

to continue my medication, however after my re-arrest, I was refused any medication and interviewed regardless, during these interviews I can be heard asking for my medication on several occasions, to which a female officer exclaimed, "there is nothing wrong with you, you're not mentally ill".

A female officer was getting quite aggressive and banging on the table, this can be heard on the tapes. I stated that she was bullying me in order to get a confession from me, which she didn't like and eventually stormed out of the interview, although none of this was played in court and she was not called as a witness.

I did not have my glasses during this interview and this combined with my condition with not having my medication made it very difficult to concentrate, when I was asked to draw my route that night on a map, I struggled to see street names and the female officer thrust a marker into my hand and lifted my arm in an attempt to "help me" mark out the route, the route I marked was not near to the one took but she refused to take no for an answer and demanded I draw on the map. I later told my solicitor the correct route that I took. End of part one

David Kent, A1843AJ, HMP Gartree, Gallow Field Road, Market Harborough, LE16 7RP

BBC wins right to broadcast Babar Ahmad prisoner interview

The High Court has ruled that Justice Secretary Ken Clarke was wrong to stop the BBC filming a terrorism suspect held for seven years without trial. The court said there was public interest in interviewing Babar Ahmad, due to the case's exceptional nature.

In their judgement, Mr Justice Singh and Lord Justice Hooper said: "The [interview ban] constitutes a disproportionate interference with the right to freedom of expression in Article 10. In the circumstances of this particular case, the justification for that interference has not been convincingly established. The claimants have demonstrated on the evidence before the Court that they do require a face-to-face interview with Mr Ahmad.

The Justice Secretary had argued an interview was not necessary to inform the public about Mr Ahmad's story. After the ruling, the justice secretary said he would not be appealing against the verdict and would now begin negotiations with the BBC about how and when the interview would take place.

The 38-year-old south London man has been held in prison (Currently in HMP Long Lartin) pending extradition to USA since 2004, believed to be a record for an unconvicted British citizen. He is awaiting a final decision on his case by the European Court of Human Rights. Last year, more than 140,000 people signed an official government e-petition calling for him to be tried in the UK, leading MPs to include his case in two Parliamentary debates.

Babar Ahmad: A9385AG, HMP Long Lartin, Evesham, WR11 8TZ

Hostages: Stephen Young, Anthony Jackson, David Kent, Norman Grant, Ricardo Morrison, Alex Silva, Terry Smith, Hyrone Hart, Glen Cameron, Warren Slaney, Melvyn 'Adie' McLellan, Lyndon Coles, Robert Bradley, Sam Hallam, John Twomey, Thomas G. Bourke, David E. Ferguson, Lee Mockble, George Romero Coleman, Gary Critchley, Neil Hurley, Jaslyn Ricardo Smith, James Dowsett, Kevan Thakrar, Jordan Towers, Peter Hakala, Patrick Docherty, Brendan Dixon, Paul Bush, Frank Wilkinson, Alex Black, Nicholas Rose, Kevin Nunn, Peter Carine, Simon Hall, Paul Higginson, Thomas Petch, Vincent and Sean Bradish, John Allen, Frank Wilkinson, Stephen A Young, Jeremy Bamber, Kevin Lane, Michael Brown, Robert Knapp, William Kenealy, Glyn Razzell, Willie Gage, Kate Keaveney, Michael Stone, Michael Attwooll, John Roden, Nick Tucker, Karl Watson, Terry Allen, Richard Southern, Jamil Chowdhary, Jake Mawhinney, Peter Hannigan, Ihsan Ulhaque, Richard Roy Allan, Sam Cole, Carl Kenute Gowe, Eddie Hampton, Tony Hyland, Ray Gilbert, Ishtiaq Ahmed. Ishtiaq Ahmed.

Miscarriages of JusticeUK (MOJUK)
22 Berners St, Birmingham B19 2DR
Tele: 0121- 507 0844 Fax: 087 2023 1623

MOJUK: Newsletter 'Inside Out' No 354 (15/01/2012)

Justice for Stephen Young

On 10 February 1993 Harry and Nicola Fuller were murdered in their home in Wadhurst. Both had been shot and a white powder sprinkled over Mr Fuller's body (which later emerged to be a sugar-based substance, not drugs).

Despite Mr Fuller's associations with criminals, some senior, Stephen Young, a man of previous good character and a financial adviser, was later charged and convicted of the murders. His first conviction for the Fullers' murders was quashed when it emerged that the jury had, whilst sequestered, used an Ouija Board to assist them reach a verdict. However he was later convicted again by a different jury.

The Crown case against Mr Young was and has always been that he was a lone killer motivated by financial difficulties. He has always maintained his innocence.

A key part of the evidence in the case was a 999 call Mrs Fuller had made after she was first shot. This recorded background noise and the evidence has always been that one person can be heard searching the premises and walking around. The possibility of a second person could not be ruled out but was considered a remote possibility.

Using state of the art technology an expert based in the United States has subjected the recording of the 999 call to extensive interrogation and has been able to conclude to "a reasonable scientific certainty" that two people were present at the time of the murders. This dramatic new evidence will now form the basis of an urgent application to the Criminal Cases Review Commission to re-investigate the circumstances of the Fullers' murders and it is hoped refer the case back to the Court of Appeal to review the safety of Mr Young's convictions.

Simon McKay, a solicitor-advocate and Mr Young's legal representative said "this new evidence is a great breakthrough which I hope will lead to one of the criminal justice system's most notorious miscarriage of justice cases being righted". He went on to say "it is interesting that on the day of the murders a school girl spotted two people outside the Fullers' home but her evidence was completely discounted as being unreliable. This new material would tend to suggest that what she saw that morning may have been accurate".

Mr McKay will be pressing for a full review of the case, 'my priority is to secure Mr Young's vindication - he has been in prison for nearly 19 years - but to also persuade the authorities to establish whether advances in technology and science can now be exploited to ascertain the identities of the real killer or killers. So far Sussex Police has not been prepared to provide access to original exhibits or other assistance which has delayed some of the progress we have been able to make".

Simon McKay has handled a number of high profile cases including the Private Lee Clegg case (paratrooper cleared of murdering two teenagers in 1990) and is the solicitor handling Jeremy Bamber's current CCRC case.

Notes: Simon McKay can be reached by email: simon.mckay@mckaylaw.co.uk

Letters of Support/Solidarity to:

Stephen A. Young, A1950AK, HMP Hollesley Bay, Woodbridge, Suffolk, IP12 3JW

96 murders since Stephen Lawrence's

By IRR News Team, 5th January 2012

The convictions of Gary Dobson and David Norris will be bitter-sweet vindication for the family of Stephen Lawrence who have fought an 18-year campaign for justice.

No family has campaigned as this one - taking their own evidence to the police, bringing a private prosecution against the alleged killers, demanding and getting a public inquiry which culminated in landmark changes to the law and the redefining of racial incidents. And yet, despite all their efforts, the hideous fact is that since Stephen Lawrence's death, at least ninety-six people have lost their lives to racial violence - an average of five per year.

For politicians the issue has been dealt with in the Macpherson Report of 1999. However our research shows that the main parties are in denial about the extent and severity of racial violence, and interested in rightwing extremism only when it challenges them electorally.[1] And yet it is the policies and pronouncements of mainstream politicians, on a range of issues from terrorism and foreign wars to cohesion, criminality and immigration, which create the insidious popular racism in which such violence fomented.

The sad fact is that such murders hardly make news. The names of victims will barely be known to any but their immediate families.

The IRR, which records all deaths with a (known or suspected) racial element[2] has found that since the death of Stephen Lawrence in 1993 that at least ninety-six people have died in such attacks.

* At least forty of the deaths were as a result of random acts of violence, many being the result of unprovoked attacks which took place on the street.

* The victims were overwhelmingly young men under the age of 30; there were twenty-one deaths of young people aged 20 and under. Of these, five deaths took place in unprovoked attacks similar to that on Stephen: Zardasht Draey, Anthony Walker, Christopher Alaneme, Ahmed Hassan, Mohammed al-Majed. There were thirty deaths of those aged 21 to 30.

* There were fourteen deaths of those aged 31-40, eighteen deaths of those aged 41-50; seven deaths of those aged 51-60 and six deaths of those aged 61+.

* At least ten of those who died were refugees or asylum seekers.

* Five migrant workers have been killed and all between 2005 and 2012.

* Those working in the night-time and service economies are particularly at risk with five taxi drivers killed in recent years; six restaurant workers or owners killed at work and four shop workers or owners killed at work.

* There have been nine deaths in Scotland, six in Wales, two in Northern Ireland and the remainder in England.

* Four deaths were of white British citizens and all the others were from BME communities or migrant workers.

We remember all those that have died since Stephen Lawrence in 1993 and list their names here: 1993: Saied Ahmed, Ali Ibrahim. 1994: Shamsuddin Mahmood, Donna O'Dwyer and Mohan Singh Kullar. 1995: Mushtaq Hussain. 1996: Daniel Blake and John Reid, 1997: Michael Menson and Lahkvinder 'Ricky' Reel. 1998: James Tossell, Akofa Hodasi, Remi Surage, Surjit Singh Chhokar and Farhan Mire. 1999: Jay Abatan, Stelios Economou, Harold (aka Errol) McGowan, Liaquat (aka Bobby) Ali, Joseph Alcendor, Ben Kamanalagi, Hassan Musa, Zardasht Draey and Jason McGowan. 2000: Zahid Mubarek, Santokh 'Peter' Singh Sandhu, Komra Divakaren, Jan Marthin Pasalbessi, Glynne Agard, Mohammed Asghar, Abdi Dorre, Tariq Javed, Khaliur Rahman and Sarfraz Khan. 2001: Gian Singh Nagra, Fetah

The police claimed that I had left my house at around 6pm on the night of the attack and returned in the early hours the following morning. If it took me 90 minutes to cycle half the distance one way the full journey would have taken almost double the time. Meaning the return journey would have taken almost the same time. Which would have put me arriving back at my house at approx 2-2.30am. My pc showed activity at around 8.30pm which matches with the amount of time it would have taken to return home from the ½ way point, this evidence was overlooked and a police expert claimed it may have been a virus scanning program set to operate at 8.21pm, although I have never installed any such program.

If I had cycled back 11.6 miles and as claimed by the police took the time to stop off somewhere dispose of a weapon and footwear that I was supposedly wearing, but forgot to dispose of the balaclava, arrived home, washed my bike, (which police photographs show mud and dirt still on the handle bars and pedals), placed all my clothing in the washing machine, on a hot wash, which took about 90 minutes as the water needed to be heated and it was an old washer, the washing machine had finished before the police arrived approx 3am, then taken a shower (completely drying the shower tray and towel that is supposed to have been used) how did they manage to find work related dirt under my fingernails and in my hair. I then managed to clean the light brown leather jacket I was wearing on the night, as shown in the cctv pictures from the ATM, but was not mentioned by the IPs son in his description) and all this before the police arrived.

The named man is known to the police as are his connections but even though he was named as the attacker the police never did any forensics tests at any point, no swabs nail scrapings, etc.

A family friend of the IPs who had given a statement, which also identified the named man, contacted the police to express his concerns for the IP after an incident involving the IP the named man and a handgun. The police searched his house and found what they say was an air pistol and a bulletproof Kevlar vest was also found, no action was taken, the man was also cautioned for carrying a butterfly knife at the seaside at some point after the attack,

The judge allowed us to mention the knife and the air gun but not the vest, we were also not allowed to mention any of the activities the group he is connected with were involved in. We were allowed to call him as a witness, but he had to gain permission from his associates to do this.

The IP stated she had tried to call the named man several times that day and he admitted that he had ignored her calls, but had responded to numerous (about 70) text messages that had been sent throughout the day.

Later that evening they had a lengthy conversation which resulted in an argument, which her son confirmed because he had overheard it, because she had discovered that he was seeing someone else and was in fact round her house whilst texting and calling her. This conversation was around 11pm. Her house is approx 5.8 miles away from the IPs home. The named man had also come from the area that the IP was living in, as they had been at school together, so knew the area well. Later that evening they had a lengthy conversation which resulted in an argument, which her son confirmed because he had overheard it, because she had discovered that he was seeing someone else and was in fact round her house whilst texting and calling her.

This conversation was around 11pm. Her house is approx 5.8 miles away from the IPs home. The named man had also come from the area that the IP was living in, as they had been at school together, so knew the area well.

At the time of my arrest I had been out of hospital just 7 days, after taking an overdose in a suicide attempt and had been on anti-depressants for several years, during the first interview I was allowed

that he had overheard 2 officers talking on the Friday 21st Nov 08 about a search being carried out and finding a metal bar in a bag in the brook near his house. Then on the Sat 22nd before he made his video statement, officers had come to the hospital and said they had found a yellow item (the handle on the chisel was yellow) outside the house. Did these 2 occasions contribute to what he remembered or what he thought he should remember? As his description then became a metal bar that was yellow. On many occasions throughout his interview he said "they said" or "they told me" and contained comments that had been made by other people.

He has been excluded from school for violent outbursts including throwing a chair at a teacher. He has ADHD and is on medication for his condition.

Forensic evidence claimed that the weapon used was yellow as they had found yellow paint chips in the IP's hood on her hooded top. They also claimed the top had an area of "forcible contact" with something yellow on one of the shoulders. Our own forensics found this contact area was red and not yellow, they even gave the exact shade of red and found red paint chips in the hood (as well as 2 shades of yellow, cream and some glass like fibres), none of which had been previously mentioned, this red paint match was omitted at trial.

When I was first arrested I saw an officer place a pair of trousers (army/cargo) into an evidence bag and these were logged into the property store at 4.50 am, this officer also stated during trial that he also seized another pair of these black trousers later that same day, 21st Nov, although no evidence number or log exists for these, he also denied having taken the pair he had previously logged in that morning at 4.50am. Another officer seized a 2nd identical pair of trousers to those logged in at 4.50 at 17.55 that day and logged them into the property store, they were an identical make but were smaller and did not fit me, these are also the ones claimed to have been seized from the washing machine. The 2 identical pairs were supplied by a previous employer and were made by Allen and Douglas the other pair were a cheap nameless brand.

After I was re-arrested 3 weeks later a 3rd officer also recovered a pair of black Allen and Douglas trousers from my house and they were logged into the property store at 13.00 on Dec 10th 08.

I have great difficulty explaining how this pair of trousers had reappeared at my house 3 weeks after they were logged into the police evidence store, as I was only ever given 2 pairs of them, but they somehow did and were no longer carrying the label which clearly displays the company logo, this logo could be seen on the CCTV footage at the ATM, these trousers were the ones I saw the officer bag myself taken from the floor of my living room 3 weeks earlier.

The other identical pair still carried the label and even though they didn't fit me it was claimed that they were the pair seen on CCTV as the ones I claimed did fit didn't have a label, I was never allowed to try the trousers on to prove that they didn't fit even though the Judge had said I would be allowed to do this.

There were fingerprints found on the outside of the front door of the IP's house and another print was found on the door frame. The one on the doorframe was in the IP's blood, these matched each other but did not match mine.

When asked for the results of these prints (long before trial) no information was handed over, eventually after almost a year and just 1 month before trial the police claimed that no forensic tests were carried out on the front door. There are police photographs of the prints after having been dusted and arrow labels being attached and also a statement from the IP's brother proved that tests had been done, and on the day of the trial (Dec 09) my legal clerk informed me that the police could not find a match for the prints on their database so were unable to identify who they belonged to again this was not used during trial.

Marku, Shibli Rahman, Sharon Bubb, Firsat Dag and Ross Parker. 2002: Frankie Kyriacou, Peiman Bahmani, Shah Wahab, Derrick Shaw and Israr Hussain. 2003: Mohammed Isa Hasan Ali, Unnamed Asian man, Paul Rosenberg, Johnny Delaney, Awais Alam and Qadir Ahmed. 2004: Kriss Donald, Shahid Aziz, Akberali Tayabali Mohamedally, Brij Brushan Sharma, Bapishankar Kathirgamanathan and Kalan Kawa Karim. 2005: Deraye Lewis, Mi Gao Huang Chen, Mugilan Sutherland, Kamal Raza Butt, Anthony Walker, Rushi Kamdar and Isiah Young-Sam. 2006: Lee Phipps, Christopher Alaneme, Khizar Hyat, Hamidullah Hamidi, Mohammed Pervaiz, Changez Arif, Shezan Umarji, Wei Wang, Syed Sorafot Ali and Meshack Brown. 2007: Enayit Khalili, Tarsen Nahar, Marion Moran, Adam Michalski, Gregory Fernandes, Ahmed Hassan and Asaf Mahmood Ahmed. 2008: Hamida Begum, Alana Mian, Nilanthan Moorthy and Mohammed al-Majed. 2009: Syden Pearson, Kunal Mohanty, Marek Muszynski and Ekram Haque. 2010: Papa Mbaye Mody (aka Alioune Cisse), Mohammed Idris Mirza, Marcin Bilaszewski, Nachhattar Singh Bola and Simon San. 2011: Mahesh Wickramasingha and Anuj Bidve.

Ross Macpherson - Not Guilty of wounding with intent

On Wednesday 7th December at Aylesbury Crown Court, after just two hours of deliberation, the jury found Ross not guilty of wounding with intent of another prisoner at HMP Woodhill, on the grounds of self defence.

Ross was attacked in his cell on Monday 13th September (2010) at HMP Woodhill by inmate Jonathan Watson and two other prisoners. As a result of refusing to hand over canteen the week before, the trio had made threats to stab Ross and set fire to his cell. Fearing for his own safety and not wanting to go to prison officers for fear of being labelled a grass, Ross acquired a weapon, a tooth brush with a razor blade embedded in it and used it to defend himself when he was attacked in his cell. Jonathan Watson sustained a large cut to his head and Ross was subsequently charged with wounding with intent but the jury saw through Watson's lies and the prison officers' contradictions. No-one from HMP Woodhill could give an explanation as to why there was no CCTV footage!

Ross feels he should never have been charged and just wants to put the incident behind him and is looking forward to his release in April 2012. He would like to say a big thanks to his solicitor Zeeshan Khan of JD Spicer and Co, his barrister Joe Stone of Doughty St Chambers and Kevan Thakrar for recommending them and to everyone else who has helped and supported him throughout his time in prison.

Lawrence case: the elephant in the room

Brendan O'Neill, Spiked, 05/02/12

The double-jeopardy rule survived the Dark Ages, but it could not survive the New Labour years. With every media outlet, from the Sun to the Socialist Worker, editorialising about how the conviction of David Norris and Gary Dobson for the murder of Stephen Lawrence was a 'glorious day' for Britain, I knew it would be a thankless task to go on the radio and ask: 'What about the double jeopardy rule?'

On Nick Ferrari's breakfast show on London's LBC radio this morning, I argued that all the people describing this case as a victory for justice are overlooking the fact that it is a victory built upon the wreckage of some pretty important legal principles. One longstanding legal protection in particular - the double jeopardy rule, the idea that no one should be tried twice for the same crime - had to be dismantled in order to get Dobson back in the dock. Having been acquitted of the murder of

Lawrence in 1996, Dobson was what we used to call 'autrefois acquit', previously acquitted, which in the past would have meant that he could not have been tried for the murder a second time. That all changed in 2003, when New Labour ditched the double-jeopardy rule.

Ferrari was having none of it. 'But these men are wicked', he said. Even my agreement with him that the men are indeed lowlifes, alongside my argument that 'this isn't about them, it's about what kind of justice system we want to have', didn't wash. 'I disagree with everything you say', Ferrari told me, and cut me off mid-sentence.

Double jeopardy is the elephant in the room of the Dobson and Norris conviction. Sure, journalists are mentioning it, usually in fluffy factboxes titled 'How this case came to court', but no one wants to discuss it in detail. No one wants to discuss the extraordinary amount of history and progressive tradition that had to be consigned to the dustbin of 'bad ideas' in order to secure one conviction against two nasty blokes.

The double-jeopardy rule had existed in some form or other for centuries. There was a Roman maxim which said 'nemo bis in idem debet vexari' - no man shall be punished twice for the same. It's there in early Christianity, too, in St Jerome's insistence in the fourth century that 'there shall not rise up a double affliction'. It's also in the sixth-century Digest of Justinian, the seed of much of modern jurisprudence, which insisted that, 'The governor should not permit the same person to be accused of a crime of which he has been acquitted'. An academic study of the double jeopardy rule in history points out that it is one of the 'few legal rights recognised by the Christian fathers throughout the Dark and Middle Ages'.

In twelfth-century England, a form of double jeopardy was codified in the Constitutions of Clarendon, which, in an attempt to rein in the authoritarian instincts of Henry II, stipulated that no man could be tried for the same offence in both the ecclesiastical courts and the king's courts. It had to be one or the other. From England it spread to the US, where the eighteenth-century revolutionaries and their successors made a bar against double jeopardy a key plank of their new republic's constitutional guarantee of liberty against state power. In each historic period, the purpose of the rule against 'double afflictions' was strikingly similar: to protect individuals from potentially being hounded and interminably retried by governors, crown forces or cops determined to stick them in jail. That's because being permanently at risk of prosecution is itself a kind of life sentence.

Yet where the double-jeopardy rule survived the Dark Ages, it could not survive the New Labour years. Proving they're even more allergic to liberty than those pointy-hatted men who ruled Europe in that bleakest period of cultural and moral deterioration, New Labour suits decided to ditch the double-jeopardy rule in 2003. Taking their cue from the 1999 Macpherson Report into the Stephen Lawrence case, which proposed a new 'power' to override the double-jeopardy rule, New Labour's Criminal Justice Act 2003 made it possible to retry someone for a serious offence of which he had previously been acquitted or convicted.

And so it was that a legal protection that had existed in various forms for two millennia, articulated by everyone from Romans to saints to revolutionaries, was discarded - all in the name of bringing a few rotters from south London back to court to answer for the killing of Stephen Lawrence. Add the ditching of the double jeopardy rule to recent assaults on the right to silence and even on the right to trial by jury in some instances, and you can clearly see that it is not justice that is being boosted here, but rather the power of the state over the once-sovereign individual. The further legal denuding of the individual before the forces of the state is simply too high a price to pay to secure convictions against people we don't like. The

overnight as I was on Economy 7 tariff and took advantage of the cheaper rate, which was confirmed by my bills at the time and my mother when the police asked her about it

The items 1 + 2 were not in the washing machine and the evidence log/statement proves this, however, the officer was not called as a witness so questions regarding this were never raised.

Forensic tests on the woolly hat/balaclava failed to connect it to the attack and no evidence that it had even been worn recently was found, as no hairs were found to have been recently deposited in it and no fibres from the hat were found in my hair, it was claimed that I may of showered and washed my hair to remove evidence, but the hair combings and fingernail scrapings contained debris relating to the work I had been doing that day, but these details were also not mentioned in court.

The DNA and prints which the officer claimed were on the weapon were not mine and results showed that I was not forensically linked to the item, although I was still questioned about it, and it was still used as evidence during trial. It was a bladed item (a wood Chisel) but there were no incised (stab) wounds on the IP and forensic experts could not establish if the item had actually been used during the attack as a result of this, nor did it match any other similar items I owned and work colleagues failed to recognise it when asked if they had seen it before (I worked in the building trade, so did the person named).

The forensics results did claim that I "could of" contributed to the DNA found on the item but it was a low copy DNA sample and unsuitable for evidence, after lengthy pursuit for further details the forensic lab admitted that the results also had similarities to the IP and the named man so either of them could of contributed to the DNA profile found, but it was never divulged whose profile was a better match from the 3 of us. The fingerprint was unsuitable for use as it was only a partial so no match was found.

My mobile phone was not detected at the scene as previously stated by officers during interview, it was in fact around 5 ½ miles away 4 hours before the attack and heading in the opposite direction to the crime scene, back towards my own home.

It was claimed during trial that I had travelled from East to West during my cycle ride that night but the last signal showed me heading East again to return home. The attack took place 11.6 miles away from my house and it had taken me 90 minutes to cycle 5 ½ miles as I had only been out of hospital 1 week after a suicide attempt (overdose).

CCTV near the IP's house and on the route I was alleged to have taken failed to see me and it was claimed that I had put my mountain bike over my shoulder as well as carrying a rucksack with items in and climbed over hedges, fences and gone through gardens to avoid being detected, even though I was not aware that there was CCTV on a nearby house, although some CCTV was said to be not working that night at a pub/restaurant and I was never shown the CCTV from 100 yards away from the IPs address. The only CCTV that I was actually seen on was 1 mile away from my house withdrawing cash from an ATM, (this information I actually supplied to them on my first questioning) and I was aware there was a camera at this atm. If I had not stopped at this machine the cctv would not have seen me going past on the main road as the view is not that far reaching. The cctv shows the clothes I am wearing and the rucksack on my back with an object sticking out one of the small pockets which is yellow, on one of the sons video interview he is asked about the weapon he saw being used during the attack, he replied "They said it was yellow".

This was the first time that he had mentioned a colour in any of his interviews.

When asked at trial who "They" were, he replied the police and went on to describe

evening by telephone between the 2 of them. I was not the boyfriend I had not made any such call and had in fact had no contact with the IP for approx 3 weeks, which my phone records proved. There was also mention of a 999 call after the attack where the IP and her son, who was the main witness, when asked if they knew who the attacker was both named the same person and identified him straight away as the person known to police as the IP's boyfriend, as was the fact that she was expecting him to visit her around the time of the attack.

This man's name was also mentioned again, when a friend on visiting her within a few hours asked the question, was it her current boyfriend that had committed the attack?, she stated she believed that it was, this information does appear in this person's statement, he also states he had warned her about getting involved with this particular person. This friend was not called as a witness but some of his statement was read out in court.

The IP's son first claimed that he had not seen anything but later changed this and gave a description of the attacker, which seemed to match the person that had been named during the 999 call. The description was of a tall man who had muscular arms and shoulders. I am not tall or muscular, more described as being a little fat if anything. There was approx 4 statements made by the son and the clothing and details seemed to change with each one, from dark clothing, to sports clothing to jeans or trousers, long sleeves or short sleeves, gloves or no gloves.

The named man was never arrested even though the police seemed fairly desperate to do this initially as they visited 3 addresses in order to find him and attempted to contact him on his mobile and then to trace him via mobile signal but their efforts were unsuccessful as they could not trace a signal.

Later that day Friday 21st Nov 08, his phone signal was detected at around midday, somewhere in Nottinghamshire, the attack took place close to the borders of Derbyshire and Staffordshire, some 30 miles away (phone records prove this). The police eventually managed to contact him on the Saturday to ask him to visit them to discuss the attack he was evasive and uncooperative (this is logged in an officer's notebook), but eventually he agreed to go to the station.

Prior to his police station visit he went to the hospital to see the IP even though he had not been officially eliminated from the enquiry at that time, the IP and her son have not mentioned his name since.

Although I was arrested just 3 ½ hours after the attack took place, forensic tests were unable to find anything that connected me to the attack. They took finger prints, DNA, nail clippings and scrapings from under my nails, swabs from my hands and forearms and combings from my hair to analyse the fibres/debris trapped in it, but nothing was found which connected me. They also took many items of my clothing and footwear not just dark items but many coloured items too, and my footwear, shoes and boots including all work boots and again nothing was found which connected me to the scene or crime.

The police claimed that the clothes I had been wearing that night had been recovered from my washing machine after being washed, although no evidence was produced to confirm these claims until the day of the trial (which was aborted) in July 09.

I do not believe that these items were in the washing machine and a statement from the officer who claimed to have recovered them (handed over in July 09 at trial) had them listed as Item 1: Balaclava Item 2: Black Trousers Item 3: Clothing recovered from washing machine.

Underneath these items it said all of the above were found in the washing machine and the statement was dated a few days before we were given it in July 09 and not Nov 08 when the items were recovered. The clothes in item 3 were in the washing machine but none of them matched what the police claimed they were looking for. I always did my washing

immediate losers might be people like Dobson, but the long-term losers are all of us, with our rights and protections, fought for over centuries, further eroded by the state and its compliant media cheerleaders and supposedly liberal supporters.

You don't have to be a friend of Dobson or Norris to recognise that undermining long-standing legal protections for a narrow and fleeting end is never a good thing to do. Isn't there also an old legal maxim about how 'hard cases make bad law'?

After Dobson and Norris, what other unsolved murders could be closed?

Duncan Campbell and Eric Allison, guardian.co.uk, Friday 6 January 2012

How many unsolved murders - and miscarriages of justice - could be cleared by detailed scientific reviews? Susan May, who served twelve years in prison for her aunt's murder but has protested her innocence. Susan May's case merits a review of the DNA evidence

The breakthrough in DNA analysis that led to the conviction of Gary Dobson and David Norris for the murder of Stephen Lawrence this week raises the question of how many other unsolved murders could be solved by similar means and, more controversially, how many miscarriages of justice cases could be cleared up.

The detailed scientific review that painstakingly went through all the exhibits in the Lawrence case reportedly cost £3.4 million. The Met's homicide and serious crime command alone are currently re-examining between 15 and 20 cold case murders, all of which take time and money. Clearly there would be reluctance to dedicate those sort of resources to investigating alleged miscarriage of justice cases which have slipped from public view but many campaigners believe that, if the money was allocated to such intricate analyses, some cases could finally be resolved.

It is nearly three years now since Sean Hodgson walked out of the court of appeal as a free man after spending almost three decades in prison for crimes he did not commit. His 1982 conviction for rape and murder of Teresa de Simone three years earlier was quashed as a result of a DNA analysis that could have established his innocence a decade before.

Hampshire police had reopened the murder inquiry after new analysis of DNA evidence from the scene did not match a sample from Hodgson. Such tests were not available at the time of his trial. In the wake of the appeal, the Criminal Cases Review Commission (CCRC) asked the Crown Prosecution Service to review all similar murder cases where DNA evidence was available and the defendants still alive.

"We decided to look again at every application received by the commission in relation to a conviction for rape or murder arising before 1990," said a CCRC spokesperson.

"We did so with an open mind, but we did not anticipate that there would be a great many cases because the commission is an organisation created after the use of DNA evidence became established in this country, and DNA has therefore always been a routine consideration in reviews."

A total of 240 cases were re-examined. The number does not include a further 38 cases which met the criteria but which had already been referred by the commission and the conviction quashed. In 80 of the cases, it was established that admitted facts about the case meant that DNA could not be at issue, such as rape cases where intercourse was admitted and the issue was one of consent, and murder cases where applicants admitted causing the fatality but claimed provocation or self-defence. In the majority of remaining cases, the commission decided to take no further action after re-examination of the facts of the case. There is one case outstanding.

Such DNA testing, of course, may not always bring about the result sought by campaigners in miscarriages of justice cases. James Hanratty was hanged in 1962 for the murder of Michael

Gregsten and became the subject of a series of campaigns to have his name cleared. In 2002, DNA evidence from the murder scene was deemed to link him to the murder, establishing his guilt "beyond doubt", in the words of the then lord chief justice, Lord Woolf. His supporters have argued that this showed only that the evidence must have been contaminated.

One case in particular would merit more detailed analysis: in 1993, Susan May was convicted of murdering her 89 year old aunt, Hilda Marchbank. She was sentenced to life imprisonment and ordered to serve a minimum of 12 years. In 2005, she became the first convicted murderer to be released "on tariff", despite continuing to protest her innocence. Marchbank was found dead in her home in Royton, Lancashire. She had been beaten and the house ransacked. Police initially believed her to be a victim of a robbery gone wrong, but suspicion was cast on May, who was her aunt's carer.

The main plank of the prosecution's case were marks found on the wall of the deceased's home. These marks were said to contain human blood, suggested to be that of the victim. May's fingerprint was said to be within one of the marks. May has repeatedly requested the samples containing the marks be re-tested using proper analytical techniques. Her requests have been denied. Her case has twice been rejected by the court of appeal; simple, affordable, tests could send her back to that court.

US: Harsh Conditions for Young Lifers

Human Rights Watch

Sexual Violence, Solitary Confinement, Depression, this is the lot of the approximately 2,570 youth offenders serving life without parole sentences in adult US prisons. The United States is the only country in the world with youth offenders (below the age of 18 at the time of offense) serving life without parole sentences. The US Supreme Court will consider arguments about the constitutionality of the practice in March 2012.

Human Rights Watch found that nearly every youth offender serving life without parole reported physical violence or sexual abuse by other inmates or corrections officers. Nationwide statistics indicate that young prisoners serving any type of sentence in adult prison, as well as those with a slight build and low body weight, are most vulnerable to attack.

Youth offenders are serving life without parole sentences in 38 states and in federal prisons. They often enter adult prison while still children, although some have reached young adulthood by the time their trials end and they begin serving their sentences. Prison policies that channel resources to inmates who are expected to be released often result in denying youth serving life without parole opportunities for education, development, and rehabilitation.

1,000 police officers and Police Support Officers have criminal records

By Raymond Peytors - theopinionsite.org, 8th January 2012

Freedom of Information requests have revealed that there are over 1,000 or more police officers and PCSOs who have a criminal record serving in Britain's police forces. Some forces did not respond so the number may be even higher.

Obviously, not all police officers are bad but it has also been revealed that over the last 12 months 130 Metropolitan officers were allowed to resign rather than face disciplinary hearings, thus saving the police from potentially embarrassing revelations regarding corrupt officers. The excuse for this lack of accountability in some cases was the high cost involved in investigating the corruption or breaches of discipline.

43 officers were actually sacked over the same period. A police officer cannot normally

Former police chief calls for new look at Chhokar case

One of the senior officers in charge of the investigation into the murder of an Asian man more than 13 years ago has called for a fresh inquiry into the case, which was never solved.

Graeme Pearson, formerly Assistant Chief Constable of Strathclyde Police, said the death of Surjit Singh Chhokar, which drew comparisons with the Stephen Lawrence case, was "unfinished business" and called for Scotland's Crown Office to reconsider investigating what remains one of Britain's most notorious unsolved murders.

Father-of-two Mr Chhokar, 32, a waiter, was stabbed to death in Overton, Lanarkshire, in 1998 after a confrontation with a group of white men. Despite two High Court trials, in which the three accused blamed each other, no-one was convicted. After a judicial inquiry into the case, former Lord Advocate Colin Boyd, QC, apologised for "incompetence, ignorance and institutional racism" in the way police and prosecutors had dealt with the murder.

The Chhokar family lawyer, Aamer Anwar, has already said he will ask the Crown Office to reopen the inquiry into the killing following the reform of double jeopardy laws that stopped the same person being tried twice for the same offence.

Justice for David Kent

Part 1: I was arrested on 21st November 2008 at approx 3am, the arresting officer said that it was part of an ongoing investigation into an assault that had taken place the previous evening. I was processed, questioned and released on bail after 36 hours in custody. 3 weeks later I was re-arrested on suspicion of a Section 18 assault. I was again held for 36 hours but no explanations was given as to why and no new information was discussed during the additional period just a recap of the same things. I was told I would be interviewed about the wood chisel which had been found, but no questions were put to me about this, instead I was questioned about previous relationships. I was then charged with attempted murder and remanded into custody. After almost a year, on 6th December 09 my trial began and I was found guilty 9 days later and eventually sentenced to a discretionary life sentence with a minimum of 11 years, I was not offered a plea bargain (deal) at any time.

From the moment the interviews began I stated that I was not responsible for the assault and did not have any worries about forensics linking me to it.

The police claimed otherwise and produced 3 items of evidence to link me to the event, these were a weapon found at the scene, my mobile phone records, which they said put me at the scene, and an injury which they claimed I had received during the attack, which the 'injured person' (IP) could be heard asking about in the 999 call, these were the items used to charge me.

Further inquiries revealed some other evidence included items of clothing which they believed were worn at the time of the attack and were waiting for forensic results some CCTV footage which showed me on my mountain bike carrying a rucksack with what they believed was a weapon, (possibly a crowbar) sticking out of the top, they now claimed it was premeditated. The items of clothing included black trousers and a woolly hat which had eye holes cut into it, all of which was said to have matched the description of what they were looking for, worse still they claimed that these clothes were found in the washing machine and had been washed, suggesting that I had tried to dispose of evidence.

Besides the fact that I did not commit this assault, it was noted on a document, which was placed on the table in front of me, which I saw, that the attacker had been identified as the IP's current boyfriend, and the attack was as a result of an argument that had taken place earlier in the

I was framed by the police, says Gilfoyle

Eddie Gilfoyle alleged on radio yesterday (08/01/12) that he had been framed by police over the death of his wife 20 years ago. His comments came after The Times disclosed last week that a secret diary that could have cleared him of murdering his pregnant wife Paula had been in police hands for 16 years.

Gilfoyle, 50, who is fighting to get his conviction quashed after serving a life sentence, told Broadcasting House on Radio 4 that he was living in hell. He said he would never forgive the authorities for "the deliberate withholding of evidence" from two unsuccessful appeals.

In a further development, Louis Appleby, chairman of the National Suicide Prevention Strategy Advisory Group, suggested that it was wrong for judges to have used Mrs Gilfoyle's cheerful demeanour as evidence in favour of her husband's guilt.

Gilfoyle was convicted after witnesses told a jury that his wife was bubbly and looking forward to the birth of her first baby. Her diary, seized by police from the marital home in Upton, Wirral, reveals a darker side, including the fact that she tried to commit suicide after a row with a previous boyfriend. The CCRC has now spent 17 months considering Gilfoyle's request for a new appeal.

Report on an unannounced full follow-up inspection of HMP Long Lartin

17–26 August 2011 by HMCIP. Report compiled October 2011, 10/01/12

Inspectors were concerned to find that:

- Muslim's form 25% of the Long Lartin population - It is disappointing that little progress appears to have been made in responding to our thematic report on Muslim prisoners' experiences. Eid took place before inspection and those held in the Detainee Unit were not allowed to celebrate with the rest of the prison population.
- Gypsy/Traveller's form 10% of the Long Lartin population - Efforts to meet their needs and understand the implications of their background for resettlement and offender management were (as they are nationally) superficial.
- a high proportion of prisoners on the vulnerable prisoner wings said they did not feel safe;
- supervision of and efforts to address bullying and violent behaviour were not rigorous enough;
- too often, the few prisoners subject to self-harm prevention procedures were held in the segregation unit, which had a limited regime, staff who often appeared disinterested and a grim 'exercise yard';
- staff relationships with mainstream prisoners appeared mixed and too many staff appeared distant and unapproachable;
- the vulnerable prisoner wings had a night sanitation system, which amounted to slopping out;
- the prison needed more help from the Prison Service nationally to work successfully with around a quarter of prisoners who were Muslim; and
- although a good offender management strategy and procedures were in place, some offender supervisors lacked the training, experience and supervision and time to carry out their duties effectively.
- Immigration wing in Long Lartin, though not the subject of this inspection there had been little change in the position of the detainees, some of whom had been held without trial for a number of years. One of the detainees has now been released back into the community, which appears to further undermine the case for a blanket policy of detaining all of these men in isolation from other prisoners.

be sacked unless they are guilty of gross misconduct.

According to the Home Office police force figures published in March 2011, the UK has over 137,000 police available for duty (excluding transport police). The Metropolitan police force has just under 32,000 police available for duty so, if one were to be kind, on that basis one may consider that some corruption is inevitable when there are so many police officers in the first place.

However, if you were sitting in jail for 10 years and then discovered that the officer that put you there was in fact himself corrupt, how would you feel then, particularly if he had been let off scot free and you had another 15 years to go?

If officers resign or even if they are sacked, their past arrest and investigation records are rarely reviewed. If there are no disciplinary proceedings against the officer, none of the facts are examined in any meaningful way – not officially anyway. Therefore, an officer that resigns is not investigated – and neither is their possible corruption of the law.

One police chief in the City of London force has said that it is simply too expensive to put officers through a disciplinary panel. The Independent Police Complaints Commission (IPCC) previously said forces failed to respond to "far too many" complaints about officers.

Commander Peter Spindler, who heads the force's directorate of professional standards, also said complaints about Met officers had fallen by 9% in a year "due to a lot of hard work". The head of Scotland Yard standards said it was actually more practical to let some people quit. "It's actually more pragmatic to let them resign", Mr Spindler said.

One officer (what the Sun would call a 'sex fiend' if he were a member of the public) indecently assaulted a vulnerable teenager. Last month, two officers were dismissed for beating up three men after a car chase, and a trainee detective was sacked after sexually assaulting a vulnerable woman. A major trial of allegedly corrupt police officers costing millions collapsed after vital evidence was apparently 'lost' by the CPS and police.

Another anti-corruption detective, Ch Supt Richard Heselden said, "It's cheaper and quicker to get them out of the force."

So then, it is ok for the police and Crown Prosecution Service (CPS) to 'bring to justice' an old man who may or may not have indecently assaulted a teenager 40 years ago (can you honestly remember in detail what you were doing on a particular day that long ago?) but it is not ok to apply the same 'principles of justice' if the offence was committed by a serving police officer within the last 12 months.

One could be forgiven for thinking that perhaps there really is one law for the police and a completely separate penal code for the rest of us. It would seem that actually, if you are a policeman and you commit even a sexual crime, unless the force has absolutely no alternative to prosecute because the offence is already public, the officer concerned is likely to simply be allowed to resign or, in a worst case scenario, be sacked.

Were the perpetrator of that offence an ordinary member of the public however, the CPS and police would go to any lengths possible to prosecute, even if there was no real evidence and the offence allegedly took place 50 years ago.

TheOpinionSite.org has only recently written about police corruption following the report by Her Majesty's Inspector of Constabularies (HMIC) that showed that the public think that the police are corrupt (<http://www.theopinionsite.org/report-by-hmic-shows-that-the-public-believe-police-are-corrupt>). It is a sad thing indeed that we are now having to report the scandal of corrupt policemen being let off the hook and avoiding prison just in order to save money and embarrassment to the police.

Sadly, British police are among the most powerful in the world. 'Sadly' because it is

the same kind of power that is prevalent in condemned police states around the world.

Police officers in Britain hate the Human Rights Act, they detest the Freedom of Information Act, are arrogant, dismissive of complaints against them and consider themselves to be above the law that they supposedly represent. Many are also apparently corrupt. That is the opinion of the public by the way, not just TheOpinionSite.org, although you will not find this site disagreeing with any of the sentiments expressed.

Why is this opinion amongst ordinary people so widespread and how have the police become the way that they are? TheOpinionSite.org believes it is because police officers are getting younger and younger and, like their counterparts in the Probation Service, are coming straight from school and university with no experience of real life whatsoever and with an attitude of 'we have the power to screw your lives, so do as we say, or else'. They are completely career-minded, completely risk-averse and have no consideration for anyone other than themselves. Critically, they love the power as well.

The days of the mature, responsible bobby have long gone. Young officers nowadays can't wait to get their hands on the latest tazer gun or sign up for firearms training. They have only two aims in life: arrest and bring to court, that's it. The concept of truly 'serving' has been replaced with one of 'ruling' the public.

They have been given this damaging and obnoxious power by successive governments that don't have the courage to make difficult, unpopular decisions themselves and prefer instead to delegate such decision making to what has become known as 'the uniformed branch of government', the police. The principle that the police should be separate from the Executive seems to have passed by those in power completely unseen and unheard.

Even David Cameron, our somewhat slippery prime minister has said that 'People must obey the rules.' He did not want to be drawn on whether or not the 'rules' were fair or just to those 'people'.

It is unacceptable that a corrupt police officer with the power to destroy lives should be allowed to walk away without consequences when they are found out. It is certainly not acceptable that the politically ambitious and sanctimonious Home Secretary, Theresa May allows these actions to continue when she is fully aware of what is taking place; and if she is not aware, she should not be in office anyway.

The public cannot have respect or confidence for any officials that are corrupt, particularly when those same corrupt individuals have power over the rest of us. Nor are matters helped when the Commissioner of the Metropolitan Police states that he 'wants criminals to be afraid of the police'.

The truth that he and other officers conveniently miss again and again is that nobody is a criminal until lawfully convicted, they are not a criminal just because the police say or think that they are a criminal and, given the manner in which some 'easy target' prosecutions are pursued, the person concerned may be innocent anyway.

Margaret Thatcher once said that she was 'shocked' at how much hate there was towards the police from ordinary members of the public. Since she said that, the British police have acquired immensely more power than they had at that time and they abuse that power somewhere, against someone every day.

Many ordinary people feel that the police are greedy, overpaid, dishonest, power-drunk, arrogant and completely contemptible. It should be stated that there are of course some officers with integrity but they are seemingly becoming increasingly hard to find. Give a young police officer a tazer gun and he will fire it, whether it's use is justified or not. Tell a detective about any alleged sexual offence and they will arrest, charge and if possible convict, even

if there is no real evidence and the allegation relates to something that may or may not have happened a quarter of a century ago.

Policemen grab these types of opportunities whenever they can for one reason only; they are easy, take little effort and guarantee a result – even if it is sometimes the wrong one.

Find a corrupt officer though and the story is one of complacency, economics and face-saving. Our 'wonderful' police are, it would seem, sometimes no different to the people that they arrest other than the fact that one group carries a warrant card and a pair of handcuffs and the other does not.

Despite the fact that most people understandably want to trust the police, it is little wonder that the public have so little faith in them when the fact that so many officers have been found to be corrupt was only revealed after an act of parliament that police hate (the Freedom of Information Act) was invoked.

One may think that chief constables may have been better off putting aside their arrogance for once and being honest with the public about the cancer within their forces. To do so however would mean admitting that the police are not omnipotent, do make mistakes and frequently get everything wrong; something that they will never be prepared to admit, not with the amount of perverted power that is now available to them.

Is there a solution? Certainly; just take some of their power away but, regrettably, that is something that the politicians will never do. In fact, as time goes on they will do exactly the opposite and give the police even more power than they have now. Politicians (and some police officers) love creating fear in society as it gives them more power.

So much for democracy and a free society.

Report on an announced inspection of HMP/YOI High Down

18-22 July 2011 by HMCIP. Report compiled October 2011, published 05/01/12J

Concerns: - it is hard to escape the conclusion that many of those in the prison's population are not so different from the patients incarcerated in the old asylum

- concerned about the number of prisoners subject to suicide and self-harm procedures held in the segregation unit.

- much activity for prisoners was part-time, many prisoners were under-employed with a third locked in their cells during the working part of the day, and some classes and workshops were only two-thirds full;

- black and minority ethnic, disabled, young adults and foreign national prisoners felt significantly less safe than the population as a whole;

- provision for foreign national prisoners was uncoordinated and too many disabled and older prisoners did not receive the practical support they needed; and

- there was no specific strategy to address the needs of young adults, who were disproportionately represented in the use of force against them, and had insufficient access to vocational training.

- provision should be improved for prisoners whose needs differ from the population as a whole - particularly because of their age, disability or nationality.

- Vulnerable prisoners generally had access to a poor regime.

- too many foreign national prisoners held beyond the end of their sentence - one for 14 months.

- Too many disabled and older prisoners found moving around the prison difficult and did not receive some of the practical help they needed.