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 811 (16/09/2020) - Cost £1

England's Criminal Justice System Was on its Knees Long Before Coronavirus

Mike McConville, Luke Marsh, Guardian: The effects of court closures and cuts to support services and legal aid since 2010 are coming home to roost. If there is truth in the aphorism that "justice delayed is justice denied", the current backlog of criminal cases in England and Wales should leave us wondering about the capacity of the courts to deliver justice at all. The pandemic has dealt a blow to an already enfeebled legal system. Cuts to legal aid have forced lawyers to compete over a reduced amount of work and pushed some solicitors' firms and barristers' chambers to the brink of closure. With trials suspended, criminal courts have ramped up the use of digital hearings. This has violated the fundamental concept of open justice by preventing public access to court hearings, even in cases that decide whether a person should be held in custody or released on bail.

Some 550,000 cases currently await court, including more than 40,000 serious cases scheduled for the crown court. But although these numbers have grown as a result of Covid-19, the virus is far from the main culprit behind this backlog. Even with the promise of emergency "Nightingale courts", priority will be given only to the most serious cases, while the rest gather dust elsewhere for up to a year or two. Some may never see a courtroom at all. As with all frontline workers during this crisis, the decimation of the legal profession should concern us all.

The government's efforts to salvage its reputation during the pandemic have provided cover to its pursuit of a stripped-down justice system that threatens to jeopardise the rights of individuals and offers cold comfort to victims. Invoking wartime emergency procedures, the justice secretary, Robert Buckland, recently proposed allowing crown court cases to be heard by juries of seven rather than 12 members, and for less serious cases to be heard without a jury at all. These proposals were sidelined following widespread condemnation, but remain on life-support with judicial backing, not least from former lord chief justice and first president of the supreme court, Lord Phillips, who supported the introduction of judge-only trials because "the alternative of rising delays to trials is horrible". Indeed, as the backlog of cases increases, the top echelons of the legal profession have warned of a disturbing risk: that victims might be driven to take matters into their own hands, resorting to vigilante justice meted out in desperation on those believed to have escaped the reach of the law. But in the midst of this crisis, it's easy to miss the bigger picture and mistake the virus as the cause of a breakdown of criminal justice. The truth is that the wheels of this system had come off long before Covid-19.

Backlogs of the most serious cases have been a staple of the crown court for much more than a decade. Although the case queue is spilling over 40,000, this number was exceeded every year from 2005 to 2011; it reached almost 50,000 in 2013, and exceeded that figure in both 2014 and 2015. The backlog has continued to escalate despite the number of cases sent to the crown court actually decreasing every year since 2015 – clear evidence that the system was falling to its knees long before the virus started to spread. The picture is little different in magistrates' courts. Year on year, the figure for "outstanding" cases (in other words, a backlog) has hovered almost consistently around 300,000. But the coalition-era policy of centralisation, which involved the large-scale axing of magistrates' courts from 2010, has led to this backlog ballooning to some 500,000 cases.

Covid-19 has not triggered a legal pandemic. What has happened is that government policies have eroded the capacity of the criminal justice system to meet the demands of prosecuting criminal cases, let alone the pile-up caused by a pandemic. Our focus shouldn't be on Nightingale courts and other short-term measures, welcome those they might be. Instead, the spotlight should fall on long-term policies that have decimated an entire system. The centralisation of the justice system has been accompanied by a stark reduction in court support services and administrative facilities. Prior to the pandemic, large numbers of trials were unable to proceed due to the lack of administrative support staff and consequently empty courtrooms. Between 2010 and 2019, eight crown court centres closed, while magistrates' courts have been cut down; where there were 900 in 1970, there are presently just 156.

Cuts to justice have now reached towering levels. A recent Bar Council report noted that spending on legal aid per person had reduced by 37% between 2010 and 2019, putting Britain in pole position for the largest reduction in justice spending in Europe. And in the last 12 months, 10% of criminal defence firms have collapsed, helped in part by the pandemic. Some areas of the country now have no criminal defence firms at all. At the same time, the pressure of mounting caseloads on criminal prosecutors and courts has been used by state officials and judicial policymakers as cover for the introduction of managerial policies designed to undercut jury trials and create a guilty plea culture. The ambition of those at the helm of the criminal justice system appears to be to turn the colloquial expression "the jury's out" into "the jury's out for good".

This wreckage is destructive to all of our civil rights, and will weaken the capacity of citizens to hold the state to account. The agencies central to the criminal justice system have been continually enfeebled. Judges have been forced by custody limits to release untried defendants. Defence lawyers are depleted in numbers and debilitated by a struggle for survival. There's a growing sense that the fight against crime is being lost to the slow corrosion of a demoralised, enervated system. The story of criminal justice is not one about case backlogs, as unacceptable as they are, nor about people taking the law into their own hands to guarantee that justice, as they see it, is carried out. It's about deliberate decisions, jointly sponsored by politicians and senior judges, which will ensure that criminal justice is not done, but that it is done in.

Why We Need to Rethink the Way We Use 'BAME'

Susu Hagos, Each Other: Use of the acronym BAME – which stands for black, Asian and minority ethnicity – has skyrocketed with the onset of the pandemic and the resurgent Black Lives Matter movement. But what began partly as a category to help identify racial discrimination is now being used to hide it, writes Susu Hagos. BAME is the umbrella term often used by politicians and the media to refer to the 14% of the UK population which does not identify as "white". As a black woman, I feel as though it's a term used to talk more about us, rather than a term I identify with as an individual. It is clearly important to recognise how people from minority ethnicities in the UK are often seen and treated differently and face unique obstacles. This is where the term BAME has a place – it's an acknowledgment of discrimination, prejudice and a way to ensure there is representation and diversity reflective of society in workplaces and institutions. It has a specific function on those limited occasions when it's appropriate to talk about all minority ethnic groups in general.

However, it is too often used to lump us all together as one seemingly homogenous group, hiding the unique obstacles different communities face. A recent YouGov poll exploring BAME experiences in Britain revealed that 74% of respondents had been asked where they were "really from", whilst 65% have had a racial slur said directly to them. There is clearly a widely shared experience of racism among people from minority ethnic backgrounds, yet disparities in other factors of life vary

greatly. Not only are Black Caribbean pupils three times more likely to be excluded from school than other pupils – they're also twice as likely to be excluded than their Black African counterparts.

"There is strength in solidarity and our shared experiences as people from minority ethnic backgrounds must unite us in striving for change. But we must also recognise the nuances and differences in the injustices our communities face". The term BAME has been used extensively when discussing the unequal impact of Covid-19. Public Health England's August report found that people from Bangladeshi backgrounds had double the risk of dying from the virus compared to those who are white. Meanwhile people of "Chinese, Indian, Pakistani, Other Asian, Black Caribbean and Other Black ethnicity" had between 10 and 50% higher risk of death. A separate analysis published by the Institute of Fiscal Studies in May found people of Black Caribbean descent had the most disproportionate risk of dying from Covid-19 in England's hospitals. It also found people of Chinese heritage were dying at a lower rate than white British people. These figures illustrate how Covid-19 has also not impacted all "BAME" communities equally.

The word BAME also appears to have increasingly become a way of portraying workplaces as fair and diverse, when really black voices are absent. In June, Sky News quizzed health secretary Matt Hancock on the lack of black ministers in the Cabinet. He replied that there are a "whole series of people from a black, Asian and minority ethnic background," pointing to chancellor Rishi Sunak and home secretary Priti Patel, who both trace their heritage to India. When pressed on the absence of black members specifically, he goes on to say that what really matters is "a diversity of thought". It is an example of how BAME discourse can be used to silence, rather than serve, black communities.

BAME and black are not interchangeable. There is strength in solidarity and our shared experiences as people from minority ethnic backgrounds must unite us in striving for change. But we must also recognise the nuances and differences in the injustices our communities face. Overuse and misuse of the word BAME can be regressive, particularly whilst trying to discuss issues that disproportionately hinder the black community. A phrase with roots in holding institutions accountable is being turned into a loophole of ambiguity that allows for those in power to shirk responsibility and trivialise the adversity we face. We must be mindful and limit our use of the word BAME, instead referring to different communities by their name.

Unconvicted: Custody Time Limit to be Increased to Ease Court Case Backlog in England

Jamie Grierson, Guardian: Unconvicted defendants awaiting trial in prison face longer stints behind bars, as ministers plan to increase custody time limits to ease the pressure of a rising backlog of court cases, the Guardian understands. The coronavirus lockdown temporarily halted jury trials in March and despite the government creating "nightingale" courts there are more than 500,000 cases yet to be heard in magistrates and crown courts, an increase of about 100,000 on pre-pandemic levels. In July a crown court judge ordered that a suspected drug dealer be released from prison because the shortage of courtrooms meant his trial was unlikely to be heard until next year. The Guardian understands the custody time limit is to be increased from six months to eight months through secondary legislation to be laid on Monday. Prosecutors are able to apply for custody time limits to be extended but it is in a judge's power to refuse an application. The Ministry of Justice did not respond to requests for comment.

David Lammy, the shadow justice secretary, said: "Rather than deal with the backlog they helped create through a decade of cuts and court closures, the government has been forced to increase the amount of time unconvicted defendants spend locked up. As a result, justice will be further delayed

for the victims of crime, as well as defendants. "This is the result of the government's incompetence and complete failure to address the crisis in our courts that Labour has been warning about for months." The move will raise questions about the impact on prisoner numbers. The MoJ has been reducing the number of inmates held in jail as part of its approach to managing coronavirus across the estate. The total number of prisoners held in England and Wales is about 4,000 lower than in March. But any move to increase the amount of time prisoners are held on remand is likely to slow down the rate at which the total prison estate is reducing. In a rare criticism of the government in July, one judge, Keith Raynor, said: "Many defendants in custody will not be tried until well into 2021." He was speaking at Woolwich crown court during a hearing regarding Richard Graham, 49, who was arrested in December and charged with drug offences. His trial had been due to start in May. Refusing a third extension to Graham's custody, Raynor said the lack of available courts was not a good enough reason to keep him in prison.

Plaques Commemorate Women Accused of Witchcraft

Claire Mitchell, Scottish Legal News: Thousands of women who were executed from the 16th to 18th centuries after being accused of witchcraft have been commemorated at an event in Fife. Three plaques along the Fife trail were unveiled at the ceremony to commemorate the accused women of Culcross, Torryburn and Valleyfield. It is estimated that 380 Fifers, most of them women, were accused of practising black magic between the 16th and 18th centuries and many were subjected to imprisonment, torture and brutal death sentences. Across Scotland, it is thought that around 5,000 women were accused of black magic and witchcraft. The event was organised by the Remembering the Accused Witches of Scotland (RAWS) group, and featured speeches from Lindsey Marchant, Councillor Kate Stewart and Claire Mitchell QC. Ms Mitchell said: "We don't have a central point of saying we're sorry for what we've done or recognising it, or acknowledging it in any way. "I want a pardon for the women who had been convicted as witches, I want an apology for those that had been accused that never made it for whatever reason to trial, some of whom died while they were being tortured. "And also a national memorial, some sort of national statue or something of the like where people understand and see what has happened in the past."

Police to Drop 'Domestic Extremism' Label to Describe Protest's

Ellie Williams-Brown, Justice Gap: The police have finally dropped the term 'domestic extremism' after critics have accused them of rebranding lawful protest by using the phrase to capture a wide range of campaigning activity. The National Police Coordination Centre, which oversees the deployment of police officers to large scale events and in times of national crisis, has confirmed that it will no longer use the term. Its decision comes 12 months after a similar decision by the Home Office (here). A freedom of information request by the campaigning group Netpol, the Network for Police Monitoring, has confirmed the policy change. You can read more on Netpol's site here. The NPoCC have told Netpol that the counter terrorism policing headquarters will be looking for new terminology.

'Domestic extremism' has been used to justify police surveillance on people, many of whom have not been arrested. In January 2019, The European Court of Human Rights in Strasbourg ruled police were not justified in retaining and compiling records of 94-year-old peaceful protester, John Catt. The Court ruled the records on a database of 'domestic extremisms' were unnecessary, violating Catt's human rights, and that the database lacked safeguards to protect protesters' rights. The abandonment of 'domestic extremism' follows criticisms that the term was slippery without a clear, legally binding definition. The vagueness of 'domestic extrem-

ism' has left it open to differing, subjective interpretations. MI5's website, which no longer contains the term, previously defined 'domestic extremism' as 'individuals or groups that carry out criminal acts in pursuit of a larger agenda' who 'may seek to change legislation or influence domestic policy and try to achieve this outside of the normal democratic process'.

Netpol criticised the lack of clarity around 'criminal acts' and 'normal democratic process', claiming the definition failed to acknowledge direct action protest's role in democratic process and the implied ignorance of the differences between civil disobedience and more serious forms of criminal activity. The group suggested its broadness has allowed the police to use the definition as it suits them. Netpol has run a 'Protest is Not Extremism' campaign to highlight its concern that the has been assigned to campaigns using civil disobedience or direct action tactics which do not break the law. Netpol claims the term 'extremist' is consequently given to campaigns who are not undertaking unlawful actions.

The term was given to Green Party peer Jenny Jones and comedian Mark Thomas. The Guardian revealed in January 2020 that counter-terrorism police labelled Extinction Rebellion (XR) as an extremist ideology, bundling Greenpeace, and Stop the Badger Cull with extremist right wing groups, such as the National Front. This labelled the non-violent groups the same as the National Action group, banned for terrorist violence in December 2016, under the Terrorism Act 2000. A letter to the Guardian in 2019 from 152 campaigners, lawyers, politicians, and journalists demanded 'domestic extremism' no longer be used to categorise protest activities. The list included John Catt, Kate Hudson from the Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament, and the co-founder of Extinction Rebellion, Dr Gail Bradbrook.

Pat Finucane: UK Government Pressed Over Murder Probe

The UK government has been asked how it intends to comply with a Supreme Court ruling for a probe into the murder of Belfast solicitor Pat Finucane. The Committee of Ministers of the Council of Europe has demanded "concrete information" by 22 October. Mr Finucane was shot by loyalist paramilitaries in front of his young family at their home in February 1989. In 2019, the Supreme Court ruled there had not been a human rights-compliant inquiry into his death. A UK government spokesperson says it is committed to "taking forward these important issues as soon as possible". The Committee of Ministers is a decision-making body made up of the ministers for foreign affairs of the 47 member states of the Council of Europe.

'Run Out of Patience' The committee issued an eight-point document, which included a call that it was "urgent that the authorities take such a decision without further delay" over the Finucane probe. A general measure further expressed concern at the "lack of detail" in the government's approach to mechanisms to deal with the past. Mr Finucane's widow Geraldine welcomed the statement, saying it was "disappointing the UK government must be compelled in this way". "It would appear that the Committee of Ministers has now run out of patience and, like me, is demanding clear answers," she added. Geraldine Finucane has been involved in a long-running legal battle over her husband's murder

Dublin's Minister of Foreign Affairs Simon Coveney has welcomed the decision in relation to both the Pat Finucane murder and the wider issue of legacy cases. The Irish government said it was a "matter of significant and increasing concern" that the legislation to implement the Stormont House Agreement framework to deal with Troubles-related cases has not been progressed. "Victims and survivors have had to wait for far too long for a suitable and effective system in Northern Ireland to deal with the legacy of the Troubles," the government said.

Mr Finucane was a high-profile solicitor and convicted members of the IRA were among

his clients. In February 2019, the Supreme Court judges said none of the inquiries into Mr Finucane's death, including the review carried out by Sir Desmond de Silva, had the capability "of establishing all the salient facts" about his killing or the liability of those who were responsible for his death. In his 2012 review, Sir Desmond de Silva QC said the state had facilitated Mr Finucane's killing and made relentless efforts to stop the killers being caught. However, his report concluded there had been "no overarching state conspiracy".

UK Government Told Keep Pseudoscientific Polygraph Tests Out of Scotland

John Finnie, Scottish Legal News: The Scottish Greens have told the UK government to keep their polygraph tests out of Scotland's legal system following reports that 'Jeremy Kyle' lie detector tests could be rolled out across the UK for convicted terrorists. A review of terror legislation has recommended the polygraph tests – despite the fact they are widely regarded to be pseudoscientific. Polygraph technology is most widely used in the US. Justice spokesman John Finnie said: "Amnesty International have rightly expressed serious concerns about the use of these tests, which are already used by officers in England and Wales. There is no evidence that they work, and there are books published about how to fool these tests.

"Scotland has always had a separate legal system, and the Tories have no mandate to meddle with it in this way. If UK ministers are so confident in the efficacy in this disproven method, they should take the test themselves over their claims on NHS spending and their intentions to dismantle devolution and hand Boris Johnson a veto over our parliament." Justice Secretary Humza Yousaf tweeted: "We don't use 'Jeremy Kyle' polygraph tests in our Justice system in Scotland, never have. UK Govt Ministers want power to introduce them in Scotland without consent of Scot Govt & Parliament. "This measure won't keep us safe." He added: "What's worrying is UK Govt want to be able to bypass Scottish Parliament & Govt & have power to introduce polygraph tests in our justice system without our consent – justice is devolved (hence why they would need an LCM)."

MPs Accused Ministers of 'Demonising' Asylum Seekers 'Stoking' Racial Tensions

Zaki Sarraf, Justice Gap: MPs accused the ministers of 'demonising' asylum seekers, 'stoking' racial tensions and using 'Trumpian' language. In a debate about migrants crossing the channel on Wednesday 3rd September, the government was criticised for its approach to migrants fleeing conflict five years after the death of the Syrian toddler Alan Kurdi on a Turkish beach. Boris Johnson expressed sympathy for those 'so desperate as to put their children in dinghies' but went on to condemn the act as criminal and 'undermining the legitimate claims of others who would seek asylum in this country'. 'That is why we will take advantage of leaving the EU by changing the Dublin regulations on returns and we will address the rigidities in our laws that make this country, I'm afraid, a target and a magnet for those who would exploit vulnerable people in this way,' the prime minister said. Johnson was speaking prior to an urgent question on small boat crossings from the shadow home secretary, Nick Thomas-Symonds. Immigration minister Chris Philp told MPs that there was 'a completely unacceptable increase' in illegal migration through such crossings from France to the UK and said that the government was 'working relentlessly' to stop migrants making the journey. He pointed out that 24 people had been convicted and jailed for facilitating illegal immigration. Philip also said that France was a safe country and that 'genuine asylum seekers' should be claiming asylum in the first safe country they reach.

Several MPs made reference to the Home Office's criticism of 'activist lawyers' last week.

'Does [Chris Philp] understand that Trumpian language like that and other comments in the Chamber today risk stoking further divisions and tensions?' asked Alan Brown, SNP MP. Brown continued on: 'Will he apologise for demonising both asylum seekers and lawyers acting on their behalf in saying that they were trying to "undermine" the rule of law.' Dehanna Davison, Conservative MP, claimed that legal returns of illegal migrants were 'frustrated by activist lawyers putting in last-minute challenges' and that they were 'happy to see taxpayers' money wasted.' Philp agreed that 'activist lawyers' were intentionally lodging cases at the last minute to frustrate returns. Stuart McDonald, SNP MP, asked the minister to confirm whether there is anything in international law which obligates asylum seekers to seek asylum in the first safe country they reach. In response, the minister stated that safe routes from Europe was not the answer because Europe is already safe. However, Philip did not comment on whether there is anything in international law necessitating asylum seekers to stay in the first safe country. The Green MP Caroline Lucas pointed out that people have a right to apply in any country they choose 'and family reunion is supposed to take precedence'. 'I would like him to correct that when he replies,' she said. Later, in response to a question about the current safe routes, Philp stated that safe routes already exist, including the Gateway Resettlement Scheme, the Dubs scheme, applying for asylum in-person after arriving in the UK with a visa.

Voyeur Sentenced After Woman's Five-Year Campaign

Michael Buchanan, BBC News: A man has been sentenced for filming a naked woman in a hotel room while she was unconscious, following her five-year campaign for justice. Christopher Killick, 40, recorded a 62-second clip of Emily Hunt in an east London hotel in 2015. Prosecutors told Ms Hunt what he did was not illegal, until the law was clarified by the Court of Appeal. Killick, who previously pleaded guilty to voyeurism, was given a 30-month community order and fined £2,000. At a Stratford Magistrates' Court hearing, he was also ordered to pay Ms Hunt £5,000 in compensation and put on the sexual offenders register for five years. Christopher Killick was given a 30-month community order and fined £2,000

Ms Hunt, a New York-born former PR executive, said she had no recollection of how she ended up in the Town Hall Hotel in Bethnal Green in May 2015. She maintains she was drugged and raped. Killick, from Brent, north-west London, was initially arrested on suspicion of rape, but police dropped the case due to a lack of evidence. The 40-year-old had always claimed the encounter was consensual and no prosecution for rape was ever brought against him. During the course of their investigation, officers discovered the video of Ms Hunt, which Killick told police he had filmed for his own sexual gratification.

On six separate occasions the Crown Prosecution Service (CPS) told Ms Hunt what had happened was not illegal. But in January, judges considering a separate case at the Court of Appeal ruled that filming a partner during sex without their consent is voyeurism and Killick was subsequently charged. In her victim impact statement, Ms Hunt told the court his actions "ruined my life" and the case had been "profoundly disturbing, debilitating and ultimately devastating".

What Does The Law Say About Voyeurism? In law in England and Wales, a person has committed an act of voyeurism if they: • Observe for their own sexual gratification someone else "doing a private act" • Know the other person does not consent to being observed. The law also says you have committed a voyeurism offence if you film someone "doing a private act" without consent. Because Emily Hunt's encounter with the man who filmed her was deemed consensual, the CPS said she had consented to being observed naked and this extended to filming. In other words, you don't have a

reasonable expectation to privacy when with a consensual partner. But Ms Hunt maintains she didn't ever give consent and was raped, but the police dropped the case due to lack of evidence.

In January, during a different case, the Court of Appeal clarified that someone should not be filmed doing "a private act" without consent, even if the person filming was the consensual partner. Effectively, even if you are having consensual sex with someone, it does not entirely remove the expectation of privacy from that person when it comes to filming them.

This decision meant that Ms Hunt had the legal grounds to pursue her case against Killick. Speaking about her five-year battle for justice, Ms Hunt - who has waived her right to anonymity - told the BBC that the CPS had "behaved in an appalling manner". "It's just inexcusable. We deserve better, we deserve a criminal justice system and a prosecution service that believes that violent criminals belong in jail." She said that since January's ruling she had been contacted about similar cases to hers, adding that now "somebody was taking this seriously from the beginning and treating the victim like a victim" that this was "the biggest win". A CPS spokesperson said: "We recognise the delays in bringing this case to court have had a lasting impact on the victim. "This is a complex area of law, which was clarified for the first time in the Court of Appeal this year... the CPS does not make or decide the law; that is the remit of Parliament and the courts respectively."

Dangerous Drivers Causing Death Could Face Life Imprisonment Under New Plans

Zoe McDonnell, Scottish Lega News: Drivers across the UK should take note of a proposal on the sentencing of dangerous drivers who cause death discussed at the UK Parliament on 21 July 2020. Former Prime Minister Theresa May MP secured permission to present a Private Member's Bill to increase the maximum sentence for causing death by dangerous driving from 14 years to life imprisonment. Second reading for this bill - when MPs will debate its key themes and principles - is scheduled for 16 October 2020 in the House of Commons. The criminal offence of dangerous driving is defined as driving in a way which falls far below what would be expected of a competent and careful driver where it would be obvious to a competent and careful driver that driving in that way would be dangerous. Dangerous driving can include falling asleep at the wheel, accidentally pressing the accelerator instead of the brake, ignoring road signs or signals, racing, and being distracted by using a mobile phone.

The Sentencing Council for England & Wales implemented sentencing guidelines for causing death by dangerous driving in August 2008, giving a range of two years to the current UK statutory limit of 14 years imprisonment. These guidelines distinguish between three levels of seriousness and provide for each level a starting point and range of sentences. The guidelines also set out aggravating and mitigating factors. Aggravating factors include previous road traffic convictions, causing multiple deaths and failing to stop at the scene. Mitigating factors can include the offender also sustaining very serious injury and having a close relationship with the deceased. Scottish judges have regard to these guidelines but do not follow them mechanistically due to the different sentencing regime north of the border. A sentence of nine years and four months imprisonment was imposed in England on a 23 year old driver after he killed a four year old girl and caused serious injury to her grandmother in a "hit and run" incident in 2017. The offender was driving without a licence and had mounted a pavement when driving at excessive speed.

The Scottish Sentencing Council, established in 2015, is undertaking research with a view to implementing its own guidelines on causing death by dangerous driving. This Scottish body issued its first guidance - on the principles and purposes of sentencing - in 2018, stipulating that sentences should be fair and proportionate and that the purpose of a sentence may include protecting the public, rehabilitating offenders and allowing them to make amends,

punishing the offender and expressing disapproval of the offending behaviour. Examples of Scottish sentences for causing death by dangerous driving in the years 2007 - 2017 include three community-based rather than custodial sentences. In one of those cases, a 29 year old mother of two young children received a community payback order requiring 300 hours of unpaid work. Her defence counsel argued that custody would breach her family's right to a private and family life in terms of the European Convention on Human Rights. She was the main caregiver and due to the impact that a custodial sentence would have on her children, their schooling and the family's finances, a non-custodial sentence was deemed appropriate.

Two other Scottish examples in recent years are worth reflecting on. Two years imprisonment was the sentence imposed upon a 60 year old man who pled guilty to causing death by dangerous driving after falling asleep and crashing his van into a car parked on the hard shoulder killing a person inside the car. The offender expressed genuine remorse and accepted entire responsibility though explained that he was under considerable pressure from his employer to meet delivery targets. 12 years imprisonment was the sentence imposed upon a 27 year old man convicted of causing death by dangerous driving after he drove a Maserati hire car on the wrong side of the road at "ridiculously excessive speed", killing the driver of an oncoming van in a head-on crash. The offender had been drinking alcohol for eight hours before driving and, in the judge's assessment, not only showed no remorse but gave evidence in court with "staggering arrogance."

70 per cent of respondents to a UK government consultation thought the maximum sentence should be increased to life imprisonment. If this becomes law, how it will be addressed by the Scottish Sentencing Council and how many cases there will be where the offence is so serious that the principles and purposes of sentencing can only be met by a life sentence remain to be seen.

Ireland: Defendants With Delayed Trials to be Able to Apply for Compensation

Scottish Lega News: Defendants in Ireland who face unreasonable delays to their criminal trials will be able to apply for compensation under planned legislation, according to reports. The European Convention on Human Rights (Amendment) Bill is currently being drafted by the Department of Justice in response to a European Court of Human Rights judgment in 2010, The Irish Times reports. The European Court held in McFarlane v Ireland that the Irish state was in breach of article 6 (right to a fair trial) of the ECHR because there was no effective remedy for a breach of the constitutional right to reasonable expedition. There is no clear timescale for the new legislation, but there is concern that the backlog of criminal trials caused by the COVID-19 pandemic could lead to a slew of compensation claims once it is in place.

Great Scottish Witch Hunt of 1597

Lauren Brown, Scottish Legal News: Between March and October 1597, Scotland was gripped by witchcraft hysteria. Around 400 people were tried for witchcraft and 200 are believed to have been executed. The number of people accused was double that of those unfortunates who were accused during the infamous Salem witch trials of 1692-1693, immortalised in Arthur Miller's The Crucible. These trials marked the beginning of the large-scale witch hunt phenomenon in Scotland, paving the way for a further three 'great' witch hunts. Amongst them, the trials of 1661-1662 in which 660 people were accused of witchcraft. It is estimated that 4,000 Scots were executed for the 'crime' of witchcraft. Most were horrifically tortured to secure confessions.

The trials of 1597 were markedly different from those that had preceded them in 1590. The 1590 'North Berwick' trials implicated over 70 people in the East Lothian area and were personally overseen by King James VI. These trials marked the stirrings of an anti-witch movement in Scotland, but the Great Witch Hunt of 1597, which followed the publication of the King's anti-witchcraft book Daemonologie the previous year, ushered in an era of regular witch trials across many communities.

The political conflict between the King and the Presbyterian church, alongside outbreaks of plague and famine, may have been the catalysts for the witch hunts. Historian Julian Goodare has revealed that many Scottish people believed that, by carrying out witch trials, they would earn God's favour and facilitate an end to famine and plague. One documented case from Aberdeenshire is of Isobel Skuddie. She was accused of gathering human bones to create love charms. Convicted of witchcraft, she was subsequently burned at the stake.

The trial of Margaret Aitken is often cited in discussions of the 1597 trials. Named the Great Witch of Balwearie, she was arrested in Fife in April of 1597. Under torture, she pled guilty to the charges of witchcraft but managed to save her life by swearing her ability to recognise other witches. Accordingly, she aided the courts in identifying numerous 'witches'. The witch trials were a means of controlling women and ridding the communities of unfavourable or rebellious characters. The tragic case of Margaret Aitken, forced to seal the fate of other accused people, reveals the lengths women were driven to in order to survive this dangerous period in Scottish history.

'A Cowardly Decision' to Extend Custody Time Limits

Nicholas Reed Langen, Justice Gap: In many legislatures, countries have tried to foster a sense of collegiality amongst their legislators through the architecture of their legislative chamber, like the European Parliament's circle or the Scottish Parliament's horseshoe, adopting styles that reflect unity rather than fostering division. This is not the case in the UK. Instead we take an antagonistic approach, with government benches directly facing-separated by two sword lengths – those of the opposition. MPs stare into each others' eyes, the floor of the house a constant physical reminder of the ideological gulf that lies between them. This layout reflects the 'winner takes all' philosophy that pervades British politics, with the parties in opposition expected to challenge and scrutinise the government through the cut and thrust of debate.

For this philosophy to bear fruit, however, parliament must be allowed to play a role in the process of governing. This is not something that Boris Johnson's government has been eager to grant. Instead, we have seen parliament reduced to the role of bystander, watching mutely and ineffectually from the sidelines, while the government dashes from pillar to post, unchecked and unscrutinised. Not all of these unscrutinised decisions are catastrophes like this summer's exam results; some are notable successes, like Rishi Sunak's 'eat out to help out' scheme, and the extension of the furlough to October.

Admittedly, the exigencies of the pandemic, coupled with the summer recess, meant that the government had to make some decisions on the fly. Convening parliament to decide if Manchester needed to be put into lockdown, or if Greece should have been taken off the no-fly list, would have been farcical, a government refusing to assume the mantle of its responsibilities. What is concerning is that the government is now extending its authority, under the guise of the coronavirus, into matters that should be for parliament, not for a ministry on Whitehall.

Foremost among these is the government's decision, announced this Sunday evening, to add two months to the period that accused persons can be held in custody before trial – technically known as the custody time limit. This means that for someone charged with a criminal offence and denied bail, they can be locked up and treated like a convicted prisoner for eight months – almost a year behind bars before they've even had the chance to put their defence to a jury. At the moment,

this means facing months of confinement, with little chance of exercise or even companionship, with most prisons forcing prisoners to stay in their cells for up to twenty hours a day- cells that are already in a dismal state, as the Howard League reports show again and again.

Ostensibly, this is necessary because the coronavirus has brought the court system crashing down. Jury trials were unable to proceed during the lockdown, while the need for social-distancing means that conducting trials in ordinary courtrooms is fraught with difficulty, and so court capacity is heavily reduced. All of this has resulted in trials being pushed further and further back, with criminal trials now being listed for 2022. It is these delays, according to the Lord Chancellor, Robert Buckland, that raise the risk of potentially dangerous criminals being released upon the expiry of the CTL, and so warrant the extension to the time limit to 'keep victims and the public safe'.

If this was a genuine emergency, and there had been a sudden delay in cases over the past six months, it might be possible to consider this an unfortunate necessity. But it is not. The crisis in the Crown Courts has been growing for years, with courts being sold off to raise money for the Treasury, while courts still supposedly in use stand empty, with the government unwilling to pay – or recruit – enough judges to hear all the cases. Couple this with police recruitment being too low to efficiently investigate and process cases, let alone considering the state of legal aid, and you have a justice system on the brink of collapse.

In this context, the cries of 'public safety' from the Lord Chancellor ring hollow, with the pandemic merely tipping the system over the cliff and onto the rocks below. It is a cowardly decision, with the government preferring to invert a foundational principle of justice – the presumption of innocence – rather than properly fund the justice system. The fact that Buckland announced an £80m plan to 'help the courts' recover, including hiring 1,600 more staff, is meagre compensation for a decade of parsimony.

What makes this all the more invidious is that the government should have been forced to account for these failings. By making the change through secondary legislation, there will be little opportunity for meaningful scrutiny of the decision from the opposition, with the Lord Chancellor able, in essence, to unilaterally extend the period of time that those accused of trial are to be detained for. Such power is more reminiscent of a Tudor monarch than of a 21st century parliamentary democracy. Members of the opposition should have had the opportunity to scrutinise this decision, forcing Buckland to acknowledge that the failings of the justice system have been obvious to everyone except the government for years, and that the extension of the CTL simply takes advantage of the fact that people accused of crimes are unpopular with the public, and curtailing their rights is the easy way out.

There is a time and a place for quick decisions, but too often now we are seeing a government that prefers to rule by decree than by consent. Throughout the lockdown, there were constant amendments to the Coronavirus legislation, diligently tracked by Adam Wagner, but ultimately impossible for anyone to meaningfully follow. Among these amendments was the decision by Matt Hancock, the Health Secretary, to criminalise public gatherings towards the end of August, an amendment that saw Piers Corbyn, the brother of the former Labour leader, fined £10,000. As Matthew Scott has said elsewhere, creating law in this way is 'unprecedented and deeply disturbing'.

British governments with strong majorities are already almost omnipotent, able to pass almost anything they desire. However, this use of executive authority through secondary legislation empowers them further, allowing them to evade scrutiny, both from their own MPs and from the opposition. Few things illustrate this more starkly than the decision to extend pre-trial detention. Civil liberties should not be so easily brushed aside.

Helen McCourt's Mother Ordered to Pay Killer £40,000 Legal Fees

Marie McCourt has been ordered to pay Ian Simms' costs after a High Court bid to stop his release from prison failed. Simms was jailed in 1989 for the murder of 22-year-old Helen McCourt on Merseyside and has never revealed where her body was hidden. The court ruled money raised through Mrs McCourt's crowdfunding page would be used to cover costs. Mrs McCourt, who has campaigned for a law which would deny parole to killers who refuse to disclose the location of their victim's body, said "it seems unfair that I have to pay his costs but that's what's happened". She said she was "grateful to all the people who contributed" to the fundraising page. Mrs McCourt added: "Prisoners get legal aid and people like myself - we're ordinary people and we don't have the kind of money to take it to a High Court. "The only thing we can do is go to a GoFundMe and thank god they did give me that."

David Lammy, shadow lord chancellor and shadow secretary of state for justice, tweeted: "It is totally wrong for the family of Helen McCourt to be forced pay a penny of the legal costs of the man who killed her daughter. "The government should recognise the exceptionally tragic circumstances here and apply some common sense." Last week High Court judges refused to order a review of Simms' release and said a Parole Board decision "involved no arguable public law error". But Mrs McCourt said the law doesn't recognise how "painful" it is for families of loved ones whose bodies have not been found.

'Show remorse' "I have been going out searching for my daughter's body for 33 years and the government and our laws don't seem to understand how painful this all is," she said. "Our families should have the right to know that when these killers are caught and if they refuse to say where their victims remains were hidden or what they did with them, at least let the family know. "They should have to show this remorse before they can ever be considered for release." A bill denying parole to killers who refuse to disclose a body's location, known as Helen's Law, cleared the Commons in March but came too late to prevent Simms being released. Mrs McCourt said it would be a "great day to get that law passed and make sure no-one has to go through what I've had to go through".

Benjamin Bestgen Takes an Honest Look At Marriage

During my legal studies, a professor opined that one of the most legally significant things the majority of people will ever do in their lives is to marry and divorce (the other things were: entering into employment contracts, having children, buying a house and dying).

Writer Jane Austen started her most famous novel asserting that "It is a truth universally acknowledged, that a single man in possession of a good fortune, must be in want of a wife." Philosopher Arthur Schopenhauer countered that marriage meant to halve one's rights and double one's duties and is akin to grabbing into a bag of snakes while blindfolded and hoping to catch an eel. He also noted that to marry meant that spouses do their utmost to become thoroughly disgusted with each other. Despite many witticisms, depictions of marital bliss and detailed social observations on the subject, Austen never married. Neither did Schopenhauer, though both had opportunities. People have pondered marriage for millennia and better writers than me have done a thorough job already. Philosopher Elizabeth Brake provides a great summary on the philosophy and history of marriage. But for lawyers, a few things regarding the future of marriage could be interesting:

Many marriage vows include promises to "love and cherish" the other. But promising to feel love for a person or to make the feeling last is impossible and unenforceable, given the biology and nature of love. More realistic might be vows to treat one's spouse justly, fairly and deal with them in good faith – but interestingly, this doesn't seem to be a common marriage vow. Philosopher Julian Savulescu considers though that neuroenhancements which increase

feelings of bonding and emotional attachment (e.g. through oxytocin) might make it easier to keep "love vows". They are also more likely to be effective, unlike date nights and romantic weekend trips. But such technologies can be problematic in abusive relationships and pose serious questions about consent and the authenticity of our emotional life.

Marriage is a contract that does not expire until death, its legal terms cannot be altered (though people can compromise in practice) and many jurisdictions still make its dissolution costly and contentious. But people change over time: mentally, physically and in terms of preferences, experiences, ambitions, knowledge or desires. Metaphysical questions about personhood aside, the person you are with now is likely not the one you married five, ten or twenty years ago. Depending on your stage in life, your spouse may not be the right partner for you anymore. Issuing temporary marriage contracts might help: if the spouses are content, they can renew the agreement. Conversely, an expiry date could take the pressure off some relationships that ran their course: instead of costly divorces, temporary marriages could already include arrangements for dealing with any jointly owned property after expiry: a marriage contract and pre-nup rolled into one.

Separating Marriage From Childcare: Poet Philip Larkin implied that many parents are woefully inept at raising kids to be smart, confident, fair-minded and emotionally mature adults. Arguably, that's asking too much of any individual couple anyway: it takes a village to raise a child, as the saying goes. Psychologist Robert Emery considers that couples who won't divorce "because of the children" potentially do them harm. Children mostly need a stable environment and the feeling that they are loved. Parenting does not require that the parents are married or love each other. Therefore, philosopher Laurie Shrage proposes legally splitting parental rights and duties from marriage, making them legally and factually separate things. Co-parenting agreements could serve the interests of the children best: they can include, but are not limited to, the biological parents but also step-parents, godparents or other people who exercise de-facto parenting functions. They would also protect the rights of important caregivers to the children, irrespective of marital status or biological relation.

In Praise of Arranged Marriage: Humans have fallen in love since the emergence of our species. Until about two centuries ago, love was not a good enough reason to marry but nowadays it seems it's the only commonly acceptable ground (in the Western world at least). But passionate love fades after a few months and rarely lasts longer than two or three years. Due to the biology and psychology of passion, we see the loved one as we want them to be, not as they likely are. Our decision-making is impaired. Important questions are either not asked or unsatisfactory answers accepted, warning signs overlooked or denied, unrealistic hopes indulged. It's worth asking if a person in such a state of mind should be allowed to sign a marriage contract at all.

If done well and in good faith, a lot of key conflict factors in marriages can be disclosed and discussed upfront in the due diligence process of an arranged marriage: For instance, the prospective spouses' motivation for marriage, education, socio-economic background, health, reproductive capacity, views on children, career, household management, lifestyle preferences, financial habits, family, friends and associations, political beliefs, religious views, sexual proclivities… the list can go on. Given that marriage means a joining of estates and bodies with the view of building a life together, surely it makes sense asking the important practical and philosophical questions from the start and not leaving them to chance and wishful thinking.

Spouses in a love marriage can fall out of love while spouses in an arranged marriage can come to love each other. Love is a great bonus, but legally irrelevant to a marriage. We commonly say that marriage is a journey of discovery: people discover who their partner really is. But in an

arranged marriage people start the journey more informed, with more realistic expectations and can pre-empt or mitigate potential conflicts. Both types of marriage can work out great. But legally speaking, the 'arranged marriage approach' sounds preferable, if only to remind us that a degree of diligence should be exercised before entering into important agreements.

Hope For Offenders Facing Deportation Which Would Be 'Unduly Harsh' On Children

Zohra Nabi, Justice Gap: Appeal judges have offered hope to offenders facing deportation where it would be 'unduly harsh' on their children. Whilst the UK Borders Act 2007 requires the secretary of state for the Home Department to make a deportation order where a non-British national is convicted of a criminal offence and sentenced to at least 12 months' imprisonment, there is an exception where effect of deportation on a non-national's partner or child would be 'unduly harsh'. In a previous judgment, it had been held that for circumstances to be 'unduly harsh', they must go 'beyond what would necessarily be involved for any child faced with the deportation of a parent', with Lord Carnwath in the Supreme Court going so far as to say that the consequences must be 'severe or bleak', bearing in mind the strong public interest in deporting foreign criminals. In practice, this has frequently left applicants unable to make use of the exception, save where there is something extraordinary in their circumstances. In the judgment handed down on Monday 07/09/2020, (HA and RA (Iraq) v SSHD), however, Underhill LJ warned against the danger of comparing an applicant's circumstances to that of an imaginary child whose parent is about to be deported, setting out that the test should not be one of exceptionality, but rather one of holistic evaluation. This approach marks a stark contrast to that currently adopted by the Upper Tribunal, and was described by barristers at No. 5 Chambers as providing 'welcome guidance'. The often-unyielding approach by the Home Office towards the deportation of foreign criminals came under fire from human rights campaigners earlier in the year, with the chair of charity Detention Action Bella Sankey telling the BBC that non-violent offenders who 'have been here a long time, and are to all intents and purposes British' were being unfairly punished. The government were further criticised after 25 out of 42 Jamaican nationals were removed from a foreign criminal deportation flight to Jamaica in February, with Shadow Justice Secretary David Lammy urging the government to suspend such flights until publication of the Windrush scandal report However, the Court of Appeal decision comes in the wake of Home Secretary Priti Patel doubling down on her criticism of 'activist lawyers' frustrating the removal of asylum seekers. It is yet to be seen how the government will respond to the decision.

Overdue Review of the Coroner's Service Must Tackle Fundamental Inequality of Arms

INQUEST has given evidence alongside Andy McCulloch to the House of Commons Justice Committee in their inquiry on The Coroner Service. They havecalled for long overdue action from government on the coronial system, which is failing in its role to prevent future deaths and struggling to ensure bereaved families have access to justice.

Now more than ever, as coroners struggle to respond to the high number of deaths arising from COVID-19, change is urgently needed. Drawing directly from their experience supporting bereaved families since 1981, and the recent evidence of 50 families who informed written evidence to the inquiry, the key concerns that INQUEST will raise include: 1)The need for a full time Chief Coroner and a National Coroner's Service, rather than the current part time Chief Coroner and inconsistent localised services. 2) The establishment of a National Oversight Mechanism; a new independent body with the duty to collate, analyse and monitor the currently disparate, hard to access and locally held recommenda-

tions of coroners and other post-death investigations and inquiries. 3) The introduction of a right to appeal to the Chief Coroner, to address the current absence of accessible appeal mechanisms against coroner's decisions. 4)Automatic non-means tested funding for families for specialist legal representation immediately following a state related death, as described in INQUEST's Legal Aid for Inquests campaign.

INQUEST also highlighted the significant backlog of inquests which existed before the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic, which creates long delays in identifying necessary learning and change required following a death. Since the beginning of the pandemic, this situation is even more troubling. INQUEST remain concerned that inquests are not being opened into most COVID-related deaths. In the absence of a public inquiry, inquests are a necessary forum for upholding the government's obligation to prevent and investigate deaths (under Article 2 of the Human Rights Act).

Andy McCulloch joinedthe Director of INQUEST Deborah Coles in giving evidence to the committee. Andy is the father of Colette McCulloch, who died whilst in the care of mental health services. Their family faced multiple challenges in navigating the inquest system, and ensuring there was a full examination of the circumstances of Colette's death. An inquest ultimately concluded in March 2019 and found Colette had been failed by services involved in her care. Charlotte Haworth Hird is a human rights solicitor at Bindmans specialising in inquests around deaths in state custody or care. She will give evidence alongside a representative of the charity for patient safety and justice AvMA.

There have been some significant improvements in inquests over the last 30 years, including as a result of the 2009 Coroners and Justice Act, implemented in 2013, and the Human Rights Act 1998. However, there are continuing problems that must be addressed for inquests to serve their purpose in full, and for them to be conducted in a way that supports, listens to and is informed by bereaved families. There is also an urgent need to consider the essential preventive role of inquests, and INQUEST will set out recommendations to achieve this.

If You do Not Convict at First Trial, Trial Again

A man who faced an unprecedented five trials over four years for the shooting of a mother-of-nine and her nephew has been found guilty of murder. Annie Ekofo, 53, and Bervil Ekofo, 21, were killed in their home in East Finchley, north London, in 2016. Obina Ezeoke first went on trial in 2017 but it collapsed, while juries in two more failed to reach verdicts and the other was halted by coronavirus. At his fifth trial, the 28-year-old was found guilty of two counts of murder. The court heard Ezeoke, of Cambridge Heath, had "crept noiselessly" into Mrs Ekofo's home on 15 September 2016 just after dawn. He then shot her 21-year-old nephew, who happened to be staying there that night, while he slept and killed Ms Ekofo in the hall when she went to investigate what had happened. Prosecutor Mark Heywood QC said the 28-year-old drug dealer had gone to kill one of the teenage boys in the family as "part of a vendetta of violence". "His hate was such that he did not falter when confronted by a second person - he simply took her life as well," he said. The key evidence centred around firearms residue found in Ezeoke's car, which was used in the getaway, and on his top recovered from a female friend's home. Ezeoke, who denied murder, told successive trials he had an alibi for the time of the shootings and suggested the gunshot residue in the vehicle must have been from a previous shooting. When the fourth trial was halted, the defendant's lawyer James Scobie QC claimed the case should not go to a fifth trial, saying it "would be oppressive" and "enough is enough". But Mr Heywood successfully argued the "public interest" in a case "of this exceptional kind and such gravity". Sally-Anne Russell, from the Crown Prosecution Service (CPS) said Ezeoke's actions "have devastated a family". "He went to the flat to carry out a revenge attack... When he couldn't find the person he was looking for, he murdered a young man and a mother-of-nine instead," she added. Ezeoke will be sentenced on 1 October.

Use of Segregation Post-Lockdown at HMP Whitemoor 'Excessive'

Almost four out of 10 prisoners (38%) felt unsafe at HMP Whitemoor in Cambridgeshire according to a report that raises concern about the use of segregation at the category A prison. The number of prisoners in segregation had increased post lockdown, and the average length of stay had nearly doubled to an 'excessive' 95 days. HM Prison Inspectorate found that the increased anxiety about personal safety was 'a combination of those who felt physically unsafe and those who had anxieties about the pandemic'. The jail experienced a COVID-19 outbreak in March and, at its peak, 'around 250 staff were off work, which prevented the delivery of a decent regime'. At the time of the inspection, the prison had not had a case for 12 weeks. 'Most prisoners could be out of their cells for two to two-and-a-half hours each day, which was better than at many other prisons,' the chief inspector Peter Clarke noted. Whitemoor was holding around 450 prisoners at the time of the visit and most were high risk serving indeterminate sentences and had been at the establishment for over a year. Levels of violence and self-harm had fallen at the start of the pandemic. 'However, they were now rising, and self-harm had returned to pre-restriction levels,' Clarke wrote. The key barrier to family contact was a shortage of telephones. The prison had tried to source additional wing telephones but this had been refused as the prison service was going to deliver mobile phones for use in prisons. 'However, by the time these phones had arrived at Whitemoor, guidance had been issued preventing their use in the high-security estate,' the report noted.

Scale of Failure in Prison System Staggering, Say MPs

The scale of failure in the prison system in England and Wales is "staggering", with only 206 out of 10,000 promised new prison spaces delivered by the government, parliament's spending watchdog has said. Ministers and officials have failed to deliver on a pledge to improve the condition of the prison estate by 2020, the public accounts committee says in its report, published on Friday. In 2016 the Prison Service launched the "prison estate transformation programme", which was expected to create 10,000 new-for-old prison places by 2020 by building five new prisons and two new residential blocks. But by January 2020 it had created 206 prison places, the report says. The committee says the Prison Service allowed a "staggering" backlog of maintenance work to build up that will cost more than £900m to address, meaning 500 prison places are taken permanently out of action each year due to their poor condition. The poor state of many prisons, coupled with high levels of overcrowding, are contributing to dangerously high levels of violence and self-harm in prisons, the report says. Meanwhile, there is "no sign of a cross-government strategy for reducing reoffending", sustainable long-term strategy.ailures at the Ministry of Justice echo the disastrous and now abandoned reforms to probation .services The committee says the failures at the Ministry of Justice echo the disastrous and now abandoned reforms to probation services introduced by Chris Grayling when he was justice secretary.

Serving Prisoners Supported by MOJUK: Walid Habib, 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, Peter Hannigan.