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 772 (18/12/2019) - Cost £1

## Mangrove Nine: When Black Power Took On the British Establishment

*Nicholas Reed Langen, Justice Gap:* On the August 9, 1970, 150 black protesters marched against the Metropolitan Police, challenging the campaign of intimidation that had been waged against their community. This protest set in motion the train of events that led to the trial of the Mangrove Nine where the power of the British state went up against black power and lost. The trial of the Mangrove Nine was a historical event. The first time the British establishment, sitting incarnate as a robed judge in the Old Bailey, recognised that there was institutionalised racism at the heart of the British state. Alongside this, it played its part in the rise of the radical barrister, Ian Macdonald QC, who died this month. Macdonald was a landmark figure in the civil liberties community, campaigning both in court and beyond for equality in society. He was instrumental to the trial of the Mangrove Nine, guiding the black activists in the presentation of their case, and relentlessly challenging the prejudices of the bench, the prosecution and their witnesses.

The issue which lay at the heart of the Mangrove Nine case was the rise of a black power movement in Britain. As the black civil rights movement rose in America, figures like Martin Luther King and Malcolm X at the forefront, a British wing paralleled its ascent. This was Britain at the end of Empire, a Britain that had opened its doors to subjects of the Commonwealth, the Windrush generation flocking to Britain, taking up the British government's offer of new jobs and a new life.

In London, the West Indian community congregated in Notting Hill, with Frank Crichlow's Mangrove restaurant becoming their 'resting place in Babylon', a safe place of shared cultures and values, but also a place to plot political revolution. Its charms were not confined to the black community alone, the restaurant drawing its custom from across Notting Hill's diverse community. Robin Bunce and Paul Field, writing in Darcus Howe: A Political Biography, noted that 'figures such as Mary Tuck… assistant editor of Vogue, and Lord Gifford QC, a radical human rights lawyer' were amongst its patrons, whilst it was visited by Jimi Hendrix, Nina Simone and other celebrities, drawn to its status in London's counterculture.

Mangrove's reputation meant that Crichlow drew the attention and the ire of the Notting Hill police, who sought to bring the weight of their jackboots down on the revolution's burgeoning roots. The 'heavy mob', a division of the Metropolitan Police in Notting Hill who saw the district as their own imperial outpost, sought to expunge the activists and destroy Crichlow's business, offended at the thought of a black man thriving on their patch. Using the pretence of drugs searches, they subjected the Mangrove to inspection after inspection, baselessly raiding it on twelve occasions over an eighteen month period, all to no avail. Throughout this, Crichlow endeavoured to remain within the law, trying to stop the discrimination through turning the gears of British bureaucracy, but other radicals at the Mangrove sought to take more direct action, drawing inspiration from the American civil rights movement. At the forefront of this was Darcus Howe, a black activist and writer, who had moved to the UK from Trinidad with the intent of studying law.

Howe had little time for Crichlow's moderate approach, encouraging him to take more direct action. Drawing inspiration from the Black Panthers in America, and his Trinidadian roots, he worked with their chapter in the UK to mobilise the black community, remarking in the film of the Mangrove Nine that 'this government is not going to take up its responsibility unless it sees people on the street'. It was Howe's organisational skills which meant that on that August day in 1970, the 150 protesters marched peacefully on police stations in Notting Hill. The mood was celebratory, some protesters echoing the Black Panthers' style, many carrying placards bearing slogans like 'Calling All Pigs, Freak Out or Get Out' and 'Power to the People'. They were outnumbered by a force of over 200 officers, standing five deep, with another 500 held in reserve. This was force intent on inciting violence, and prepared to inflict it.

The police had calculated that the best response was to overwhelm them with sheer weight of personnel, hoping that their numbers would spark a conflict, giving the officers the right to arrest, charge and prosecute the demonstrators. A brief struggle at Portnall Road provided the police all the justification they needed, with Howe later writing that they descended on the protesters with 'pure, unadulterated, unlicensed brutality', releasing their pent up rage and frustration at the thought of black people challenging their authority.

The then home secretary, Reginald Maudling, who alongside Special Branch, had been paying particular attention to the preparations against the protest, demanded an immediate report on the individuals behind the movement, alongside a presentation of the legal options he had before him to quash it and punish the radicals. Within the report on the 'Battle of Portnall Road', Maudling was given options including deporting Crichlow, Howe and other radicals, or charging them with inciting racial hatred. Given the circumstances, these options were rejected because Maudling feared that they would arouse public sympathy for the protesters, sympathies that currently lay with the police and the government. Instead, the home secretary instructed the Director of Public Prosecutions to charge them with incitement to riot.

It was after the first prosecution was dismissed by the magistrate, before, exceptionally, being reissued by the DPP and added as a separate count to the indictment for trial at the Old Bailey, that Macdonald became involved. He already had a reputation as an activist barrister, albeit being, as he later acknowledged, 'relatively inexperienced at the time'. He was approached by the Barbara Beese, a member of the Black Panthers, asking him to represent her and to advise Howe and Lecointe-Jones in the running of their defence.

Rather than all be represented by lawyers, the activists decided to part represent themselves, with Ian Macdonald the crucial liaison between them and the other defence counsel. Not only did this serve to counter the prejudice of much of the country, who thought that the 'idea of black people actually defending themselves was quite extraordinary', according to Beese, but freed some of the trial from legal niceties, allowing them to more effectively expose the prejudice and politics that underpinned the prosecution.

Howe and the others used the trial to excite political support, the prosecution a metaphor for state sanctioned oppression. They had already built up a groundswell of public support before the trial, speaking at rallies and meetings throughout London and the rest of the country. Howe wrote that they were given 'a terrific send off on the day before… the Old Bailey', support that was mobilised at the trial with protesters massing in their hundreds outside court.

Howe had studied the past prosecutions of black activists in the UK and the USA, and was determined to not follow their failures, where they were unable to reveal the political underpinnings to the prosecutions, constrained by the formalities of criminal trial procedure. Macdonald applied for an all black jury arguing that the accused were entitled to a 'jury of their peers' under Magna Carta following the example of American trials where the Black Panthers sought to rely on the 14th Amendment. As with all claims based on the great charter.

Anticipating the application's failure, Macdonald, Howe and Lecointe-Jones turned their

attention to the jury selection procedure. They used a line of questioning that focused on the jurors' politics to strike out 63. Not only did this ensure that there were two black jurors on the panel, it emphasised that the Mangrove Nine, and Macdonald, were not intending to sit back and defer to the court and its restrictive procedures.

The cross-examination of the officers by Macdonald, Howe and Lecointe-Jones relentlessly peeled back the thin veneer of legal legitimacy which lay over the case. They exposed the prejudice which motivated it, the prosecution entirely rooted in the desire to suppress the politics of the black radicals. Howe, in particular, tied the police witnesses up in knots with Beese later recalling that the prosecution witnesses were 'going down like nine-pins, faced with their contradictions'. Crucially, Howe spotted that four individual officers claimed to see the defendants inciting the police from a surveillance van, yet the viewing panel in the van meant this was simply impossible. Told by one constable that each had an eye to the slit, Howe asked each 'where was your face' – a simple question that highlighted the absurdity of the claim. Summing up, Macdonald told the jury that they were not in Russia, and the Old Bailey was not a 'Star Chamber', where the state could persecute dissidents at will. He turned his fire on Judge Clarke, claiming that he had acted with 'naked judicial tyranny', and telling the jury that the true authority in the courtroom lay not with Clarke, but with them. Such a statement was extraordinary at a time of great deference towards the judiciary, who held near absolute authority in their courtroom.

The jury took a mere eight hours to return their verdict, after a trial that had lasted 55 days. They acquitted all the defendants on the charge of incitement to riot, and acquitted Howe and Lecointe-Jones of all charges. The most astonishing consequence was Judge Clarke's volte-face. He acknowledged that the case had revealed 'evidence of racial hatred' existing within the Metropolitan Police. This was a groundbreaking moment, met with astonishment amongst the establishment, with Maudley beseeching Clarke to withdraw his comments. He refused.

Macdonald did not take star billing in the Mangrove Trial, that went to Howe and the other activists who demonstrated legal acumen and forensic examination skills that belied their experience. He did, however, play an integral and necessary role in the exposure and unravelling of systemic police racism, a role he continued to play throughout his career. The trial was crucial in the shift of public opinion, with the decision of the jury showing that white people were not universally prejudiced, whilst it provided momentum to the black power movement, revealing that not all challenges to the state had to be noble, yet lost causes, but could truly succeed. Macdonald continued to work to counter racism throughout his career, acting for Duwayne Brooks in the Stephen Lawrence Inquiry, and leading an inquiry into racism and violence in Manchester schools in the 1980s. Whilst racism still lurks within public institutions, with ethnic minorities still disproportionately exposed to the worst instincts of some institutions, Macdonald has done much to redress the balance, as Professor Gus John writes here.

Ian Macdonald's work in exposing institutional racism forms only a small part of his enormous role in the development and protection of civil rights in the UK. Beyond this, he laid the foundations of immigration law, publishing Immigration Law and Practice in 1983, providing the blueprint for challenges to the operation of immigration law. He was a special advocate to the Special Immigration Appeals Commission, which heard immigration cases that went to matters of national security, resigning after the House of Lords' decision in Belmarsh, where he felt that his role had become one which lent 'false legitimacy' to a law which was an 'odious blot on our legal landscape'. Macdonald's legacy will live on, his work a permanent tribute to his indefatigable efforts to resist, challenge, and overcome discrimination and prejudice in society.



### 'Oval Four' Convictions Quashed Almost 50 Years After They Were Jailed

*Jon Robins, Justice Gap:* Three men from South London jailed for stealing handbags on the London Underground and assaulting the police have cleared their names after almost half a century after they were convicted. The Court of Appeal has quashed the convictions of Winston Trew, Sterling Christie and George Griffiths following a referral for appeal by the miscarriage of justice watchdog following new information concerning the disgraced police officer who led the arrest. In October Winston Trew spoke to the Justice Gap – see below – saying he was 'cautiously optimistic' that the men would finally clear their names. 'It's affected my life deeply,' he said. 'It cut off my future. I couldn't plan anything.'

The Criminal Cases Review Commission, which has come under fire because of a dramatic collapse in the number of cases it refers to the Court of Appeal, said they were 'delighted for Mr Trew, Mr Christie and Mr Griffiths' known as the 'Oval Four'. The fourth co-defendant has not been traced and is thought to have emigrated from the UK in the 1970s. 'It is a good example of what we do at the CCRC,' said commission chair Helen Pitcher. 'We worked hard on this case, as we do on all our cases, and it is good to see our efforts recognised in this way. The age of this 1970s case created particular challenges and we had to go to great lengths to piece things together because so much of the case material had been destroyed.'

Pitcher said that the CCRC 'sought out these cases' after the conviction of Stephen Simmons for appeal last year based on the misconduct of the same police officer. 'The Commission referred that case to the Court of Appeal and his conviction was quashed in January 2018 as a result of the misconduct of DS Ridgewell who was the lead officer involved in a series of cases which became known as the Stockwell Six, Waterloo Four and Tottenham Court Road Two (see below). The disgraced officer was to plead guilty in 1980 to conspiracy to steal and sentenced to seven years' and died in prison in 1982. 'The passage of time has meant that few if any records survive to help us understand how many similar cases there may be,' Pitcher commented. 'The CCRC would be very glad to hear from anyone who believes they were wrongly convicted where DS Ridgewell was involved.'

Winston Trew, Sterling Christie, George Griffiths and Constantine 'Omar' Boucher were aged between 19 and 23 years when they were approached at the Oval underground station on March 16, 1972 by undercover police officers. According to Trew, the four men were accused of 'nicking handbags' on the tube and given 'a good hiding there to confess to things we didn't do'. The men were arrested, held in jail overnight and claim to have been beaten. They were sentenced to two years' imprisonment which was reduced to eight months on appeal. Talking to the Justice Gap, Winston Trew said he was 'cautiously optimistic' that the men would finally clear their names. 'It's affected my life deeply,' he said. 'It cut off my future. I couldn't plan anything.' Earlier in the year Trew attended the launch event for the last issue of the Justice Gap's Proof magazine at the invitation of the Guardian journalist Duncan Campbell who has written about the case (here). Campbell was on a panel with Patrick Maguire of the Maguire Seven who was just 14 years old when was wrongly convicted along with members of his family. 'I'm glad I spoke to Patrick. He said the devastating experience was with him all the time,' Trew recalled. 'His consciousness mirrors my consciousness. You can't forget it. This could bring some closure.'

As well as the Oval Four case, detective sergeant Derek Ridgewell was the lead police officer involved in a series of cases which became known as the Stockwell Six, Waterloo Four and Tottenham Court Road Two. Ridgewell would typically approach young black men on the tube, accuse them of theft and 'verbal' them – attributing incriminating fictitious remarks to

enable an arrest. The appearance of Ridgewell in the run of similar cases eventually alerted the courts to some malpractice and he was moved to another job investigating mailbag theft. Whilst in this post he collaborated with two career criminals, splitting the proceeds from stolen mailbags. He was sent to jail for this crime in 1980 and he died in prison in 1982.

There have been multiple cases that called into question Ridgewell's credibility but it was not until the case of Stephen Simmons reviewed by the CCRC and quashed by the Court of Appeal last year that a new application in relation to the Oval Four. Simmons was one of three young white men who were sat in a car playing music. They were approached by Ridgewell who accused the men of mailbag theft. All three were arrested, tried and jailed in 1976. After his release, Simmons investigated his conviction. He discovered not only that Ridgewell himself was a convicted mailbag thief but he read about Winston Trew's experience at Oval tube station at the hands of DS Ridgewell in Trew's book Black for a Cause… Not Just Because. After Simmons name had been cleared he said that Ridgewell 'ruined three lives for no reason and I am sure many, many more and if this can help someone else who was also arrested by him then at least something will have been achieved'. After the conclusion of the Simmons case, Trew applied formally to the CCRC for his case to be reviewed. The appeal will only involve Winston Trew and Sterling Christie as the other two members of the Oval Four have left the country and cannot be located. Trew praised the work of the CCRC saying he was 'very impressed' by the quality of the CCRC's investigation. 'They have found out things about Ridgewell that I never knew.' The CCRC said that their decision to refer the case to the Court of Appeal is based on 'a real possibility that the Court will quash the conviction on the basis of new evidence and arguments concerning the integrity of DS Ridgewell'. The CCRC have also stated that they expect the case to be of 'potential significance' for other similar convictions.

Winston Trew recalled his confrontation with the police at Oval tube station as he and his friends returned from a community meeting to discuss the disproportionate amount of young black boys in 'ESN' (educationally subnormal) schools otherwise known as 'sin bins'. 'Because we're were black activists we demanded they showed us their IDs. They must have been taken aback. They grabbed us, pushing, shoving and shouting "Turn out your bloody pockets". The next thing I realized one of them had his hands around my throat trying to choke me.' He also recounted how the four men were beaten up at the police station and forced to sign confessions. 'I refused to sign anything and they came back with a statement from one of the others saying I was trying to pick pockets,' he said. 'I said he didn't do this voluntarily. "You beat him up to make him sign it".' The four men were convicted on 10 to 2 majority. 'Two of the jury didn't believe what they said. But the truth is no match for consistent lies. It was four of us against 11 of them. Since 1973 till now I've been fighting to have my name cleared.

**'News From SAFARI**

A Same-Sex Couple, Ben & Jordan, have been targeted by a vigilante group calling themselves "Yorkshire Child Protectors" (YCP). First, the group pulled them from the car, then falsely accused them of committing paedophilic offences and live-streamed a confrontation between themselves and Ben & Jordan to around 30,000 people. They also, according to Ben, hurled homophobic abuse, calling them 'pooffs' and 'gay nonces'. The group then seized Ben & Jordan's phones from them as they believe they would contain proof of inappropriate communication with their decoy who was pretending to be a child. The police eventually arrived, and the officers took Ben and Jordan's phones. Ben said: "The paedophile was still messaging their decoy while we were standing there and the police had our phones".

This proved that Ben and Jordan were completely innocent. In a statement, the group said: 'We at YCP take responsibility for our part played in these innocent men being arrested, but we won't be taking all the blame." Instead, they blamed the sting on false intelligence from other vigilantes. As far as we are aware, they made no apology for the homophobic abuse they allegedly hurled at Ben & Jordan – which is hate crime. The live-stream was seen by 30,000 people, but their apology would only have reached a tiny minority of that figure. Supt Alan Farrow said: 'There can be nothing more important than the ongoing protection of our children, but this has to be spearheaded by the police and other law enforcement agencies.' SAFARI agrees. If you know a crime is being committed, tell the police, but do not confront the potential culprit. We hope YPC compensate Ben & Jordan for the terrible ordeal they were put through, although we doubt they will. We do not know if the members of YPC involved have faced any charges for their own crimes, including the assault on Ben and Jordan.

*The All-Party Parliamentary Group On Miscarriages Of Justice Ceases* to exist while Parliament is dissolved for the General Election during which there are no Members of Parliament. The website and other communications channels will not be updated until after the election on 12th December 2019. After four oral evidence sessions, the Westminster Commission on Miscarriages of Justice has been continuing with its consideration of written submissions. Further updates will be made in the new Parliament. The report following the inquiry, containing its findings and recommendations, remains set to be published in early 2020.

**Bloody Sunday: Joe Mahon Awarded £250,000 For Injury**

*BBC News:* A man who pretended to be dead after being shot by a British soldier on Bloody Sunday is to receive £250,000 in damages, the High Court has been told. The settlement was reached in Joe Mahon's compensation claim for serious injuries. Mr Mahon was injured in Londonderry in January 1972 when he was aged 16. He is believed to have been hit by the same bullet that claimed the life of another victim. Thirteen unarmed people were killed when members of the Parachute Regiment opened fire during a civil rights demonstration in Derry. More than £3m has now been paid out in a series of settlements and awards made in claims against the Ministry of Defence (MoD) on behalf of those bereaved or injured on what became known as Bloody Sunday. With liability accepted in all cases, proceedings brought by Mr Mahon centred on the level of pay-out. He was shot in the hip and abdomen as he tried to flee gunfire at Glenfada Park. According to his lawyers, he then lay on the ground pretending to be dead.

**Jeremy Bamber Lawyers Challenge CPS Over Withheld Evidence**

*Eric Allison and Simon Hattenstone, Guardian:* Lawyers representing Jeremy Bamber, who is serving a whole life sentence for killing his adoptive parents, sister and her six-year-old twin boys in 1985, have launched a high court challenge to the Crown Prosecution Service for its failure to disclose evidence they say would undermine the safety of his conviction. The statement of facts and grounds, lodged at the high court on Friday 6th December 2019, maintains that the CPS has refused to follow directions made by the court of appeal in 2002 to disclose the sought-after material. It also accuses the CPS of rejecting a report by an eminent ballistics expert appointed by Bamber, without instructing its own expert to challenge the claims.

During the night of 6-7 August 1985, Nevill and June Bamber were shot and killed inside their Essex farmhouse, along with their adoptive daughter, Sheila Caffell, and Sheila's six-year-old twin sons, Daniel and Nicholas Caffell. Bamber, then 24, had phoned the police to say Nevill

had phoned him, saying his sister, Sheila, had "gone crazy and has the gun". Initially, police believed that Sheila, diagnosed with schizophrenia, had fired the shots then turned the gun on herself. But, on 10 August, after the police ended their examination of the crime scene, a relative of Nevill and June Bamber, David Boutflour, found a silencer in the gun cupboard of the farmhouse. It was later said to contain blood belonging to Sheila Caffell. On 7 September 1985, Jeremy Bamber's ex-girlfriend told police Bamber had discussed killing his family with her and that he was involved. On 29 September 1985, Bamber was charged with the murders.

The silencer featured heavily at the trial at Chelmsford crown court the following year with the prosecution contending it was attached to the rifle during the killings. If true, that would have made the rifle too long for Caffell to have shot herself. The trial judge, in his summing up, told the jury: "On the evidence of the silencer alone you may find Mr Bamber guilty." After the jury were sent out to reach a verdict, they returned and asked the judge for clarification on the silencer and blood evidence. The judge said it contained only the blood of Sheila Caffell. Seventeen minutes later, they returned and convicted Bamber by a 10 to two majority. But a week before the trial, the head of biology at Huntingdon Forensic Science Laboratories wrote to Essex police in a letter seen by the Guardian last year, saying the blood on the silencer "could have come from Sheila Caffell or Robert Boutflour", another relative. That letter was not disclosed to the defence. Last year, the Guardian reported on a letter sent to Bamber's lawyers from the then head of special crime at the CPS on this issue. It stated that while he did not believe there was evidence of a second silencer, if any emerged it "would significantly undermine the case against JB [Jeremy Bamber] and any material supporting such a possibility would plainly be material which casts doubt on the safety of the conviction."

Earlier this year a peer-reviewed report compiled by Phillip Boyce, a ballistics expert at Forensic Equity Ltd, was sent to the CPS suggesting there had been more than one silencer. Boyce, who has advised governments and the United Nations on ballistics, concluded that, based on differing groove patterns, sizes and exhibit numbers, "at least two sound moderators had been examined in this case". Boyce believes both silencers contain blood that could belong to either Caffell or Robert Boutflour. The CPS has dismissed his findings, without employing its own expert to study his report, as is the protocol. Last year, the then director of public prosecutions, Alison Saunders, published a revised version of CPS disclosure manual. Saunders concluded: "To maintain public confidence in the criminal justice system, it is essential that the relevant disclosure regime is complied with in every case and all duties performed to a high standard. I hope this manual will continue to offer practical guidance to practitioners and give the lay reader a degree of reassurance that the prosecution team is fully committed to meeting its obligations in this hugely important area."

Speaking from Wakefield prison, Bamber said his requests for disclosure had been ignored for almost 35 years, despite court orders issued in 2002 during his only full appeal that directed complete disclosure to be made. "We are now in a position to show exactly what has been withheld, which amounts to thousands of key files and documents pertaining to, not just the forensic examination of two silencers, but also to my innocence. This repeated non–disclosure means that the truth remains unknown, as the evidence that gives my case clarity still remains hidden," he said. Mark Newby, a solicitor advocate from QualitySolicitors Jordans, which represents Bamber, said: "It is disappointing that the CPS has not agreed to provide material that is needed by an independent expert to support the overwhelming inference that a second silencer was examined during the police and forensic science service investigations. We hope that this can quickly be resolved so that the expert can get on with his job and the case can be put back before the court of appeal in order to correct this very grave miscarriage of justice."



**Rejecting the Brutality at the Heart of Prisons Policy**

Nicholas Reed Langen, Justice Gap: The instinctive reaction to punish prisoners harshly, to deter current and future prisoners through brutal conditions, is a natural one for some. In the aftermath of an attack like last week's London Bridge attack, the desire to exact vengeance from those who have wreaked havoc and devastation is understandable, especially when such an attack seemingly rejects the very notion of rehabilitation. But while an Old Testament-style fire and fury response may appeal to our primitive passions, it is poor policy- unless the aim is to incite more crime, not less.

Learning Together, which was last week celebrating its fifth anniversary until the cries of celebration turned to cries of horror, is a charity which fundamentally rejects the idea that brutality and suffering should lie at the heart of our prisons policy. Imagine struggling to read a letter from your bank. Or looking at the change handed over in Tesco's, unsure if it's right or not. Or applying for a job when you don't have anything to put in the box labelled 'educational qualifications'. Half of the UK's prison population is functionally illiterate. Learning together is premised on the ideal that few are truly beyond redemption, and that all deserve, at least, the opportunity to try and rise above their past actions. Founded at the University of Cambridge in 2015 by Amy Ludlow and Ruth Armstrong, it aspires to change prisoners' lives through education, fulfilling its motto of 'education as the practice of freedom'.

Students at Cambridge and partner universities are encouraged to work with prisoners in courses that range from criminology to literary criticism, developing prisoners' and students' knowledge and skills, whilst giving students awareness of a life which may have been hitherto foreign to them. Ludlow told the Guardian in 2016 that students had found it to be 'the most engaging way they've studied', allowing them to see prisoners as names and faces, rather than mere statistics. Even if few and far between, programmes such as Learning Together and Durham University's Inside-Out recognise that prisoners should not be defined by the label 'criminal'. Instead, they allow inmates to learn and develop, enabling both them and the students with whom they sudy to discover that they are not bound to a single track in life, but have genuine choice.

For inmates on advanced courses like this, the aim is to lay a path to higher education, with modules taken on the Learning Together course accepted as credit towards an undergraduate degree if they pursue one, and Cambridge now offering bursaries to some participants. Other charities offer more foundational work, like the Prisoners' Education Trust, which helps inmates and ex-offenders gain basic qualifications, giving them the opportunity to achieve the credentials and hone the tools necessary to meaningfully participate in society. Admittedly, these courses are labour-intensive and expensive. Yet prison is already hideously expensive, as I have previously written here, as well as woefully inefficient. For nearly half of prisoners, prison is a mere staging post on a ceaseless track, their detention a repeated cost for the state to bear. Currently 46% of all offenders re-offend within a year, whilst those sentenced for less than a year are more likely than not to return to prison.

In contrast, while we do not yet have figures for Learning Together and Inside-Out (which, strictly speaking, target prisoner education, rather than rehabilitation), the Ministry of Justice's own data suggests that prisoners who engage on a learning programme are 10% less likely to reoffend, whilst the Violence Reduction Unit in Scotland has seen a 22% reduction in the rate of re-convictions. Programmes like this may be long-term, but are proven to bear fruit, saving criminals from a lifetime of prison, and would-be victims from the trauma of crime. Many have been quick to point to Umran Khan's participation in the scheme, forgetting that those 'citizen heroes' who bravely challenged

his attack were also participants in it. We should not judge an orchard by a single apple.

Providing meaningful education to those incarcerated is only one step towards developing a just, humane and effective penal policy. Alongside education and rehabilitation, opportunities need to be offered beyond prison, opportunities like those provided by Redemption Roasters, a coffee company which runs its coffee-roasters from Aylesbury Prison, and trains inmates in ‘competition-level barista skills’, employing some in their London coffeeshops. It gives inmates a purpose in prison, and prospects out of it. It is ideas and companies like this which should be implemented wholesale, not ridiculous and embarrassing policies like banning books or making libraries a reward instead of a well-funded, well-manned resource.

Jack Merritt’s father puts our government to shame. In the face of his son’s murder, he personified his spirit, rejecting the shallow, cynical response of the prime minister, and instead wrote for the Guardian about his, and Jack’s, belief in the ‘inherent goodness of humanity’. If Dave Merritt can set aside his pain to champion the need for a better world for those most in need, it behoves us, and the government, to listen to and engage with his words. So far, our prime minister has disappointed. Should he remain in No. 10, let us hope he can do better.

Other charities offer more foundational work, like the Prisoners’ Education Trust, which helps inmates and ex-offenders gain basic qualifications, giving them the opportunity to achieve the credentials and hone the tools necessary to meaningfully participate in society. Admittedly, these courses are labour-intensive and expensive. Yet prison is already hideously expensive, as I have previously written here, as well as woefully inefficient. For nearly half of prisoners, prison is a mere staging post on a ceaseless track, their detention a repeated cost for the state to bear. Currently 46% of all offenders re-offend within a year, whilst those sentenced for less than a year are more likely than not to return to prison.

In contrast, while we do not yet have figures for Learning Together and Inside-Out (which, strictly speaking, target prisoner education, rather than rehabilitation), the Ministry of Justice’s own data suggests that prisoners who engage on a learning programme are 10% less likely to reoffend, whilst the Violence Reduction Unit in Scotland has seen a 22% reduction in the rate of re-convictions. Programmes like this may be long-term, but are proven to bear fruit, saving criminals from a lifetime of prison, and would-be victims from the trauma of crime. Many have been quick to point to Umran Khan’s participation in the scheme, forgetting that those ‘citizen heroes’ who bravely challenged his attack were also participants in it. We should not judge an orchard by a single apple.

Providing meaningful education to those incarcerated is only one step towards developing a just, humane and effective penal policy. Alongside education and rehabilitation, opportunities need to be offered beyond prison, opportunities like those provided by Redemption Roasters, a coffee company which runs its coffee-roasters from Aylesbury Prison, and trains inmates in ‘competition-level barista skills’, employing some in their London coffeeshops. It gives inmates a purpose in prison, and prospects out of it. It is ideas and companies like this which should be implemented wholesale, not ridiculous and embarrassing policies like banning books or making libraries a reward instead of a well-funded, well-manned resource. Jack Merritt’s father puts our government to shame. In the face of his son’s murder, he personified his spirit, rejecting the shallow, cynical response of the prime minister, and instead wrote for the Guardian about his, and Jack’s, belief in the ‘inherent goodness of humanity’. If Dave Merritt can set aside his pain to champion the need for a better world for those most in need, it behoves us, and the government, to listen to and engage with his words. So far, our prime minister has disappointed. Should he remain in No. 10, let us hope he can do better.



### Mckenzie Friends Giving ‘Biased and Misleading’ Advice

*Jemma Slingo, Law Gazette:* McKenzie friends are providing ‘worrying’ advice which is biased against courts and solicitors, a university study has found. According to Leeds Law School and Birmingham City University, McKenzie friends – individuals who support (but must not represent) litigants on a paid or voluntary basis – have advised people to ignore or act against the advice of their lawyers and have suggested that courts are institutionally unfair. The study, conducted by Dr Tatiana Tkacukova and Professor Hilary Sommerlad, looked at online advice provided on 170 Facebook threads by 30 McKenzie friends. It found that online advisers often delivered biased suggestions reflecting personal anti-court and anti-social services views. McKenzie friends described family courts as ‘gender-biased’ and a ‘disgrace’ and, of all the material analysed, only one positive description of a judge was found. On three occasions parents were advised to write their own statement instead of following specialist legal advice. Dr Tkacukova, senior lecturer in English literature at Birmingham City University, said: 'While there are many positive experiences, the unregulated environment online means that our research found several instances of worrying, biased and misleading advice. ‘To help protect the many vulnerable people in these cases, we need to see a move towards a more regulated environment with increased transparency to make sure that people know the information they are accessing and the legal qualifications of those advising them.’ In her inaugural speech as Bar Council chair last week, Amanda Pinto said she was ‘very concerned’ by the rising number of paid McKenzie friends who are ‘unregulated, untrained and yet demand money for their intervention – often from the most vulnerable litigants’. Law Society president Simon Davis said: ‘McKenzie friends are unregulated and the term covers a multitude of informal roles, so there is no centralised data we know of that shows how many people are assisted in this way, but as legal aid cuts bite deeper and more people are forced to deal with legal problems without a solicitor, unscrupulous McKenzie friends may take advantage of an unmet need.’

### Asylum Seeker Wins Claim For Unlawful Prolonged Detention

Aqsa Hussain, Justice Gap: A mentally ill asylum seeker has won a claim against the Home Office as the High Court declared that it was unlawful for him to have been held in detention for a prolonged period of time. The Home Office was ordered to pay £100,000 to the asylum seeker who can only be identified as AKE for legal reasons. AKE, an Iranian national who entered the UK illegally in 2012, suffered from bipolar affective and post-traumatic stress disorder. On being refused asylum and then exhausting his appeal rights, he was detained for two periods between 2015 and 2018 totaling 838 days. AKE was denied treatment to assist with his mental health conditions which the High Court concluded was a breach of the government’s duties under the Equality Act 2010. Rather than allowing AKE to receive the necessary treatment for his mental illness, he was kept isolated at the detention facility. This led to AKE’s mental health deteriorating and he was eventually sectioned under the Mental Health Act after being released from detention. Stephanie Harrison QC, Shu Shin Lush and Anthony Vaughan of Garden Court Chambers noted that “on discharge from hospital, the Home Office imposed bail conditions on AKE even though they had no lawful power to do so and he continued to lack mental capacity to understand and comply with them”. AKE’s solicitor, Hamish Arnott of Bhatt Murphy law firm, said: “It was only by luck that AKE obtained legal assistance toward the end of nearly three years of immigration detention. Without the intervention of a charity, he would have languished in detention for an even longer period, unable to access the help he desperately needed. AKE is yet another example of the need to impose clear statutory limits and criteria on this draconian power.” This decision is in line with previous Court of Appeal judgments which hold that the immigration detention system discriminates against migrants with mental health problems ultimately breaching the Equality Act 2010.

### County Court Trial Waiting Times at 10-Year High

John Hyde, Law Gazette: Delays in civil claims coming to trial have reached a new high for this year, as increasing numbers of county court claims are defended. The latest civil justice statistics, covering the period from July to September, showed that the mean time taken for small claims and multi/fast track claims to go to trial was 38.1 and 59.4 weeks. Both were up around three weeks on the same period in 2018. The statistics reflect the wider trend for this year, as each quarter has recorded longer trial waiting times than the equivalent period in 2018. Indeed, for fast and multi-track claims the waiting time is now approaching the highest time recorded for the past 10 years, with the figure last reaching 59 weeks at the start of 2014. The statistics show 80,000 claims were defended in the third quarter of this year (up 8%) and that 17,000 claims went to trial (up 14%). Judgments increased by 7% in July to September 2019 to 341,000. Between 2010 and 2019, 90 some county courts have closed, out of 240. Campaigners against closures have argued that shutting down courts has put pressure on those that remain and increased delays.

In November, the Public Accounts Committee of the House of Commons said that HM Courts & Tribunals Service had not shown it was doing enough to understand the impact on court and tribunal users before pressing ahead with reforms, increasing the risk that justice outcomes might be affected. Of the claims defended in the third quarter of 2019, 54% had legal representation for both claimant and defendant, 27% had representation for claimant only, and 3% for defendant only. Another longer term trend continued in 2019, according to the civil justice statistics. Personal injury claims were once again down, this time falling 5% to 29,000 in the three-month period.

### CCRC Refers Human Trafficking Case of Ms A to Crown Court

The Commission has referred the conviction of Ms A to the Crown Court in light of a change in law and fresh evidence that she is a victim of human trafficking both into and within the UK, and that it was not in the public interest to prosecute her. On 19 August 2005 Ms A pleaded guilty at Stoke-on-Trent Magistrates' Court to two counts of theft, two counts of dishonestly obtaining communication services, possession of a false instrument (a passport) and obtaining a pecuniary advantage. She was sentenced to a total of 14 months in prison.

Ms A arrived in the UK in 2003 fleeing sexual exploitation and Female Genital Mutilation in her home country of Cameroon. She was arrested in 2005 while working at a phone repair shop. In interview she told police that she had been threatened into using a false passport to get the job and then into stealing customers SIM cards. She was granted asylum in the UK in 2009. In February 2018, after a referral to the National Referral Mechanism (the "NRM"), the Home Office recognised that there were conclusive grounds to believe that Ms A was a victim of trafficking in relation to being trafficked into the UK for sexual exploitation and trafficked within the UK for sexual exploitation and to work as forced labour. Because Ms A pleaded guilty in the magistrates' court in 2005, she did not have an ordinary right to appeal. She applied to the CCRC in relation to her conviction in June 2018. Having reviewed the case in detail, the Commission has decided to refer Ms A's conviction for appeal at the Crown Court. The referral is based on new legal argument relating to a change in the law identified in the case of R v GS [2018] EWCA Crim 1824 and the fresh evidence as to Ms A's trafficked status. Together they give rise to a real possibility that the Crown Court will find that it would be an affront to justice to allow Ms A's original guilty pleas to stand; that the Crown would decide it was not in the public interest to seek a rehearing; and that an attempt to seek a rehearing would stayed by the Crown Court as an abuse of process.



### Is The Public Interest in Deporting Foreign Offenders a 'Fixed Quality'?

*Robin Pickard, Richmond Chambers:* In this post, we consider the approach that the courts have adopted when considering the public interest in deporting foreign offenders. Section 117A(1) confirms that the provisions in Part 5A of the Nationality, Immigration and Asylum Act 2002 apply where a court or tribunal is: "required to determine whether a decision made under the Immigration Acts (a) breaches a person's right to respect for private and family life under Article 8, and (b) as a result would be unlawful under section 6 of the Human Rights Act 1998." Section 117A(2) mandates that the court or tribunal have regard to the considerations in sections 117B (which apply in all cases) and 117C (which apply to cases relating to 'foreign criminals'). These considerations ultimately seek to answer the following question: does the public interest in removing or deporting the individual from the UK outweigh their family life under Article 8?

Is the public interest a fixed quality? The Senior President of Tribunals, Sir Ernest Ryder, delivered the leading judgment in Akinyemi v The Secretary of State for the Home Department [2019] EWCA Civ 2098 (to which Davies LJ and Moylan LJ agreed). The Appellant ("A") is Nigerian. He was born in the UK on 21 June 1983. A was not, however, born British because, as a consequence of legislative changes around the time of his birth, one of his parents was required to have settled status in the UK. Neither of A's parents were settled. A's father became British in 2004; his mother passed away in 1999 [§4]. The Senior President sets out A's offending history at paragraphs 6 to 8 of the determination. The following offences were considered of most significance. First, on 5 July 2007, A was convicted of causing death by dangerous driving (whilst disqualified) for which he was sentenced to four years imprisonment. Secondly, On 31 January 2013, he was convicted of four counts of possession of heroin with intent to supply, as well as other offences, for which he was sentenced to a total of three and a half years' imprisonment. It should also be noted that A suffered from mental health problems and depression from a young age and struggled with the death of his mother when he was aged 14 [§9]. A also has a 'significant history of suicide attempts' [§12].

The decision under appeal: There were several aspects of the Upper Tribunal's ("UT") judgment which were argued and found to be flawed, e.g. A's risk of re-offending [§57]. However, here, we focus on the way that the UT approached the public interest in A's deportation and why that was deemed to be wrong as a matter of law. The UT held at paragraph 25 of their determination that: "The risk of reoffending is not the only, or even the most important factor, to be taken into account in terms of the public interest…the depth of public concern about the facility for a foreign criminal's rights under article 8 to preclude his deportation is a significant factor to be taken into account" (emphasis added).

Discussion: The Senior President sets out at paragraph 39 that: "The correct approach to be taken to the 'public interest' in the balance to be undertaken by a tribunal is to recognise that the public interest in the deportation of foreign criminals has a moveable rather than fixed quality. It is necessary to approach the public interest flexibly, recognising that there will be cases where the person's circumstances in the individual case reduce the legitimate and strong public interest in removal. The number of these cases will necessarily be very few i.e. they will be exceptional having regard to the legislation and the Rules. I agree with the appellant that the present appeal is such a case" (emphasis in original). The Court of Appeal held that, while the public interest will always be in favour of deportation (117C(1)), the public interest is moveable because section 117C(2) states that '[T]he more serious the offence committed by a foreign criminal, the greater is the public interest in deportation of the criminal'

[§45]. It was held that the Supreme Court in Hesham Ali, consistent with the Strasbourg jurisprudence, identified that 'the strength of the public interest will be affected by factors in the individual case, i.e. it is a flexible or moveable interest not a fixed interest' [§50]. The UT was held to have fallen into error by attaching little weight to the fact that A had been in the UK for his entire life and finding that he was unlawfully in the UK [§§40-41]. As A was born in the UK, he did not need leave to enter, and was therefore not unlawfully in the UK as he was not in breach of any immigration obligation by being here. In conclusion, the Court of Appeal states that the UT wrongly 'anchors' its approach to the depth of public concern about allowing A to remain in the UK. The UT did not properly assess the fact that A was born in the UK and lived here all his life when considering the public interest and Article 8 factors [§§52-52].

Comment: This is an important development which shows that the public interest in deporting foreign offenders is not fixed. Instead, it takes its colour from the surrounding circumstances. Where an Appellant has lived their entire lives in the UK and has no real connection with the country to which they are being deported to, it certainly seems just for the public interest weighing in favour of deportation to be reduced.

**Pakistan: Patients Die After Lawyers Storm Hospital Over Dispute With Doctors**

Three heart patients died after an angry mob of lawyers rampaged through a hospital in Lahore in a dispute with lawyers. Some 200 lawyers in their traditional black suits descended upon the Punjab Institute of Cardiology (PIC), destroying windows and doors and setting a police van on fire. Doctors and nurses fled, leaving intensive care patients unattended. "Three patients including an elderly woman died after doctors failed to provide them timely treatment and remained engaged in averting the assault," Punjab provincial health minister Yasmeen Rashid said. Kamran Ali, a Lahore government official, told Reuters that the lawyers attacked the hospital because of an earlier incident in which a doctor beat a lawyer at the hospital after he refused to queue with patients. In particular, they were angry that the doctors filmed the incident and shared it on social media. "This was kind of a high-handedness which none of civilised societies can tolerate," provincial law minister Raja Basharat told AFP. "Several lawyers have been identified from the television footage and the government will deal with all those involved in the attack with an iron hand," Mr Basharat said.

**Prison Failures Led to Death of Chris Carpenter at HMP Woodhill**

The inquest into the death of 34-year-old Chris Carpenter concluded on Thursday 12th December 2019y with the jury finding failures by prison and healthcare staff in the run up to Chris's death on 18th August 2019. Christopher was the last of four men to die in the prison in 2018. The most recent inspection of HMP Woodhill found the prison is 'still not safe enough'. The inquest heard that Chris was recalled to HMP Bullingdon on 18th July, one month after his release on licence. He had a documented history of mental health issues and debts stemming from problems related to drug misuse. He was transferred to HMP Woodhill on 20 July. Concerns were raised with the safer custody team that Chris was vulnerable due to the recent death of his father and may self-harm or take his own life if his mental health deteriorated. The jury heard that there was no evidence that any meaningful safeguards were put in place. The inquest heard from Governor Spellman that at the time Woodhill was experiencing unprecedented levels of Spice use and unprecedented levels of violence. The availability of drugs brought with it a culture of debts, threats and violence.



Chris made numerous attempts to alert prison staff to the threats he was facing including handing them two notes. On 15 August 2018 Chris reported that he had been threatened with a bladed weapon, and even went as far as to name the prisoner who threatened him. A day later he handed prison staff a note stating that he feared for his life, requesting to move to the vulnerable prisoner's unit. No meaningful action was taken despite Chris's clear distress. He was found unresponsive in his cell just two days later as a result of synthetic cannabinoid toxicity. High doses of prescription drugs that were not prescribed to Christopher were also found in his system.

The jury found that Chris death was drug related, they also found that there was 'unsatisfactory risk management of a very vulnerable prisoner'. The jury found failures in: Co-ordinating concerns regarding Chris's welfare; Documenting and sharing information vital to safeguarding Chris; Carrying out necessary searches after reports of threats involving bladed weapons, drug use and drug selling; Reassuring Chris's that appropriate actions to keep him safe were being taken.

Linda Carpenter, Chris's mother, said: "It's utterly disgraceful to know my son was threatened with a blade and no searches or procedure was followed to ensure a basic level of care was given to him." Carole Carpenter, Chris's sister, said: "How many times did my brother have to ask for help before anyone listened, its heart-breaking to know that in his final days he was suffering so much and in distress and no one listened. As a family we believe Chris was attempting to take his own life through all the suffering and distress he was in."

Deighton Pierce Glynn's Jo Eggleton said: "Chris's story is tragically all too familiar and he won't have been the only one under threat at this time. Another who was, Darren Williams, took his own life on 4 January 2019. The jury at his inquest found very similar failings. Evidence at Chris's inquest suggested that everyone was well aware of the problems at the time yet nothing was done to resolve them," Chris's family are represented by Deighton Pierce Glynn's Jo Eggleton and Maya Sikand of Garden Court Chambers.

**Genocide: Humanity on Trial**

Guardian Editorial: Aung San Suu Kyi's decision to personally defend Myanmar in the genocide case at the international court of justice weekending 13th December 2019, has torn away any scant remaining shreds of moral credibility from the figure once lauded as a champion of democracy and the fight against oppression. Yet what is at stake is far more than one woman's reputation. Nor is this even about the six military leaders – including the commander in chief – who UN-appointed investigators last year said should be prosecuted for the "gravest" crimes against civilians, including genocide. This is about the more than 700,000 Rohingya Muslims from Rakhine state forced to flee to Bangladesh since late 2016, the 10,000 who UN investigators believe may have died in the crackdown, and the 600,000 still living in apartheid conditions, denied basic rights. Lawyers for the Gambia, which has brought this case with the backing of the 57-nation Organisation of Islamic Cooperation, laid out the details: the mass shootings, throat slittings, infanticide, torture, rape and burning down of villages, carried out systematically and together amounting to the destruction of the Rohingya as a group, in whole or part. These crimes are well documented.

Even the Nobel peace laureate conceded that "it cannot be ruled out that disproportionate force was used by members of the defence services in some cases in disregard of international humanitarian law, or that they did not distinguish clearly enough between fighters and civilians". But this did not, she argued, amount to genocide. She did not once use the term Rohingya. She dismissed the accusations against Myanmar as an incomplete and fac-

tually misleading account. (Though the "clearance operation" followed attacks by militant groups on security forces, all the evidence points not to a targeted campaign against insurgents, but a pogrom against a people who have suffered decades of discrimination.) She claimed that authorities had held troops to account – yet even when soldiers were jailed for the murder of 10 Muslim men in the village of Inn Din, they were released after less than a year, while two Reuters journalists who exposed the killings served more than 500 days.

Her personal representation of Myanmar has dispelled any lingering hope that she was acting reluctantly as leader of the civilian government in a country where the military still call the shots. The rallies held to celebrate her advocacy reinforce the suspicion that this appearance is designed to boost her popularity ahead of 2020's elections. And while she was defending her country in front of the UN's highest court in the Hague, dozens of Rohingya – including 23 children – were in court in Myanmar for attempting to flee the misery.

To prove genocide requires evidence of intent as well as of atrocities: the bar is high. Even if the court agrees to issue provisional measures to protect the Rohingya, the impact is unclear. The ICJ ordered such measures in 1993; two years later, 8,000 men and boys were massacred at Srebrenica. Myanmar's generals are largely inured to international condemnation. But the reminder that there may one day be consequences for their actions could offer some deterrent to the worst abuses. It could also increase the pressure on the security council to take on the issue. China has received little scrutiny for its role in sheltering Myanmar. This case had to be brought, not only in the hope of offering some protection to the Rohingya, but because – as the court was reminded – what is on trial is not only the state of Myanmar but our collective humanity.

**Santa Won't be Able to Deliver Presents to the UK After Brexit?**

With Christmas, and Brexit, fast approaching, it is a good time to consider how Brexit could affect Santa's annual task of delivering presents to the children in the UK. Santa lives in Lapland, in Finland, so we can presume he is a Finnish and therefore an EU citizen. At the moment he enjoys freedom of movement throughout the EU. He can come to the UK to visit for up to 3 months, and to deliver services as a self-employed person for an unlimited period of time. The UK will not leave the EU until 31 January 2020 at the earliest, so Christmas 2019 will be no problem. Santa's elves can continue making presents in his workshop in Lapland, safe in the knowledge that there will be no customs or immigration barriers preventing delivery of those presents to the UK. At the moment Santa does not need a visa to come to the UK to work; he is not subject to immigration control and can enter at any time (and by any means) without breaking the law. He is required to remain economically active if he wishes to stay for longer than 3 months, and may be required to leave if he is not working or self-sufficient, however he cannot be forced to comply with any additional requirements over and above these prerequisites of EU free movement law.

Christmas 2020 is a little less certain. In the event of a no-deal Brexit on 31 January 2020, EU citizens wishing to come to the UK after that date will be subject to immigration control. Theresa May originally planned that EU citizens would be granted a 3 month visa at the UK border and would need to apply for European Temporary Leave to Remain, which would last for 3 years, before the end of that 3 month period. This would cause a problem from Santa, who tends not to enter the UK through border control. Thankfully, when he took over the leadership of the Conservative party (and by default the country), Boris Johnson changes this.

The current plan is that EU citizens will continue being able to enter the UK without a visa until 31 December 2020 (by which point they will have to have applied for European Temporary Leave to Remain or have left the UK). This won't be a problem for Santa, who is unlikely to hang around in the UK after completing his deliveries. He should, however, keep an eye out for any future changes. This is all just policy so can change (and has changed) at short notice. If the Withdrawal Agreement is concluded, free movement will continue in its current form until 31 December 2020.

So either way Christmas 2020 should hopefully come and go without a hitch. Things are not looking quite so rosy for Christmas 2021. By this time the transitional period will have ended and the UK's new immigration system will be in place. Santa will need a visa to come to the UK. If he enters the UK in the usual way, in his sleigh pulled by reindeer, he'll be guilty of a criminal offence and could be sent to prison for up to 6 months. Avoiding border control and entering the UK by other means is not permissible. There are exceptions for people who are members of the crew of a ship or aircraft. However these provisions would be of no use to Santa as they do not permit the crew to deliver goods once in the UK. There's also no provision for reindeer sleighs.

To avoid committing the criminal offence of illegal entry, Santa would need to be granted a UK visa allowing him to enter the UK. The most appropriate visa would probably be a visit visa. In order to obtain a visit visa, he would need to enter the UK through an air or sea port and speak to an Immigration Officer (or pass through an e-gate). Gone are the days of flying through the skies, landing on rooftops, and sliding down chimneys. The reindeer will need to stay at home after Brexit.

Entry as a visitor is far from guaranteed. Work is generally prohibited with a visit visa. However some "business activities" are permitted, providing no payment will be received from a UK source for the activities. One such activity is "a driver on a genuine international route delivering goods or passengers from abroad to the UK". However the visit visa rules require the driver to be "employed outside the UK". Santa has no employer. He's his own boss. So entry under this category would be uncertain. There are no other suitable visa categories. So Santa will need to hire a UK based distributor or courier company to deliver the presents around the UK (or perhaps send an elf, who would be an employee). All of these options would incur additional expense. Santa may just have to miss out the UK after Brexit.

What about the presents? All of this just concerns Santa's ability, as a self employed person, to enter the UK for a short period to deliver the presents. I haven't even got to the restrictions on the presents. Santa would need to hire a trade lawyer for that. Needless to say, once the free movement of goods comes to an end, all of the presents would have to pass through UK customs and any import tariffs paid. The precise details will depend on what, if any, future trade deal is agreed between the UK and the EU (the Withdrawal Agreement covers only the process of leaving the EU, we haven't event started negotiating the agreement which will govern our future relationship!). After Brexit Santa, and any other EU citizen who wants to deliver goods to the UK, can no longer be sure that they will be able to do so without restrictions. This is what happens when you bring an end to free movement of goods and people. Never mind though, on the upside we will have "taken back control" – whatever that means!

Serving Prisoners Supported by MOJUK: Giovanni Di Stefano, Naweed Ali, Khobaib Hussain, Mohibur Rahman, Tahir Aziz, Roger Khan, Wang Yam, Andrew Malkinson, Michael Ross, Mark Alexander, Anis Sardar, Jamie Green, Dan Payne, Zoran Dresic, Scott Birtwistle, Jon Beere, Chedwyn Evans, Darren Waterhouse, David Norris, Brendan McConville, John Paul Wooton, John Keelan, Mohammed Niaz Khan, Abid Ashiq Hussain, Sharaz Yaqub, David Ferguson, Anthony Parsons, James Cullinene, Stephen Marsh, Graham Coutts, Royston Moore, Duane King, Leon Chapman, Tony Marshall, Anthony Jackson, David Kent, Norman Grant, Ricardo Morrison, Alex Silva,Terry Smith, Hyrone Hart, Warren Slaney, Melvyn 'Adie' McLellan, Lyndon Coles, Robert Bradley, Thomas G. Bourke, David E. Ferguson, Lee Mockble, George Coleman, Neil Hurley, Jaslyn Ricardo Smith, James Dowsett, Kevan & Miran Thakrar, Jordan Towers, Patrick Docherty, Brendan Dixon, Paul Bush, Alex Black, Nicholas Rose, Kevin Nunn, Peter Carine, Paul Higginson, Robert Knapp, Thomas Petch, Vincent and Sean Bradish, John Allen, Jeremy Bamber, Kevin Lane, Michael Brown, Robert William Kenealy, Glyn Razzell, Willie Gage, Kate Keaveney, Michael Stone, Michael Attwooll, John Roden, Nick Tucker, Karl Watson, Terry Allen, Richard Southern, Jake Mawhinney, Peter Hannigan.