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 813 (30/09/2020) - Cost £1

Cheryl Pile Claimant - and - Chief Constable of Merseyside Police

Cheryl Pile brings this appeal to establish the liberty of inebriated English subjects to be allowed to lie undisturbed overnight in their own vomit soaked clothing. Of course, such a right, although perhaps of dubious practical utility, will generally extend to all adults of sound mind who are intoxicated at home. Ms Pile, however, was not at home. She was at a police station in Liverpool having been arrested for the offence of being drunk and disorderly. She had emptied the contents of her stomach all over herself and was too insensible with drink to have much idea of either where she was or what she was doing there. Rather than leave the vulnerable claimant to marinade overnight in her own bodily fluids, four female police officers removed her outer clothing and provided her with a clean dry outfit to wear. The claimant was so drunk that she later had no recollection of these events.

It is against this colourful background that she brought a claim against the police in trespass to the person and assault alleging that they should have left her squalidly and unhygienically soaking in vomit. Fortunately, because this appeal will be dismissed, the challenge of assessing damages for this lost opportunity will remain unmet. She also alleges that the circumstances in which these events took place amounted to an unlawful invasion of her right to privacy under Article 8 of the European Convention on Human Rights. Her claims came before Recorder Hudson in Chester last November. The hearing lasted three days at the conclusion of which the Recorder found for the defendant Chief Constable on all issues. Ms Pile now appeals against the Recorder's decision to this Court with the permission of the single judge. For ease and continuity of reference, I will refer to her henceforth in this judgment as the claimant.

On 22 April 2017, the claimant got into a taxi in an advanced state of intoxication. Her condition was such that she has no, or virtually no, recollection of what happened afterwards.

The relevant events can, however, be pieced together from evidence from other sources. The unfortunate taxi driver rang 999 after the claimant had started abusing him and "kicking off". She had been physically sick all over herself and the back of the taxi. The police officers who arrived in response to the call described the claimant as being covered in vomit. Indeed, on the following morning, the claimant herself asked the police to dispose of her trousers because of the foetid state they were in. One officer said that the vomit was in her hair and had gone all down her front. There can be little doubt from the evidence that the claimant's clothes were filthy and unhygienic when she arrived at the police station.

The claimant's behaviour at the police station continued to be challenging. I have seen the CCTV footage of the claimant's arrival. As the Recorder accurately observed, the officers accompanying her were clearly sympathetic and trying to help her. Her befuddled attempts to give her details, including her own name, reveal that she was incoherent with drink.

On her way to the cells, as the Recorder found, she started to flail her arms with the clear intention of striking at the officers accompanying her. The cell to which she was taken was monitored by a CCTV camera. Some legitimate criticism could, and indeed was, levelled at the decision of one Inspector Fairhurst not to require initially that she should be detained in an unmonitored cell but any such criticism was overtaken by events with the claimant's aggressive display in the corridor on the way to the cells. By that stage, it was obviously in the claimant's own best interests, and those of the officers responsible for her detention, that she should be monitored from the outset. Once in the cell, the officers tried to replace the claimant's wet and soiled clothes with clean ones. They were wearing protective gloves and managed to put her dirty clothes in a plastic bag. The claimant, however, continued to struggle and they left the cell. After that, Inspector Fairhurst looked into the cell through the hatch to check on the claimant. His intention was to ensure her continued safety. He had not known that she was still in her underwear. The Recorder found that all those involved in the detention of Ms Pile on the night in question were concerned with her welfare and the protection of her dignity. The officers had used no more force than was strictly necessary to remove the claimant's clothes and she was too drunk to understand what was going on. Furthermore, Inspector Fairhurst had no darker voyeuristic purpose when he was checking up on her.

The CCTV monitoring in the cell fed back to the custody suite. In the event, it was fortunate for the claimant that she was kept under observation because, soon after she had been left alone, she lost her balance, fell over and banged her head on the cell floor. She was taken to hospital and treated for her injuries. I note, in passing, that she brought a claim in negligence against the defendant in respect of these injuries but that claim was rejected by the Recorder at first instance and this finding remained wisely unchallenged on this appeal. After her hospital visit, the claimant was returned to the police station and released. She agreed to pay a £60 fixed penalty for being drunk and disorderly and thereby avoided prosecution.

First Ground of Appeal: The claimant contends that the police have no power to change the clothing of a detainee incapacitated by drink however contaminated such clothing may be by bodily fluids. This prohibition, it is said, applies: (i) even in circumstances in which to leave the detainee in her own clothes would give rise to a hygiene risk both to her and to those required to come into contact with her; and (ii) notwithstanding the degrading condition in which she would otherwise be left to spend the rest of the night wallowing in her own vomit or worse. Accordingly, it is argued, despite the fact that the claimant raised no objection to the removal of her clothes and that the officers were acting her own best interests using no more force then necessary, she was the victim of a trespass to her person.

Second Ground of Appeal'The second ground of appeal is based on the contention that the claimant's rights under Article 8 of the European Convention of Human Rights ("the Convention") had been breached by the way in which she was treated on the evening in question. Article 8 provides: "Right to respect for private and family life 1. Everyone has the right to respect for his private and family life, his home and his correspondence. 2. There shall be no interference by a public authority with the exercise of this right except such as is in accordance with the law and is necessary in a democratic society in the interests of national security, public safety or the economic wellbeing of the country, for the prevention of disorder or crime, for the protection of health or morals, or for the protection of the rights and freedoms of others." I am entirely satisfied that the qualification to the right to a private life identified in Article 8(2) applied to the circumstances of this case.

It is to be noted that breaches of the Codes of Practice under PACE do not, of themselves, automatically amount to a breach of Article 8. In Yousif v Commissioner of Police for the Metropolis [2016] EWCA Civ 364, the Court of Appeal considered a case in which the claimant's clothes had been removed for his own protection whilst he was in custody. He was unsuccessful in his claim for damages by way of just satisfaction in the County Court notwithstanding the fact that the judge had found that there had been breaches of Code C. As the Court of Appeal held: "45…Clearly, the breaches of the Code and guidance form part of the factual matrix within which Articles 3 and 8 must be con-

sidered but could not, on any showing, be decisive. It is also to be noted in this context that section 67(10) of PACE provides: "A failure on the part (a) of a police officer to comply with any provision of a code;.shall not of itself render him liable to any criminal or civil proceedings."

The Court of Appeal summarised the trial judge's approach to the position under Article 8 thus: "36. As for Article 8 and the requisite respect for private life, the judge repeated that the police had acted "in a proportionate manner honouring the dignity of what was proving to be a difficult detainee". They had to balance the safety of Mr Yousif, the safety of others (including themselves) and Mr Yousif's personal integrity. Bearing in mind the good faith and the absence of debasing motives, he rejected this claim as well..." The Court of Appeal agreed with the judge's assessment and dismissed the appeal, observing: "43 As to the extent of the breaches, the officers were cross examined about the Code and the guidance; the judge made a number of findings about them. In particular, it is conceded that an appropriate adult should have been called by the custody officer. 44. For my part, as did the judge, I readily accept that there were also breaches in relation to the search (on the grounds that a third officer was present to bag the clothing and it could, in fact, be seen over the CCTV)"

This led to the conclusion at paragraph 70 that: "all that happened to Mr Yousif was a consequence of what was clearly his own failure to engage and flowed from what it was agreed were the legitimate and good faith concerns of the police to ensure that he was safe while in custody. Breaches of the Code and guidance were not deliberate. Having regard to the findings of the judge (which were justified on the evidence), all the actions taken by the police in relation to Mr Yousif were 'strictly necessary'; they do not give rise to any actionable wrong and do not, in this case, establish any breach of Article 3 ." And specifically, in relation to Article 8:

"71. Moving shortly to Article 8, this is not a case (unlike Wainwright) in which an in-depth analysis based on the right to private life or, indeed, a different answer resultant upon that analysis is appropriate. This provision has a specific exception for the protection of health: in my judgment, on the facts of this case and the justified findings of the judge, there can be no doubt that the police can justify what was undeniably an invasion of Mr Yousif's privacy by reference to the necessity in a democratic society for the police as custodians of a person lawfully arrested on suspicion of having committed an offence to take all necessary steps to protect his or her safety."

The first two alleged breaches on this appeal relate to the monitoring of the claimant's cell. It is argued that the decision to place the claimant in a monitored cell in which the camera broadcast to the custody suite was made before she had shown signs of physical resistance to the officers. It cannot be disputed, however, that her behaviour in the corridor justified CCTV surveillance thereafter. On this issue, I find that Article 8 was never engaged. There was no interference with the claimant's rights to privacy until after a time when she had already behaved in a way which fully justified such intrusion. Furthermore, the decision to monitor her cell and broadcast the footage to the custody suite was both lawful and necessary. Indeed, it subsequently equipped officers to see that she had fallen over and hurt herself so that she could be given prompt medical attention.

The third alleged breach is said to arise out of the provisions of Annex A 11(c) of Code C: "When strip searches are conducted: (c) except in cases of urgency, where there is risk of serious harm to the detainee or to others, whenever a strip search involves exposure of intimate body parts, there must be at least two people present other than the detainee. The presence of more than two people, other than an appropriate adult, shall be permitted only in the most exceptional circumstances" I am entirely satisfied that, in the circumstances of this case, exceptional circumstances prevailed. The Recorder found, as she was entitled to, that the claimant had been aggressive and was flailing her arms on the way to the cells. She had earlier been kicking out

at officers as she was being transported to the police station. The fact that four female members of staff were deployed to remove her soiled clothing was entirely justified. Indeed, if fewer had been involved then there may well have arisen a greater risk that one of them would be injured because the claimant could not otherwise have been adequately restrained.

The remaining alleged breaches all relate to the actions of Inspector Fairhurst in seeing the claimant in her underwear in the cell, through the hatch in the door and over the CCTV monitor. The Recorder found that the claimant had been given clothes and that Inspector Fairhurst may well have assumed that she would be wearing them when he saw her. Whatever he saw, the Recorder was satisfied that, by the time he gave evidence, he had no specific recollection of it. The Recorder further found that the fact that the removal of her clothing was monitored was a proportionate response to the risk to the custody staff. On the facts of this case, her conclusion was unassailable.

Conclusion: The observations of the Court of Appeal in Yousif apply with equal force to the circumstances of this case. All that happened to the claimant was a consequence of what was clearly her own failure to engage and flowed from the legitimate and good faith concerns of the police to ensure that she was safe while in custody." This appeal is dismissed.

Terrorist Prisoners Hit Record High In British Jails Amid Warnings of Radicalisation

Lizzie Dearden, Independent: A record number of terrorists are being held in British prisons, new figures show amid warnings over radicalisation inside “chaotic” jails. Statistics released by the Home Office on Thursday indicate there were 243 people in custody for terror-related offences, up 24 on the previous year. It comes as the government pushes for a raft of changes aiming to jail terror offenders for longer and make serious criminals serve more of their sentences in prison. Four alleged terror attacks have been launched by serving or released prisoners in the past year, in Fishmongers’ Hall, HMP Whitemoor, Streatham and Reading. A prison officer working in the high-security estate told The Independent the current situation was a “nightmare”. “I don’t see any end to the attacks whatsoever, those ones that come in with an extremist view leave with a stronger one,” he added. “You’re releasing people onto the streets and you dread to think what’s going to happen. “No matter what ministers say everything is not great in UK prisons, it’s appalling.” The man, who spoke on condition of anonymity, said there was “no control” over radicalised inmates and raised concern over longer jail terms. “They cannot cope with the extremist population they have at the minute so how do they think they’ll cope with adding to that with more extremists on longer jail terms?” he asked. The officer said radicalised inmates had attacked and threatened staff and that newly-recruited prison officers were seen as “easy prey”. “I’ve seen people do one shift and leave,” he added. “Most of the prisons are being run on chaos, a lot of things pass that shouldn’t pass because they haven’t got the time to deal with incidents.”

The Ministry of Justice said it has improved monitoring and intelligence-sharing inside prisons and trained officers on how to spot the signs of extremism. But the officer said the training was “awful” and that staff were “run ragged” and powerless to monitor conversations in other languages. Recent research warned that some extremists see their time in prison “as an opportunity” to become more extreme and prepare for attacks. A separate report published by the Independent Reviewer of Terrorism Legislation said terror offenders were not being prosecuted for further crimes committed in prison, including making weapons and glorifying terrorism. Jonathan Hall QC told The Independent: “People can move from being ordinary prisoners to terrorist prisoners at any stage in their journey. “I saw examples of people equally dangerous [as terrorists] who are not convicted of terror offences.

Research released by the International Centre for the Study of Radicalisation (ICSR)

found that at least five terror attacks have been plotted or carried out by serving and released prisoners in Britain since 2016. They include the stabbings at Fishmongers' Hall and Streatham, as well as a plot by a cell who met inside prison. The report, which covered 10 European countries including the UK, warned "there is an emerging view among extremists that prison is an opportunity, not necessarily just to recruit or network, but to also work on themselves." Around three quarters of terrorist prisoners in Britain are categorised as Islamist extremists, 19 per cent as far right and 6 per cent other. The vast majority have been convicted but 11 per cent are being held on remand as court hearings are delayed by the coronavirus pandemic. In the year to June, 54 terrorist prisoners were released, including two people serving life sentences. Of those freed, 16 had been sentenced to less than four years' imprisonment.

Sudesh Amman, who was released days before being shot dead after launching the Streatham terror attack in February, was among the cohort. A further 26 freed prisoners had been given sentences of four years or more. Shortly after the Streatham attack, the government enacted new laws to end the automatic early release of terror offenders and ensure they are risk-assessed by the Parole Board. The Counter-Terrorism and Sentencing Bill, which is currently being considered by parliament, would increase the maximum penalties for several terror offences and force terrorists given extend determinate sentences to serve the entire term in prison.

Several MPs called for improved deradicalisation efforts in prisons and raised concern about the potential impact of the proposals. During a debate in July, David Lammy, the shadow justice secretary, said: "It is simply not good enough to lock terrorists away for longer, put them out of our minds and hope for the best. As we've seen from the devastating attacks at Streatham and Fishmongers' Hall, this approach does not work." The government's new sentencing white paper contains powers to halt the automatic release of offenders who have become a terror threat while in prison. A Ministry of Justice impact assessment said the change could "increase the risk that other prisoners could become radicalised or more dangerous due to the greater time in custody for the affected individual, affording more time for further proselytising in the prison population".

UK Banks Accused of Facilitating Fraudsters and Criminals

Vincent Wood, Indepndent: UK banks have been accused of 'offering their services to those with money to hide' after a leaked cache of thousands of documents revealed some of the world's largest financial firms have facilitated criminals and fraudsters in processing dirty cash. More than 2,000 sensitive banking papers detailing more than $2 trillion's worth of transactions were analysed by a consortium of investigative journalists across 108 organisations including the BBC after being leaked to BuzzFeed News. The documents allegedly show banking officials allowed fraudsters to shuttle money between different accounts after being made aware the profits were from multimillion-pound scams or crimes. They are also reported to detail the ways in which Russian oligarchs use banks to dodge international sanctions and move money into the west. Referred to as the FinCEN files — from the US Financial Crimes Investigation Network — the cache is mostly made up of documents banks sent to the US authorities between 2000 and 2017, raising concerns about suspicious activity in their clients' accounts, according to the BBC's Panorama programme, which called the documents "some of the international banking system's most closely guarded secrets".

Anti-corruption group Transparency International UK said the suspicious activity reports (SARs) "repeatedly cite weak money laundering defences in the UK financial sector as a major problem". It added: "The leak shows how UK banks continually fail to address suspicious activity and instead

offered their services to those with money to hide. "Transparency International UK's research has previously identified 86 UK banks and financial institutions which have, unwittingly or otherwise, helped corrupt individuals acquire assets and move suspicious wealth." Chief executive Daniel Bruce said: "These revelations are a damning indictment of the system that is supposed to prevent the UK and other financial centres becoming havens for dirty money.

"The government should respond rapidly to this significant investigation in order to demonstrate that the UK is serious about tackling dirty money. "We know the solutions exist; for example by bringing forward reform of corporate liability laws to hold banks accountable for money laundering failings and expediting the legislation to overhaul the UK company law. "As it stands, it remains far too easy for kleptocrats and criminals to launder their illicit loot using the veneer of UK companies and institutions." Alex Cobham, chief executive at Tax Justice Network, said: "As will be revealed over the coming days, many of the world's major financial institutions have comprehensively failed to meet their own responsibilities, in the name of turning a profit — however dirty. "Swift and robust action is needed, including potential criminal charges, or banks will simply continue to treat the prospects of being caught and fined as a simple cost of business."

Infected Blood Scandal: Treasury Refuses to Publish Key Documents

Owen Bowcott, Guardian: The Treasury is refusing to publish key documents about the treatment of haemophiliacs infected by the NHS with HIV on the grounds that it would be "disruptive" and material might be "distorted" by the media. The unusual reasons cited by officials for refusing a Freedom of Information (FoI) request have emerged before a new round of public hearings at the Infected Blood Inquiry Jason Evans, whose father died after receiving contaminated blood and founded the Factor 8 campaign, has been an effective and energetic excavator of hidden Whitehall files.

Nine months ago he asked for further pages from a file dating back to 1989 entitled Haemophiliacs with AIDS/HIV: Macfarlane Trust and Social Security. The Treasury released pages 1-35 of the file last year. Evans sent eight further letters and appealed to the Information Commissioner's Office (ICO) before he received a reply. Most files of that era should by now have been released to the National Archives in Kew and be available to view. In their eventual refusal letter, the Treasury said some of the material covered "personal data of living individuals" and some would "prejudice the administration of justice". It said the material had been handed over to the inquiry. The letter finished: "We consider that the piecemeal disclosure of material and the consequent media coverage that it attracts is disruptive to the proper workings/process of the inquiry itself. The letter finished: "We consider that the piecemeal disclosure of material and the consequent media coverage that it attracts is disruptive to the proper workings/process of the inquiry itself. "Where information already held by, and under consideration by, the inquiry is released under the FoI Act, there is a real risk of that information being quoted from selectively in the media, with the result that the roles of particular individuals, their decisions and actions may be presented in a distorted way."

Evans told the Guardian: "It's outrageous that the government won't disclose files to me concerning what happened to my father because, basically, they are concerned I might show those documents to the press. "Yes, there is an inquiry going but it's not a court case. It's 30 years overdue … All of the families affected by this deserve transparency and not withholding of information because of what the press may report. "If the Treasury doesn't send me these documents by the end of the week, I'll have no choice but to lodge another challenge against them with the ICO … It's not acceptable … to hide information because they're scared of the media. I thought this was supposed to be a country that stood by freedom of the press?"

Des Collins, a partner at Collins Solicitors who represents more than 1,400 families infected and affected by the contaminated blood scandal, said: "Our clients are very concerned that this may be the beginning of yet another cover-up some 40 years after the first and they are determined not to let that happen. "The Treasury's response to what is on any basis a good faith request is, to say the very least, disappointing. We have every right to expect the government's transparency pledge to all those affected by the contaminated blood scandal to be upheld. "This unwillingness to disclose the requested files does beg the question as to their contents and also whether the government is genuinely committed to transparency." The infected blood inquiry, set up in 2017, reopens in London on Tuesday. Its hearings will be broadcast live online.

The inquiry is examining how as many as 30,000 people became severely ill after being given contaminated blood products, imported from the US, in the 1970s and 80s; about 3,000 haemophiliacs have since died. The first witness will be Lord Owen, who was health minister from 1974 to 1976. He has alleged that maladministration by his former department contributed to the scandal and questioned why a promise he made – that Britain would become self-sufficient in supplies of clotting factors – was not fulfilled. A spokesperson for the inquiry declined to comment on the FoI refusal or whether the inquiry was consulted. A Treasury spokesperson said: "It's important that those affected by this tragedy get the answers they deserve and lessons are learned – which is why the independent inquiry has been established. "We've been fully transparent and supplied the inquiry with all relevant files, including the specific information referred to here. "But it's important the inquiry can carry out its responsibilities effectively and be able to dictate the timetable for consideration and disclosure to the public of any records or information."

Escaped UK Prisoner Tried to Hand Himself in Seven Times

Kevin Rawlinson, Guardian: The Metropolitan police force has been ordered to launch an inquiry after a court heard that an escaped prisoner, who had been jailed for firearms offences, spent a month trying to hand himself in to officers but was repeatedly turned away. Akram Uddin admitted to absconding from an open prison to see his mother on 17 June. His lawyers told his sentencing hearing on Friday that seven times he asked police to arrest him for it and seven times they refused. "This case, more than any other I have heard or have been involved with in my last two decades of practice, perhaps illustrates the extent of the managed decay of the criminal justice system," Uddin's lawyer, Liam Walker of Doughty Street chambers, told Maidstone crown court on Friday. He detailed several attempts he said Uddin and his solicitor made to have him voluntarily taken back into custody at a south-east London police station. According to his solicitor, Kamal Channa of Brooklyn Law, he first walked into Lewisham police station on 13 July but was turned away.

During several attempts recorded by Channa, Walker told the court Uddin and Channa were variously told that there was and was not a warrant out for his arrest. Uddin's final attempt was on 13 August, Walker told the court, adding that his client was told to go back to the police station six days later. One day before that, however, he was eventually arrested. "It is utterly astonishing that, when Mr Uddin asked to be taken back into custody, he was refused. There is little more that an escaped prisoner can do than instruct his solicitor that he is going to a particular police station, attend that police station with a bag, say he has escaped from prison, give his full details and ask to be arrested and taken back," Walker told the court.

"To badly paraphrase Oscar Wilde: to pass up the opportunity to arrest an escaped prisoner once may be regarded as misfortune, to pass up that opportunity seven times is an utter shambles." The judge, Charles Gratwicke, demanded that the Met police conduct an inquiry and present its findings to the court within 28 days. He told Uddin he had no reason to doubt that he made efforts to hand himself in, though he made no observation in relation to the chronology his lawyers outlined. Uddin was jailed for four months for absconding from prison.

A Met police spokesman said: "We are aware of claims made in mitigation during the sentencing of Akram Uddin at Maidstone crown court on Friday 18 September. "After being made aware of the comments made in court, we are conducting a review to establish the facts of these claims. "If an individual attended a police station in the Metropolitan police area to confirm they were wanted for a criminal offence, their name would be put through the police national computer to confirm this. "Even if that person is not wanted, there would be a record of that name having been entered and by whom. From an initial review of our systems, there is no record of an Akram Uddin having attended Lewisham police station on dates between 13 July and 13 August."

Pick-Up Artist' Wins Appeal Against Convictions ror Threatening and Abusive Behaviour

Scottish Legal News: A self-styled "pick-up artist" who was convicted of five minor sexual assault charges has succeeded in quashing all five convictions on appeal. Adnan Ahmed, who was originally tried on an indictment labelling 18 charges, argued that the trial sheriff, Lindsay Wood, had inappropriately cross-examined him and had erred in concluding that there was a significantly sexual aspect to his behaviour. The appeal was heard by the Lord Justice General, Lord Carloway, sitting with Lord Malcolm and Lord Turnbull.

Just "flirting" The appellant was convicted on charges of behaving in a threatening and abusive manner towards young women in Glasgow and Uddingston, contrary to Section 38(1) of the Criminal Justice and Licensing (Scotland) Act 2010. Each of the charges concerned unsolicited comments which he made to them, including asking their name, complimenting them on their appearance, and asking for their phone numbers. The complainers in the five charges were aged between 16 and 24, with the appellant being between 35 and 37 years old at the material times. None of the complainers welcomed the appellant's approaches. They described themselves as feeling overwhelmed, or uncomfortable, shaken up, intimidated or stressed.

Giving evidence in his own defence the appellant described the interaction with one of the complainers as "flirting", and stated that he did not know when he approached the two youngest complainers that they were still in school. He testified that he had no intention of upsetting any of them. Following several no case to answer submissions from counsel for the appellant, he was acquitted of thirteen of the charges facing him. At the conclusion of the appellant's evidence the sheriff explained that he wished to ask some questions in clarification. The sheriff questioned the accused for a period of 10 minutes at the end of the defence case, following which the parties addressed the jury. It was contended that the sheriff asked the appellant several unnecessary and irrelevant questions, the effect of which were to undermine the appellant's credibility and give the impression of bias. Counsel for the appellant had sought to object to some of this questioning, but was told by the sheriff to sit down.

On appeal, it was submitted that the sheriff's questioning of the appellant constituted improper cross-examination that would have led an independent observer to conclude that the sheriff had formed an adverse view of his credibility. The sentence imposed was also challenged on the basis that the sheriff was wrong to have concluded there was a significant sexual aspect to his behaviour. It was also submitted that the sheriff had given inadequate directions to the jury in respect of mutual corroboration, and that the sheriff had erred in repealing the submission of no case to answer in respect of three of the charges.

Hallmarks of Cross-Examination. The opinion of the court was delivered by Lord Turnbull. Examining the transcript of the case to evaluate the sheriff's conduct, he said: "Nothing which he raised with the appellant constituted clarification. The first question which he asked sought confirmation that the complainers were all strangers to the appellant. This had been at the heart of the case for the Crown." He continued: "This was a process which had all the hallmarks of cross-examination designed to undermine the testimony of the witness, although we would observe that, in our opinion, it would be objectionable to ask a witness for comment of this sort and such evidence would be inadmissible." On the effect of the sheriff's conduct, he said: "The trial sheriff engaged in an exercise which could only be described as cross-examination. The informed and impartial observer would readily have concluded that the sheriff had formed an adverse view on the credibility of the appellant's evidence. The result was a miscarriage of justice and the appeal against conviction on each charge must be upheld on this ground."

On counsel for the appellant's attempt to object to the sheriff's questions, he said: "Counsel was correct to object to the sheriff's questioning when she did. The exercise which the sheriff was engaged in had already lacked any element of clarification and at the point when she rose to her feet the sheriff appeared to be in the process of arguing with the appellant." He continued: "It is unacceptable for a judicial office holder to address a responsible practitioner by telling her to sit down. Such behaviour carries the risk of demeaning the standing of the judiciary in the eyes of both the legal profession and of the public." On whether the sheriff had properly explained mutual corroboration, he said: "We are persuaded that by looking to the totality of the directions given it can be said that the essential elements of the doctrine were adequately conveyed to the jury. The appeal based on this ground must therefore be refused."

Regarding the no case to answer submissions for three of the charges, he said: "The sheriff does not explain what it was about any aspect of the appellant's behaviour which he considered could be construed as threatening. In relation to charge 5, 6 and 18 there was no evidence of any threatening language, manner or tone. None of the comments contained any innuendo, sexual or otherwise." He continued: "It does not seem to us that a polite conversational request or complement can be construed as threatening merely because it is uninvited or unwelcome." For these reasons, the appeal succeeded on the basis of the first and third grounds of appeal. As the appeal against conviction was upheld, the issue of sentence did not require to be addressed.

Women Who Accused Former Chief Constable of Bullying Given £1m

Scottish Legal News: Two women who accused Scotland's former chief constable, Phil Gormley, of bullying have been awarded an out-of court settlement worth over £1 million, the Scottish Daily Mail reports. Mr Gormley stepped down from his senior police position in February 2018 after being placed on "special leave" for five months pending an investigation into the allegations. Aimée Canavan and Lesley Brines, both former employees, brought legal actions to the All-Scotland Sheriff Personal Injury Court after internal investigations at Police Scotland were dropped. Ms Canavan sought legal action after a complaint that she made as an inspector was dropped in the wake of Mr Gormley's resignation. Ms Brines, who was his personal assistant, also sought damages. An out-of-court settlement has been agreed in which it is claimed that the two women will be paid "well over £1 million", the Scottish Daily Mail reports. Liam Kerr, the Scottish Conservative justice spokesman, has said the incident has raised "serious questions" and has cost the taxpayer "a significant amount of money". Mr Gormley has denied any wrongdoing and Police Scotland has said the force was not party to the proceedings.

HMP Erlestoke – "Very Troubling" Safety, Decency, Purposeful activity, all Decline

Inspectors found a "very troubling" picture at HMP Erlestoke of violence, indiscipline and self-harm, with increased use of force by staff to get prisoners back into poor-quality cells in which they had been locked up for most of the day for more than five months. HM Inspectorate of Prisons (HMI Prisons) conducted a scrutiny visit (SV) to Erlestoke in August 2020 to assess its success in returning to acceptable conditions following the initial peak of the COVID-19 pandemic and the restricted regime during it. Like other prisons, the category C prison in Wiltshire had effectively protected prisoners from the virus in the early stages of the pandemic, using severely restricted daily regimes. However, Peter Clarke, HM Chief Inspector of Prisons, said that overall "the response to the COVID-19 pandemic at HMP Erlestoke has led to a less safe, less decent and less purposeful prison."

He added: "Although the amount of time prisoners could spend out of their cells had been increased in the early stages of lockdown, during our visit in August 2020 most prisoners still only received 45-minute sessions in the morning and the afternoon, and an additional half an hour one evening a week. Prisoners reported being frustrated about daily delays in the delivery of this limited regime, and about the lack of activity." In addition to the slow recovery from severe restrictions, inspectors were disturbed by other aspects of the visit.

Mr Clarke said that had the visit been a full, pre-COVID-19 inspection, he would seriously have considered invoking the Urgent Notification (UN) protocol, in which he publicly alerts the Secretary of State to significant problems in a prison, and which requires the Secretary of State to respond with plans to improve within 28 days. Instead, Mr Clarke raised his urgent concerns shortly after the visit in a letter to the Secretary of State, Robert Buckland QC. Mr Clarke's letter and Mr Buckland's response are published in the annexes to the scrutiny visit report. Worrying findings included:

Despite prisoners being locked up for most of the day, the level of assaults had remained similar to the level before the lockdown. A quarter of prisoners reported feeling unsafe. Incidents involving the use of force by staff had more than doubled since the beginning of lockdown and were often used to enforce the restricted regime. There had also been a spike in the number of serious incidents of indiscipline in the weeks before, during and after the scrutiny visit. Self-harm by prisoners had increased significantly since the lockdown and there were deficiencies in the assessment, care in custody and teamwork case management process for prisoners at risk of suicide or self-harm. Some prisoners who were self-isolating received less time out of their cell and not all had access to the open air.

In the segregation unit inspectors saw treatment that was "degrading and unacceptable." They found one prisoner and were made aware of two others who had been without toilets, running water and a cell call bell system for approximately two weeks. They had been given buckets while waiting for cell toilets to be fixed. Most residential units were poorly maintained, and some were dilapidated. Inspectors found broken cell windows with sharp shards of glass, damaged observation panels, blocked toilets and showers that were not working. There was also racist graffiti.

While the prisoner survey suggested that staff treated prisoners with respect, most prisoners also said that the incentives scheme was ineffective; antisocial behaviour was rewarded and prisoners often resorted to it to get their needs met. Security staff had been proactive in intercepting drugs but 32% of prisoners nonetheless said it was easy to get drugs in the prison. Significant amounts of illicit alcohol, so-called hooch, had also been found – 370 litres since the start of the pandemic. Health services were mostly reasonable and although workshops and face-to-face education no longer took place, the education provider had created distance learning packages, delivering some qualifications.

Mr Clarke said the support in place for prisoners to maintain contact with their family was

disappointing. “Social visits had only resumed two weeks before our visit and take-up was very low. Many prisoners’ families lived far away from the prison. The short duration of visits, together with restrictions, such as the prohibition on physical contact, meant that for many families, visits were not a realistic or worthwhile option.” The offender management unit had maintained good staffing levels and the department had continued with face-to-face contact in more complex cases, although some work was done by telephone or written correspondence. Mr Clarke added, however: “For most prisoners, there was little opportunity to progress. In fact, the prison appeared to have lost its purpose, which was to address the offending behaviour and reduce the risks of long-term offenders.”

Overall, Mr Clarke said: “This was a very troubling visit […] Some of the issues should be amenable to local resolution, if effective leadership can be brought to bear. Others appear to be systemic, arising from the apparent inflexibility of the recovery programme […] I am in no doubt that well-led and properly supported local innovation and flexibility are now urgently needed to restore the acceptable treatment and conditions of the prisoners held there. I have now received a written response from the Secretary of State which in effect is an Action Plan to address the issues raised in this report. In due course HM Inspectorate of Prisons will return to Erlestoke to report on progress.

Benjamin Bestgen: The Right (Not) To Be Offended Part Two

Open a newspaper or look through social media and you will find people expressing their upset about all kinds of real or perceived wrongs. Taking offence with expressions of other people is probably as old as humanity itself. Priding ourselves at being somewhat civilised, we have stepped back from stripping offenders naked and flogging them in the town-square. Our pillories are largely digital now. Debates about cancel culture, trigger warnings, intellectual “safe spaces”, non-platforming or call-out culture rehash an old issue with freedom of expression: it appears that to some people, freedom of expression must be restricted where a person expresses views that are deemed offensive to others. In recent years, various debates across political and social spectrums seem focussed on the offensiveness of expressions rather than their veracity. Even generational divides opened up: elders complain about young “snowflakes” who immediately cry about some “-ism” and are accused of being overly sensitive regarding issues of environment, equality, ethnicity or sex and gender relations. In retaliation, younger people point out that “boomers” and “gammon” are equally sensitive if they get called out on their greed, casual race- and sexism, environmental ignorance or affinity for nationalism and parochial attitudes.

Freedom of Expression and Harm: Philosopher John Stuart Mill argued for largely unrestricted freedom of speech for everybody, believing in utilitarian fashion that in an idealised “marketplace of ideas” all thoughts should be heard and examined, no matter how immoral they may seem to some. The best ideas would eventually float to the surface and benefit society at large. Mill’s main test for permitting limitations on free speech was whether a particular expression would cause harm to the rights of other members of society. But arguably a lot of political and religious speech is bigoted, immoral, deceitful, offensive, dishonest or hateful. Does that cause enough harm to the rights of others to justify limiting political or religious expressions? And what about violent movies, videogames or pornography? These are partially empirical questions, hard to answer from an armchair.

Offence: Some thinkers believe the harm principle is too narrow. Even Mill acknowledged that certain acts and expressions, if done publicly, could be a nuisance and offence against others which may be censored. Philosopher Joel Feinberg argued that some expressions are so grossly offensive that even if they don’t cause direct harm to another’s rights, society

can be justified in prohibiting or restricting them. Political scientist David van Mill discusses Feinberg’s proposal, noting various considerations before deciding whether an expression should be restricted for offensiveness: “These include the extent, duration and social value of the speech, the ease with which it can be avoided, the motives of the speaker, the number of people offended, the intensity of the offense, and the general interest of the community.” Context also matters: a controversial expression may be appropriate at university, where great social value lies in the unrestricted debate and exploration of ideas. The same expression may be entirely inappropriate in a restaurant or courtroom.

But to critics, offensiveness seems too fickle and aesthetically driven to justify censorship. Many people are easily offended, be it because they are overly sensitive, ignorant or prejudiced. Others take offence not because of what was said but because of who the speaker was or how they said it. Still others find humour in topics that are deadly serious to their neighbours. Satire is often an interesting test case for offensive expressions and censorship: in recent years, one might consider the “Juice Media Controversy” in Australia, the exploits of British comedian Sacha Baron Cohen or the violent retaliation against cartoonists lampooning the prophet Muhammad.

Rights Not to be Offended: Few countries in the world have freedom of expression rights as unrestricted as in the US, which places a very high value on individual rights to say and do as one wants. Most liberal democracies recognise that there some expressions which an objective, fair-minded observer would probably deem intolerable if we are to live together in a reasonably peaceful manner. In a way, laws against harassment, defamation, bullying or discrimination are rights which at least partially protect the victim against offensive acts or expressions in some areas of life. Legal philosopher Jeremy Waldron also makes a case for prohibiting hate speech, which are expressions that voice hatred and/or encourage violence against a target due to their sexuality, gender, ethnicity or religion. Hate speech undermines over time the target’s standing as an equal member in society, their claim to basic rights, liberties and recognition, their reputation and dignity. Permitting hate speech normalises and gives a platform to the messages against the intended target with a corrosive effect on how we think about and treat the affected people.

Therefore, limitations to grossly offensive expressions can be reasonable as they protect societal cohesion. They also help minorities or less powerful persons to make their interests heard without being further marginalised, excluded or even dehumanised by persons or groups more powerful than them. The ongoing question is always where to draw the line between offensive expressions we must tolerate and those we can justifiably prohibit. This is a line we are constantly challenged to negotiate together as a society – if we don’t, somebody will do it for us and we might not like the results.

New Rules for MI5 and Police to Authorise Crimes

Read more: Undercover informants working for the police and MI5 are going to be explicitly permitted for the first time under British law to commit crimes. The unprecedented legislation to authorise and oversee crimes comes after years of unclear rules over when these agents can break the law. The law will not specify exactly which crimes can be committed. And critics are urging MPs to amend the proposed law to rule out murder and serious violence.

The highly unusual decision to create a law that sanctions crime comes after a legal battle to force MI5 and the government to reveal secret rules governing when an informant can break the law. Informants - also known as agents - are recruited to gather intelligence on targets, including terrorist organisations, major drugs gangs and child abuse networks. These

agents are often already involved in the networks being targeted and need to maintain a cover in order to gather critical evidence for investigators.

However, a major court ruling last year found that while MI5 had an "implied" power to authorise crimes - it did not mean anyone involved was immune from prosecution. That judgement, only narrowly in the government's favour, prompted the decision to create the new law.New Rules For MI5 and Police to Authorise Crimes Under the legislation going before Parliament on Thursday, MI5, the police, the National Crime Agency and other agencies that use informants or undercover agents will be able to explicitly authorise them to commit a specific crime as part of an operation. The law will require MI5 officers and others to show the crime is "necessary and proportionate".

Security officials will not say which crimes they will consider authorising because that could lead to terrorists and other serious criminals working out who is working undercover. But the legislation stresses agencies must not breach the Human Rights Act, which requires the government to protect life. While the security service's watchdog, a senior judge, will report on how the power is used, there will be no role for the Crown Prosecution Service in reviewing the crimes. Ken McCallum, the new Director General of MI5, said agents working deep undercover had played a critical role in stopping many of the 27 terror plots that have been uncovered in the last three years. "Without the contribution of human agents, be in no doubt, many of these attacks would not have been prevented," he said. And Security Minister James Brokenshire said the new law had in-built guarantees. "This is a critical capability and is subject to robust, independent oversight. It is important that those with a responsibility to protect the public can continue this work, knowing that they are on a sound legal footing."

But Maya Foa, director of Reprieve, a legal and human rights campaign group that challenged the secrecy around the rules, said: "We are seriously concerned that the bill fails to expressly prohibit MI5 and other agencies from authorising crimes like torture, murder and sexual violence. "Our intelligence agencies do a vital job in keeping this country safe, but there must be common sense limits on their agents' activities, and we hope MPs will ensure these limits are written into the legislation".

Perks of being over 60 and heading towards 80!

Kidnappers are not very interested in you.
In a hostage situation you are likely to be released first.
No one expects you to run--anywhere.
People no longer view you as a hypochondriac.
There is nothing left to learn the hard way.
Things you buy now won't wear out.
You can live without sex but not your glasses.
You quit trying to hold your stomach in no matter who walks into the room.
You sing along with elevator music.
Your eyes won't get much worse.
Your joints are more accurate meteorologists than the national weather service.
Your secrets are safe with your friends because they can't remember them either.
Your supply of brain cells is finally down to manageable size.
You can't remember who sent you this list.
Never under any circumstances, take a sleeping pill and a laxative on the same night
An all-nighter means not getting up to pee.

Old is when: You're not sure if the avove are facts or jokes

Courts Relying on 'Drill Music' to Reinforce Racist Stereotypes

Cassie Blower, Justice Gap: A study of criminal appeals in which rap lyrics or music videos are cited in evidence to support the initial conviction found that more than half involved joint enterprise convictions in support of supposed gang connections. Research conducted by Dr Abenaa Owusu-Bempah, assistant professor of Law at the LSE, reveals that lyrics and music videos are used 'almost exclusively' as evidence against 'Black young men and boys accused of serious offences in urban areas' and usually London. In a recent blog, the academic wrote that this 'indicates a deliberate tactic, whereby prosecutors are able to draw on stereotypical narratives to construct case theories'. Drill Music is defined by its dark, violent, nihilistic lyrical content and ominous trap-influenced beats. 'In other words, prosecutors can use lyrics and videos to tell a story of a dangerous rapper that reflects longstanding stereotypes about Black males as criminals. In doing so, elements of Black youth culture are conflated with serious offending. We see this also in the link to gangs,' she says.

The issue was debated in a series of webinars hosted by the barristers' chambers Garden Court Chambers on the racial injustice surrounding Drill music – a trap-influenced style of rap music – within the UK and, in particular, its use as evidence in criminal trials and its perceived associations with gang activity and joint enterprise offences. It was argued that some connection to Drill music, no matter how tenuous, risked defendants facing miscarriages of justice. Good character evidence was ignored and wrong assumptions about the defendant's connections to violent gangs were made. Dr Owusu-Bempah's research showed that the evidence was most often admitted under s101(1)(d) of the Criminal Justice Act 2003 as relevant to an important matter in issue between the defendant and the prosecution. Such matters were most commonly: intention; motive; or to rebut a defence, such as innocent presence. In all of the cases studied, all submissions that lyric or video evidence of this kind should not be admitted were unsuccessful. There was also little consideration of the relevance of the evidential material, the fairness of admitting it, or its prejudicial effect.

'The courts appear to take an uninformed and dismissive attitude towards the prejudicial effect of this kind of evidence, allowing prosecutors to use stereotypical narratives and racist image to construct a case theory,' the academic argued. The academic cited experience in the US courts of prosecutor using rap music to reinforce notions of Black criminality and, for example, a 2018 study found that participants were 'more likely to assume that a rapper is in a gang, has a criminal record, and is involved in criminal activity than are artists from other music genres, and this is based merely on the genre of the lyrics'. This research follows a theme that has emerged in recent years surrounding the UK's drill music scene. In 2018, the Metropolitan police compiled a database of 1,400 drill videos, with police commissioner Cressida Dick stating the genre is 'associated with lyrics glamorising serious violence: murder, stabbings.' Youtube then deleted 30 drill music videos from its site at the request of the Met, on the basis that they were supposedly inciting violence.

Offenders: Foreign Nationals

What steps are her Majesty's Government taking to ensure (1) that removal planning starts at the beginning of sentences of imprisonment in cases where foreign offenders are recommended for removal by sentencing courts, and (2) that the removal of such offenders takes place at the end of imprisonment.

This Government puts the rights of the British public before those of criminals, and we are clear that foreign criminals should be deported from the UK wherever it is legal and practical to do so. Foreign national offenders (FNOs) who abuse our hospitality should be in no doubt of our determination to deport them and since 2010 we have removed over 55,000. In the period April 2019

to March 2020, we removed over 2,000 FNOs direct from prison under the Early Removal Scheme (ERS) many of whom were identified as FNOs who wanted to leave the UK. Those who wish to return home voluntarily are now fast tracked through the system to ensure a speedy removal. We make every effort to ensure that an FNO's deportation coincides, as far as possible, with their release from prison however the deportation of FNOs is complex. We are working with the Ministry of Justice on options to maximise the opportunities for early removal of FNOs under ERS. All FNOs are referred to the Home Office by Her Majesty's Prison and Probation Service within ten days of being sentenced and five days when they have received a short prison sentence, so that deportation action can be considered and progressed. If an FNO meets the criteria for deportation, a notification of liability to deportation is served and deportation proceedings commence. The Home Office is now serving FNOs with notices of liability to deportation earlier in their sentence. This allows time to progress the case and remove barriers so that FNOs can be removed more quickly.

Children in Prison: 40 Minutes Out Of Cells - No Longer Able to See Families

Jon Robins, Justice Gap: Children in prison were spending just 40 minutes out of their cells and contact with the outside world curtailed so that they were no longer able to see families or friends. New research by the National Association for Youth Justice, highlighted the over-representation of minority ethnic children in prison as well as the consequences of the Covid-19 pandemic. According to the State of Youth Justice report, two of the three young offender institutes inspected limited education to undertaking worksheets in their cells whilst the third establishment was able to provide just two hours face-to-face education on school days. The report found that the time children spent out of cell varied from three hours a day to just 40 minutes.

The report, authored by Dr Tim Bateman, Reader in Youth Justice at the University of Bedfordshire, found that contact with the outside world had been curtailed with the consequence that 'children no longer have any face-to-face interaction with families or friends, nor visits from social workers, YOT staff or lawyers'. The research noted that almost one in three children arrested for a notifiable offence in 2019 was recorded as being black or from a minority ethnic group. 'Wider inequalities do not tell the whole story,' the research said. 'In 2019, black people were subject to stop and search at almost ten times the rate for the white population. Differential police practice in this regard further undermines the trust that black children have in authority, reinforcing perceptions that criminal justice agencies discriminate against them. Black children who enter the system are also more likely to receive harsher levels of punishment.'

Black children were more likely to experience longer sentences of imprisonment. While in May 2005 minority ethnic children accounted for one quarter of those in custody, by the same month in 2019, that proportion had risen to 51%. Between 2005 and 2019, the white population of the secure estate had declined by 80%; the equivalent reduction for BAME children was just 38%. 'Over the last decade, there have been some remarkable changes in the youth justice system, leading to lower levels of criminalisation of children and encouraging reductions in the extent of child imprisonment,' commented Dr Bateman. 'But there remains a considerable gap between the rhetoric of child first and ensuring that a child first philosophy and practice is fully embedded in the treatment of children in conflict with the law.'

The growing over-representation of minority ethnic children was 'nothing short of a disgrace and the treatment of children in custody is totally unacceptable', he said. The study highlighted 'a remarkable decline' in the number of females entering the youth justice system. 'Girl's detected indictable offending fell by an astonishing 95% between 1992 and 2018,' it said. 'By contrast, there are disconcerting indicators of differential treatment of young people from different ethnic groups.'

Homelessness: 'If They Could They Would Send Us Far, Far Away'

Laws linking welfare entitlement to immigration status have been a major cause of street homelessness, but legal solutions alone will not end migrant destitution. Rough-sleeping services also need to win back the trust of non-UK nationals. Before Covid-19, between a quarter and a third of the UK's rough sleepers were estimated to be from a migrant background. In London, around half of street homeless people were non-UK nationals. Unsurprisingly, central London boroughs such as Westminster, Camden and Southwark had high rates of migrant homelessness. But there were also large numbers of street-homeless non-UK nationals in some outer London boroughs, including Hillingdon (where Heathrow Airport is located), Ealing and Redbridge, as well as in Manchester and the West Midlands.

Some non-UK national rough sleepers experience what the sector calls 'multiple exclusion homelessness', meaning their rough sleeping is linked to issues such as addiction or being a survivor of abuse. The longer a person is destitute, the more likely they are to fall into this category. But in the cases of most migrant rough sleepers, there is a clear link between the homeless person's immigration status and their homelessness. Many are on the streets either because they are not allowed to work, because they cannot establish an entitlement to welfare benefits and statutory homelessness assistance, or through a combination of these two factors.

Migrant rough sleepers used to complain that homelessness services did not seem to understand the reasons for their homelessness or the kind of help they needed to get off the streets. They would report being offered substance-misuse treatment or employment support, despite not having drug or alcohol issues or the right to work. Services were often making the reflexive assumption that all rough sleepers had the same support needs. In recent years the homelessness sector has wised up to the fact that migrant rough sleepers face different barriers to their UK-national counterparts when it comes to accessing accommodation. Many homeless migrants are not eligible for help with housing costs, so the standard model for accommodating rough sleepers – putting them in a hostel and claiming housing benefit to cover the provider's costs – will not work for them. The sector's growing recognition of the intertwinement of the UK's immigration and welfare regimes has led to schemes aimed at addressing the specific issue of migrant rough sleeping.

But treating migrant rough sleepers differently has not always resulted in policies that uphold the human and social rights of homeless non-UK nationals. Instead of seeing insecure immigration status, or 'no recourse to public funds' (NRPF) status, as a 'support need', homelessness services – including councils and their commissioned outreach services – have tended to view the legal exclusion of some homeless people from statutory welfare support as an intractable barrier to housing-led solutions for this group. Instead of being challenged, 'welfare chauvinism' – the preferential treatment of citizens over non-citizens in the allocation of access to state support – has been taken as a given.

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.