to develop justice systems adapted to their needs and rights because "justice must be child-sensitive; it needs to respect, protect and fulfil the rights of children and take into account their best interests." Among her 19 recommendations, the Special Rapporteur called for adoption of alternative mechanisms to complement or replace judicial proceedings, in order to mitigate or avoid the trauma that can result when children go through the established process. Judges, prosecutors and lawyers can influence the future course of children's lives," the expert said. "To discharge such a great responsibility, it is essential that they receive specialized education and training in international human rights and in particular children's rights." Ms. Knaul took up her functions as UN Special Rapporteur on the independence of judges and lawyers on 1 August 2009. Experts like Ms. Knaul work on a voluntary basis; they are not UN staff and do not receive a salary for their work. They are independent from any government or organization and serve in their individual capacity.

30 Million Children Displaced by Conflict in 2014 *Joseph D'Urso, Thomson Reuters Foundation*

Almost 60 million people worldwide were forcibly uprooted by conflict and persecution at the end of last year, the highest ever recorded number, the U.N. refugee agency said on Thursday, warning that the situation could deteriorate further. More than half the displaced from crises including Syria, Afghanistan and Somalia were children, UNHCR said in its annual Global Trends Report. In 2014, an average of 42,500 people became refugees, asylum seekers, or inter-

What can be reported is that Yam came to police officers' attention after they realised he lived close to the victim and had been linked to stolen credit cards. The jury also heard the evidence of a postman who said he had seen someone answering Wang's description near the victim's house. The postman said he had a conversation with the man about mail due to be delivered to Mr Chappelow. The jury, which was security vetted, convicted Yam of theft and fraud offences but failed to agree on the murder charge. He was retried under identical conditions and was convicted. Wang was jailed for life in 2009, with a recommendation he serve a minimum of 20 years. The Appeal Court heard his conviction for murder depended on the jury being sure that he was the thief. His defence stated he admitted involvement in handling cheques and credit cards belonging to the victim but claimed they had been handed to him by gangsters, whose names and descriptions he had provided to police. The appeal was turned down in 2010 and his lawyers tried to take the case to the European Court of Human Rights (ECHR) in Strasbourg, on the grounds he has not had a fair trial. They tried and failed to lift the gagging order.

Now Britain's Supreme Court justices have ruled they will hear the case to determine whether the Government has the power to prevent an individual placing material before the ECHR. They will also determine whether that power can be used where UK courts are "satisfied it is not in the interests of state for the material to be made public even to the Strasbourg Court". Yam's lawyer, James Mullion, of Janes Solicitors, said the Supreme Court had granted Yam premission to appeal the order which forbids him from communicating the full facts of the defence. A date for the hearing is yet to be set.

Spinning the Death of Sheku Bayoh *Ryan Erfani-Ghettani, Institute of Race Relations*

Following the death of Sheku Bayoh last month, police used the decades-old tactic of attacking a victim's character in a suspicious custody death. On 3 May 2015, Sheku Bayoh, a gas engineer from Sierra Leone, died on the street in Kirkcaldy, Fife. He had been restrained by up to nine police officers responding to an alleged report from a member of the public of a man seen wielding a weapon. Pathologists suspect that he died from 'positional asphyxia', a cause of death following restraint in a number of previous cases.

The grief of Bayoh's mother, Aminata, and partner, Collette Bell, has been compounded by police statements that have raised more questions than they have answered about the circumstances of the death. Bayoh's family was initially told that police were hunting two men suspected of involvement in his death. Police officers then repeatedly changed their story. They had been responding to a witness who had seen a man walking down the road carrying a weapon, they said. First Bayoh was wielding a machete, next it was a knife, then a 'blade'; then a woman police officer had been stabbed, next she had not been, but had been hospitalised nonetheless. Bayoh's partner, Collette Bell, spoke to the press: 'The people we put our trust into to protect us has changed their stories too much in such a short time!'

Over the weeks, another account emerged. After being beaten with batons and sprayed with both CS spray and PAVA pepper spray, Bayoh was taken to hospital, still in handcuffs, where he died. While pathologists were told of the use of sprays – known to have caused death in a number of other cases – a preliminary post-mortem report (hastily conducted despite the family asking for it to be delayed) failed to mention their use.

Legitimising police action: In a series of statements, the Scottish Police Federation (SPF) and its legal representatives responded to the family's concerns, relying on unsubstantiated claims about the character of the deceased. On 14 May 2015, Bayoh's family, along with

their solicitor Aamer Anwar, held a press conference to ask why officers involved in Bayoh's death had not been suspended from duty, or given statements to the ombudsman, the Police Investigations & Review Commissioner (PIRC), which was conducting an investigation. Within minutes of the conference ending, Brian Docherty, chairman of the SPF, accused the family and its legal representative of making 'unhelpful comments to the press … innuendo and speculation [which] adds nothing other than to the pain and grief of the family'.

The SPF stressed that Bayoh's restraint by officers was in response to a 'violent and unprovoked attack by a large male' upon a 'petite female officer' who 'believed she was going to die'. The SPF's legal adviser, Professor Peter Watson, later reiterated the point: I would ask the media and public to remember that a petite female police officer was chased and then subjected to a violent and unprovoked attack by a very large man who punched, kicked and stamped on her. The officer believed she was about to be murdered and I can say that but for the intervention of the other officers that was the likely outcome.

Here was the first indication of the extent of the alleged attack on the police officer, its potency relying on comparisons between the disparate sizes and strengths of attacker and attacked, and an emphasis on the sincerity of the officer's fears. The full facts aren't yet known but the police's 'defence' bears a worrying resemblance to the way that other black people who have died in custody have been painted as possessed by violence, with a degree of strength that makes necessary the use of extreme force by officers. The violence meted out against Joy Gardner, for instance, who died in Tottenham in 1993 after police officers wrapped thirteen feet of tape around her nose and mouth, was justified on the basis that she was a 'strong and violent woman' who 'might be HIV positive'. Shiji Lapite, a Nigerian asylum seeker whose body was covered in forty-five separate injuries after his death in Stoke Newington, was described by one of the officers who detained him as 'the biggest, strongest most violent black man' he'd ever seen, despite his five foot ten build. Again in Tottenham in 1999, the use of force against Roger Sylvester, who had been suffering from a mental health episode, was put down to his 'exceptional strength' and allegations that he was a 'crack user'.

Undermining the campaign for truth: As the Justice for Sheku Bayoh campaign garnered media sympathy, the SPF reoriented its focus onto the family of the deceased. On 18 May, solicitors from PBW Law, SPF's legal representative, threatened action on behalf of the officers involved in Bayoh's death against what they described as 'criminal' posts naming the officer he had allegedly attacked on a Facebook page set up as a tribute to his memory. For Bayoh's mother, Aminata, the threat constituted an attempt to 'silence a grieving mother'.Two weeks later, the company claimed that Anwar, the family's solicitor, had directed 'hyperbolic, inaccurate and bizarre rhetoric at the Scottish Police Federation', before accusing him of failing to allow 'the investigation to proceed without interference'.

Yet the interventions of the Scottish Police Federation raise doubts about its own assistance of the investigation process. Its claim, that the PIRC had failed to ask the officers for a statement until almost a month after the incident, appears contentious. The PIRC has claimed it made repeated attempts to gain interviews, but new guidelines issued in March by Police Scotland commanders have stripped the watchdog of the power to compel officers to hand over evidence if they could face criminal charges.

The SPF states that it is 'saddened' that Bayoh's 'legal representatives are inferring police officers should not have the same legal protections as any other member of the public'.[13] Yet the opposite was the case. The officers involved in Bayoh's death remained on duty able to confer for a month

before providing statements to the PIRC. Allegations that an officer was hospitalised as the result of a violent attack have yet to be substantiated. So too the claim that Bayoh was wielding some kind of blade. This type of assertion has historical precedent in other spectral weapons used to justify the use of deadly force: the table-leg-cum-shotgun of Harry Stanley (1999), the pistol-shaped lighter of Derek Bennett (2001) and the gun 'raised' at a police marksman – recovered four metres away and behind a wall – that haunted Mark Duggan's reputation after his death.

Former Prisoner With HIV has Settled His Unlawful Discrimination Claim

Benjamin Burrow, Leigh Day Solicitores: A former prisoner has received substantial compensation from the Ministry of Justice following the settlement of his case alleging that he was discriminated against whilst in prison because of his HIV status. The former prisoner, known as "Mr F", has had HIV for many years. It has been effectively managed during those years through regular medication and review. Following his imprisonment, Mr F was initially assessed as being suitable for closed conditions upon his imprisonment and allocated to a closed prison. However, as a result of his good behaviour, he was subsequently assessed as being suitable for open conditions. Open conditions are those conditions suitable for prisoners who are trusted not to attempt to escape from prison. Therefore, unlike closed conditions, when they leave prison they do not have to be escorted and when they are in prison the prison regime is not as strict.

Following his assessment as suitable for open conditions, Mr F was recommended for allocation to an open prison. However, when he applied for transfer to this open prison, his application was rejected on three separate occasions. On the first two occasions, Mr F's application was rejected on "medical" grounds. This could only have meant that he had HIV as he did not have any other medical conditions.On the third and final occasion, Mr F's application was rejected on "safety" grounds. He was not told of this at the time. However, when he was later told after his release, it was explained to him that safety grounds meant that, because he had previously been assaulted in prison because of his HIV status, it was not safe for him to be transferred to that particular open prison as the prisoners who carried out this assault had or would be transferred to the same prison. Mr F was not considered for transfer to another open prison, and he remained in a closed prison until his release.

A claim was then brought on behalf of Mr F against the Ministry of Justice under the Equality Act 2010 alleging that he had suffered unlawful disability discrimination because he was denied access to open conditions for 11 months. HIV is a disability for the purposes of the Act, and, as a result, it is unlawful to treat a person less favourably than other persons because of their HIV status or because of something arising from their HIV status. It was alleged that this had happened in Mr F's case by his application being rejected because of "medical" grounds and by failing to transfer him to another open prison where such "safety" grounds did not exist. The claim was successfully settled earlier this month with the Ministry of Justice agreeing to pay Mr F substantial compensation.

In commenting on the settlement, Benjamin Burrows, a solicitor in the human rights team at Leigh Day said: "Society's perceptions of HIV have changed markedly over the years, and largely for the better. However, Mr F's case shows that the Prison Service still have a long way to go to catch up with the rest of society. Mr F was denied access to something that other prisoners were not denied access to and the reason for that was his HIV status or something arising from his HIV status. This should have been ringing alarm bells for the Prison Service, but, instead, nothing was done. Therefore, regrettably, Mr F's case is just another example of the Prison Service failing to fully understand or appreciate their obligations under the Equality Act 2010." Mr F's claim was funded by the Legal Aid Agency, and he was represented by Adam Straw, a barrister at Doughty Street Chambers.