

to Interpol's own credibility and effectiveness. Last month, the Parliamentary Assembly of the Organisation for Security and Co-operation in Europe passed a resolution expressing concern about abuse of the Interpol red notice system by states whose judicial systems do not meet international standards. Opposing the motion was Russia, routinely condemned for its arbitrary criminal trials by the Council of Europe and declared a country of concern by the UK Foreign Office – and one of the biggest red notice users. To protect its own standing, Interpol must weed out suspicious red notices before they find their way on to police databases the world over. Flaws in its current systems would be less worrying if affected individuals had access to a fair, transparent process to raise their complaints. Unfortunately, the commission we applied to in Benny's case falls short: sitting only twice a year, it operates behind closed doors with no hearings and does not give reasoned decisions. Interpol usually follows its views, but can ask it to "think again" if it disagrees. Through dialogue with Interpol in recent months, we have learned a lot about how this important crime-fighting organisation works. Interpol states that it keeps its systems under regular review, and we are hopeful that, in light of cases such as Benny's, they will be persuaded to develop new safeguards to prevent countries using red notices to export persecution. Without these reforms, people like Benny, and Interpol's own reputation, will continue to suffer.

Reggie Kray - Murderabilia up for Auction

Prison letters written by London gangster Reggie Kray are to go under the hammer. The "murderabilia" has been put up for sale by a collector and offers a rare insight into the mind of one of the 20th century's most infamous criminals. Kray's letters, written across 20 pages in mid-July 1998, are said to be coded instructions to outside associates. In the letters, Kray wrote: "Go to work for the fee. I'm so proud of all you've achieved." It is signed off at the bottom with: "Take care, God bless, affection, yours Reg." Kray also makes numerous references to "Karl", said to be outside "muscle for hire" who would do Kray's bidding. The letters state: "31st July at your place Karl will tell him to cook up. Talk later of him." Kray also refers to Karl as "so cute", although the context is unclear. Kray's twin brother Ronnie was openly bisexual and murdered a criminal associate for calling him a "fat poof", although Reggie was also reportedly bisexual. Reggie died in 2000 after a short period of compassionate release from prison, five years after his brother died in a high-security psychiatric hospital. Reggie Kray's letters are expected to fetch hundreds of pounds at Glasgow's McTear's Auctioneers taking place on Thursday 9th August.

March for Justice for Kingsley Burrell - Birmingham, Saturday 18th August 2012

A year after the death of Kingsley Burrell, after coming into contact with the police; no one has been charged and his body has still not been released to his grieving family for burial.

Hostages: Anthony Parsons, James Cullinane, Stephen Marsh, Graham Coutts, Royston Moore, Duane King, Leon Chapman, Tony Marshall, Anthony Jackson, David Kent, Norman Grant, Ricardo Morrison, Alex Silva, Terry Smith, Hyrone Hart, Glen Cameron, Warren Slaney, Melvyn 'Adie' McLellan, Lyndon Coles, Robert Bradley, Sam Hallam, John Twomey, Thomas G. Bourke, David E. Ferguson, Lee Mockble, George Romero Coleman, Neil Hurley, Jaslyn Ricardo Smith, James Dowsett, Kevan Thakrar, Miran Thakrar, Jordan Towers, 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, 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.

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

MOJUK: Newsletter 'Inside Out' No 384 09/08/2012)

Justice for Norman Grant - Missing Evidence! Was it Deliberate?

Norman jailed for life in April 2011, has always protested his innocence and is adamant that he was fitted up by the police, his personal view of how this happened, 'Now you see it, now you don't - the case of the Planted Balaclava', was printed in 'Inside Out' issue 348. Norman has never stopped fighting his conviction even going to one of America's leading experts 'Forensic Video Solutions, Inc. owned and operated by Grant Fredericks, a pioneer in *Forensic Video Analysis applications. Mr. Fredericks has provided expert opinion on the hash files, provided at Norman's trial. Below a letter to the Crown Prosecution Service outlining Mr. Fredericks concerns.

Attention of Prosecution Service Complex Casework Unit

Reference our client, Norman Washington Grant

We write further to your letter of 3 July 2012 and advice received from our expert dated 20 July. In your letter of 3 July, you suggested 'I am sorry but the hash values we have supplied are the only ones we have, please contact your previous solicitors, I cannot be of any further assistance'.

From what our expert Grant Fredericks, has to say, this simply cannot be right. There must have been hash values created when the first transfer took place from the original to the copy. We shall draw to your attention the significance of these matters by quoting extensively from our expert.

Firstly we quote as follows, 'the implication of not receiving. the correct hash value can be significant in that it demonstrates one of three things:

- a) that the crime scene investigators failed to follow best practice by producing a hash of the original flash disc and there is therefore no proper validation or chain of custody of the data;
- b) there is a hash and they have, provided the wrong one; or they are
- c) attempting to hide something and have intentionally failed to provide the correct hash values'.

In this case the Defendant is alleging plant, the view of the expert here is significant for if best practice was followed why is there no hash value available of the original flash disc?'. Without hash values there is no way to achieve proper validation or confirming that there was indeed a chain of custody leading from the photograph on the flash disc to transfer to the copy. If there is none, how can you show 'a chain of custody?'. We would be obliged if you would pay some attention to what the expert has to say here.

The expert goes on to advise as follows, 'the hash value of data on a removable media is supposed to be produced prior to removing the data from the original recording media'. He goes on further, 'in this case, whoever produced the images for you simply copied the images from one source to the source that was provided and then hashed those files, This is an irrelevant and obstructive process because all we are left with is hash to validate what was produced for you on May 5, 2012, rather than what was originally recorded on January 12, 2010'

Our expert goes on to say 'if we had access to the original hash values, that would have been produced on January 12 or 13 in 2010, we would be able to verify the authenticity of the images'. Finally, he goes on to say 'I do think that it is appropriate to request the hash values that should have been produced when the original images were transferred from the original flash media to a storage device'.

We have taken the liberty of quoting extensively from the expert's report to ensure that

the message he conveys is not lost in any interpretation we place upon them in making representation to you. Our expert is essentially saying he cannot confirm that the balaclava item he viewed from the hash file supplied were in fact from the original 'flash disc' created on 12 or 13 January 2010. Unless the information is made available our client must maintain the photographs in which the balaclava appears emanated from some other source.

We would be obliged if you would kindly discuss this matter with your officers and your expert and revert to us. We have asked our expert to remain on standby to advise further once we hear from you. *Yours faithfully, Maurice Andrews Solicitors for Mr. Grant*

Messages of Support/Solidarity to:

Norman Grant: A8832AM, HMP Whitemoor, Long Hill Road, March, PE15 0PR

*Forensic Video Solutions, Inc. owned and operated by Grant Fredericks, a pioneer in Forensic Video Analysis applications. One of the most skilled and knowledgeable trial experts in his field, Mr. Fredericks has been processing video evidence for criminal and civil investigations for more than 27 years. Fredericks is a former police officer and coordinator of the Vancouver Police Forensic Video Unit in Canada. He is an adjunct instructor of Forensic Video Analysis at the National Digital Multimedia Evidence Processing Lab at the University of Indianapolis and is a contract instructor at the FBI National Academy in Quantico.

Cleveland Police chiefs may face charges

Prosecutors are to consider bringing charges against a chief constable and his deputy after they were passed files from a misconduct inquiry overseen by the police watchdog.

Chief Constable Sean Price and his deputy Derek Bonnard have been suspended on full pay by Cleveland Police since they were held last year as part of a £2.5m inquiry into alleged misconduct in public office, fraud by abuse of position and corrupt practice. The two men have denied any wrongdoing and have begun legal proceedings.

Police and the Mental Health Trust Condemned Over Death of Sean Rigg

INQUEST Press Release, Wednesday, 1st August, 2012

The jury has delivered a damning and substantial narrative verdict following the death of Sean Nicholas Rigg at Brixton police station on 21 August 2008. They found that the cause of death was '1a cardiac arrest, 1b acute arrhythmia, 1c ischemia, 1d partial positional asphyxia' and that he died at Brixton police station as a result of a cardiac arrest.

In the jury's findings on the actions of the South London and Maudsley NHS Trust (SLAM), they found that SLAM 'had failed to ensure that their patient Sean Rigg took his medication. Furthermore SLAM's failure to undertake a Mental Health Act assessment at or from the 11 August more than minimally contributed to the Sean Rigg's death'.

The jury found that the 'the level of force used on Sean Rigg whilst restrained in the prone position...was unsuitable' and that it was 'questionable whether relevant police guidelines regarding restraint and positional asphyxia were sufficient or followed correctly'. They found that the restraint lasted approximately 8 minutes, and that Sean Rigg was in the prone position 'throughout the entire restraint'. The length of restraint in the prone position 'was therefore unnecessary'. The majority view of the jury was that the restraint 'more than minimally contributed to Sean Rigg's death'. They also found that the police 'failed to identify that Sean Rigg was a vulnerable person at point of arrest' and he was therefore taken to the police station instead of an A&E department or Section 136 suite, 'despite information about him being

Resources, was paid £259,462 after resigning in April 2011. Another Assistant Commissioner, Ian McPherson, was given £25,603 when he resigned in November. In addition the Met spent £45million on voluntary redundancy payments for 1,166 other staff.

Jenny Jones, Deputy Chairman of the Police and Crime Committee on the London Assembly, said: "I'm absolutely appalled. As far as I'm concerned, if somebody resigns they should walk away from the job and not get a penny for it. I think they should have been embarrassed to take the money. It's taxpayers' money – it's not for frittering away on people who chose to resign."

The payments were agreed by the now-disbanded Metropolitan Police Authority and its successor body, the Mayor's Office for Policing and Crime. A spokesman for the Metropolitan Police said: "Upon leaving the MPS, individuals may have entered into discussions with the MPA / MOPC regarding their contractual position and recompense. "The outcomes of discussions or agreements are a matter for each individual and we will not be commenting on specific cases."The Mayor's Office for Policing and Crime said that the payments were made in line with "contractual obligations".

Benny Wenda's Plight has Highlighted the Misuse of Interpol Alex Tinsley, guardian.co.uk

Interpol must act to stop its red notice system being abused by countries to persecute refugees and exiled political activists. Fair Trials International has successfully argued that in the case of Benny Wenda Indonesia abused Interpol for political purposes.

The case of Benny Wenda, leader of the West Papuan independence movement, is a perfect illustration of the need to reform Interpol and its abused red notice system. In 2002, Benny escaped from prison in Indonesia where he had been threatened, harassed and prosecuted on trumped-up charges. The UK, recognising persecution, granted him asylum. Benny, who now lives in Oxford with his wife and five children, went on to establish himself as the leader in exile of the West Papuan cause.

Last year, Benny discovered that he was the subject of an Interpol red notice. The notice, issued at Indonesia's request, designated Benny as a wanted criminal and put him at risk of arrest throughout the world. Consequently, he could not risk travelling and had to decline invitations to speak about West Papua at international conferences. The notice also appeared on Interpol's website, complete with Benny's picture and allegations of violent crime, staining his reputation.

Benny came to Fair Trials International, to ask what we could do to help. Indonesia's angry response to the Guardian's coverage showed it was not going to drop the red notice. The UK government was unwilling to demand that Interpol remove it; safely taking proceedings in Indonesia was unrealistic; and there was no court Benny could turn to. So we used the only avenue open to us and wrote to the Commission for the Control of Interpol's Files, arguing that Indonesia was abusing the red notice system for political purposes. We have just learned that the Commission agreed with our view. Interpol accepted the conclusion and removed the red notice.

This result is welcome, but it begs the question: how was the world's largest policing organisation dragged into such a clearly political case, in breach of its cardinal rule of political neutrality? Some of Interpol's 190 member countries have appalling human rights records and are notoriously corrupt, yet it appears there is no effective system to stop these countries using Interpol's red notice system to persecute refugees and exiled political activists. Indeed, since last year's Guardian story, other victims of abusive red notices have approached us for help.

Preventing misuse of Interpol is not only important for people such as Benny, it is also critical

a matter of days or even hours, into an equally perilous situation.

To have any chance of breaking this cycle, we must look beyond the criminal justice system. If some 40% of remand prisoners are subsequently released, why are they there in this first place? For women this is higher – more than half do not go on to receive a custodial sentence but yet have spent an average of 4-6 weeks behind bars, in many cases forfeiting their home, struggling to arrange care for their children and facing rapidly escalating financial problems. The problem lies in the fact that having stable accommodation weighs heavily on the courts' decision to grant bail, and in some cases may be the only reason someone is imprisoned.

It is no coincidence, in fact it is very telling, that as local authorities prepare to accept full costs for children and young people on remand from April 2013, the numbers imprisoned at this stage have plummeted. It is not that people didn't care before, but that the reality of budgets sharpens the mind somewhat. When local areas have to foot the bill, alternative solutions can be found. The hope is that this budget transfer will also incentivise crime prevention rather than dealing with the aftermath of failed social policy.

The Criminal Justice Alliance is embarking on new research into how budgets could be better allocated at local level to cut crime, support vulnerable people and limit wasteful use of imprisonment. Our first priority will be to look at whether local authorities should be responsible for the costs of prison remand for certain other groups. Today's report is further evidence that they should.

Phone hacking: Met chiefs given £300,000 payoffs after resigning

Martin Beckford, Home Affairs Editor, Telegraph, 03 Aug 2012

The senior Scotland Yard figures who resigned in the wake of the phone-hacking scandal shared payoffs totalling more than £300,000. Britain's top policeman, the country's head of counter-terrorism and the Metropolitan Police's press chief all stepped down from the force a year ago over their links to the News of the World. But although all three quit in the face of public anger and scrutiny from MPs over the close relationship between the police and the tabloid newspaper, rather than being dismissed, it has now emerged for the first time that they received substantial payoffs.

The force's accounts, disclosed by The Daily Telegraph, show that the Commissioner, Sir Paul Stephenson, was given £176,838 "compensation for loss of office" after his shock resignation last July. He stepped down over his decision to employ as a PR adviser Neil Wallis, a former deputy editor at the News of the World, and his free £12,000 stay at a spa resort for which Mr Wallis worked. Sir Paul's total remuneration for 2011-12 came to £275,263, even though he worked at Scotland Yard for just three months of the financial year. Sources said he chose to clear his desk within two weeks and did not ask for any compensation, but Met contracts mean that he was paid for the rest of his notice period.

The accounts also show that Assistant Commissioner John Yates received £86,382 compensation when he announced his resignation just a day after Sir Paul. He had faced criticism for not fully re-opening the phone-hacking probe when new evidence emerged in 2009, and was investigated for giving a job to Mr Wallis's daughter, although he was later cleared of misconduct. Mr Yates's total remuneration for the year came to £237,244.

Dick Fedorcio, the Met's Director of Public Affairs, received a £50,503 payoff after he resigned at the end of March. He was placed on extended leave in the summer after it emerged that he had given Mr Wallis's firm a £24,000 contract, and stepped down when the force opened gross misconduct proceedings against him. Mr Fedorcio's package came to £175,206 for the full year. Meanwhile Martin Tiplady, Scotland Yard's Director of Human

readily available and accessible'. Whilst Sean Rigg was in custody 'the police failed to uphold his basic rights and omitted to deliver the appropriate care'.

Deborah Coles, co-director of INQUEST said: "Sean Rigg was a vulnerable man in need of help and protection and yet he was failed by all those who should have been there to protect him. The inquest uncovered a litany of appalling failures by mental health services and the Metropolitan Police, outlined in the damning jury narrative. It also raises serious concerns about policing culture and practice where a man so obviously unwell was restrained in the prone position for eight minutes, became unresponsive, and yet was taken to a police station rather than a hospital, and left to die on the floor. Time and again we're told that 'lessons will be learned' and yet we see the same poor practice and system failures. A system that is not seen to deliver justice will continue to undermine public trust and confidence. As in other similar cases no police officer has lost their job, faced misconduct action or been prosecuted. Equally, public institutions must be called to account for their corporate failure to implement required systems changes identified following previous deaths. The IPCC investigation was fundamentally flawed from the outset and it is shameful that without the relentless and dogged determination of the family and their legal team, so many of these failures would never have been uncovered. "INQUEST's casework demonstrates that people with mental health problems and/or from black and minority ethnic communities are disproportionately represented in deaths in contentious circumstances involving the police. The individual and institutional neglect uncovered by this inquest should prompt the Home Office and Department of Health to urgently review how the police and mental health providers work together to respond to people in crisis and in conflict with the law. It is frightening that the callous indifference shown by the police to a vulnerable, mentally ill black man may still be replicated today."

Sean Rigg's family said: "Sean was a wonderful, talented and caring brother and son. For years he had lived with schizophrenia. He was under the care of the South London and Maudsley NHS Trust, and known by Brixton police to have mental health issues.

"We have sat through a long and painful seven weeks reliving the final days and hours of Sean's precious life. This pain has been compounded by officers at best misleading the jury and at worst lying under oath. The evidence we have heard has left us in no doubt that Sean died as a result of the wilful neglect of those who were meant to care for him and keep him safe. If the South London and Maudsley Trust had done their job properly and provided the care and help that Sean urgently needed, he would be alive today. If the police had not ignored repeated 999 calls from the hostel, and taken Sean to the hospital as they should have done, he would be alive today.

"It was perfectly apparent to ordinary members of the public that Sean was having some kind of mental crisis on the 21st August 2008, when the police were called for help. When the police did eventually arrive they restrained him, arrested him for theft of his own passport, put him in the back of a police van, drove him with sirens, not to the hospital for urgent medical care, but to Brixton police station, left him in a perspex cage in the van and finally brought him to the caged area at the back of the station where he died on a concrete floor, surrounded by police officers.

"Sean was a fit and healthy man who died less than an hour after being picked up by the police. Nothing will bring him back but we want to know that justice will be done. We want to know that those responsible will be held to account for Sean's death.

"We feel utterly let down by the Independent Police Complaints Commission investigation into Sean's death which was inadequate and obstructive from the start. Until it is fundamentally reformed, the IPCC will remain incapable of exposing the truth when people die in police hands.

We call for the Crown Prosecution Service to look at the damning evidence that has come to light in this case and demand a prosecution of those responsible for Sean's death.

"Call for an urgent public inquiry to establish why the system in this country consistently fails to deliver justice to the many families whose loved ones have died in police custody. We want to know why, last year, over half the people who died following contact with the police had mental health issues and why, like Sean, over half died in circumstances involving restraint. We want to know why there was also such a sharp rise in the number of black men who died following police contact. We want to know why our system allows officers to continue in their jobs when someone has died in their care and why not one successful prosecution has taken place in this country since 1986.

"Until we have justice there will be no peace for us or the many other families we stand with. We would like to thank all of those who have helped and supported us in our long and hard fight for the truth. *"We will continue to fight for justice for Sean."*

Mark Duggan's Death Still Needs Explaining

Leader Independent, 03/08/12

The police inquiry is so slow the coroner is threatening contempt of court

It is all too easy to forget, amid the euphoria of the Olympics, just how different the public mood was just one year ago. For five long days and nights last August, riots spread from London to Birmingham, Liverpool, Manchester, Salford, Nottingham, Bristol, Leeds and even to quiet towns like Gloucester. Five people died, 4,000 were arrested, and any number of shops, flats and businesses were destroyed. In all, one of the biggest outbreaks of civil unrest for generations wreaked more than £200m worth of damage.

Saturday 4th August 2012 was the first anniversary of the incident which sparked the rioting – the police shooting of an unarmed black man, a gangster whom they claimed (wrongly, it turned out) was exchanging fire with officers. It is, therefore, a salutary moment to consider whether unrest on such a scale might happen again.

Certainly the intervening 12 months have brought no satisfactory answers to the many questions surrounding the death of Mark Duggan which prompted his family to claim police were pursuing a "shoot first, ask questions later" policy and first brought protestors onto the streets. No officer has been charged with any offence arising out of the fatal incident.

An inquiry by the Independent Police Complaints Commission is proceeding so slowly that the coroner conducting Mr Duggan's inquest has threatened to bring contempt of court proceedings against the watchdog. Even Scotland Yard has condemned the tardiness, while the Duggan family has called for the IPCC to be abolished for institutional bias. Public confidence in either the police, or their regulatory authorities, is hardly bolstered by such proceedings.

Meanwhile, gloomier commentators are predicting that last summer's riots could easily reoccur. An official Government inquiry blamed a range of factors for the unrest, citing everything from chronic shortages of jobs for young people, poor parenting and the justice system's failure to rehabilitate offenders, to consumer materialism and youthful hostility towards the police. With socio-economic conditions broadly unchanged, the doom-mongers warn, the tensions that exploded last summer are equally unresolved.

There is some evidence to support such a position. Extensive interviews with rioters conducted by researchers from the London School of Economics suggested a strong sense of unfairness as a major motivation. Many contrasted the unethical behaviour of economy-busting bankers and expenses-fiddling MPs with the hopelessness of their own lack of opportunities. Others attacked austerity measures which left the rich unscathed and hit the vulnera-

Overall, Wetherby provided reasonably good outcomes for most of the young people it held and some of the work it did - the care for young people with mental health problems for instance - was excellent. It had some weaknesses that need to be addressed; the poor segregation unit was notable among these. However, the greatest concern was the vulnerability of some of the young people held and the difficulty of holding them safely in a large establishment with a wide spread of population a long way from home - and that raises issues about how young offenders should be dealt with that cannot be resolved in one establishment alone.

Vulnerable People on Remand Need Help - And Not Just From the Prison Service

Vicki Helyar-Cardwell, guardian.co.uk, Thursday 2 August 2012

'A disproportionate number of remand prisoners are women or from a black or minority ethnic group. They are invariably held in local prisons ? usually decrepit Victorian buildings ? in an attempt to maintain family contact and proximity to the courts.'

Another week, another blistering account of the failures of the justice system. This time the Prisons Inspectorate lays bare the fact that remand prisoners, those who are awaiting their trial or sentence, are on the whole treated worse than convicted prisoners, despite the long-standing principle that they should be accorded greater rights and entitlements. Of those individuals remanded to custody 17% will go on to be acquitted and a further 24% will receive a non-custodial sentence. That is some 30,000 prisoners released each year after trial.

The Chief Inspector is rightly critical of the prison system, and makes a series of recommendations for the Prison Service to grapple with. Clearly, the state has a duty to ensure custody is a decent and safe environment for all prisoners, that remand prisoners are under no more restrictions than is necessary, and that unconvicted prisoners are treated as innocent until proven guilty by the courts. But this report should also land on the desk of the ministers for housing, health and employment. It is their departments that bear partial responsibility for the numbers of vulnerable people being temporarily housed in our prisons.

Most individuals held in prison on remand have been here before; overall two thirds report being previously held in prison - although we don't know for what reason and whether they were convicted of any offence. In comparison to sentenced prisoners, a disproportionate number of remand prisoners are women or from a black or minority ethnic group. They are invariably held in local prisons – usually decrepit Victorian buildings – in an attempt to maintain family contact and proximity to the courts.

Remand prisoners have high levels of mental health need, and are more at risk of suicide and self-harm than other prisoners. In 2010 remand prisoners accounted for half of all self inflicted deaths, despite being 18% of the prison population. This is not the first report to show that remand prisoners are some of the most vulnerable in the system. Back in 2002, the Social Exclusion Unit found that unconvicted and unsentenced prisoners were more likely than the established prison population to have been living in unstable accommodation before imprisonment, and were more likely to lose their home through incarceration.

A shocking report by homeless charity Crisis found that a fifth of homeless people committed imprisonable offences to spend a night in a police cell and escape a housing crisis and that more than a quarter of women rough sleepers took an "unwanted sexual partner" in order to find shelter. A safe and secure place to live is the responsibility of the department for housing not the Ministry of Justice. Too often the criminal justice system becomes the dumping ground, warehousing people for short spaces of time only to turf them back out again, after

The chaplaincy was a visible and valued presence throughout the establishment.

Mental health services were well resourced and we noted much good practice. Mental health nurses worked in reception to identify young people who might need support and saw every boy who needed it quickly. They worked closely with unit staff and caseworkers. Speech and language and occupational therapists also provided valuable support. Health care was generally good.

Education and learning assessments were good and included screening for dyslexia and other hidden disabilities. The special educational needs coordinator provided excellent support. There was a broad range of courses to meet most needs but provision for more able boys or those serving long sentences was less satisfactory. Attendance and punctuality at education had improved but poor behaviour was still a problem in some lessons.

Resettlement provision was generally very good and the needs assessment was excellent. Making sure that young people had somewhere to live on release was a problem and the establishment's partnership with 'Transitional Plus Care' to provide accommodation for looked after children appeared to be a very good initiative that should be properly evaluated and, if successful, replicated elsewhere.

There was very good use of release on temporary licence (ROTL) to enable young people to take up work experience placements. Most young people had an education, training or work placement to go to on release and work had begun to track their progress after release. I met one young person leaving the establishment to go to a placement with a local charity. Like all of those on ROTL, staff made a point of providing encouragement when he left in the morning and welcoming him back after work. He was well-motivated and positive about the support he had received.

There was a good range of programmes to address young people's offending behaviour and significantly more young people than before thought the help they had received would reduce the likelihood of them reoffending after release.

About half of the young people were more than 50 miles from home and 14% were more than 100 miles away. Either because of distance or because relationships with their families had broken down, some young people received no or very few visits. The visits hall was not a welcoming environment and the visitors centre was a limited facility. Arrangements for booking visits were poor. There were no efforts to identify and address issues with young people who had very few visits.

A few days before the inspection two boys had died elsewhere in youth custody. There had been a self-inflicted death at Wetherby itself the previous April. Walking round the establishment, the vulnerability of some of the young people held was obvious. One boy in the segregation unit with a lifelong medical condition that would have been hard for any teenager to manage, and who had exhibited very disruptive behaviour, asked me tearfully if I could take him home to his mum. I was later told he had been moved to a more appropriate secure medical facility. Another boy, who looked about 12 and was sporting a dramatic black eye, had been convicted of a serious offence, had been in further trouble and was confined to his cell. A boy in health care, described to me as 'low', lay on his bed not speaking. All these boys were receiving good attention and care, but you feared for them all.

Of course, that was not the whole story. All the young people in Wetherby had been convicted of or were on remand for serious offences that had caused harm and distress to their victims. A group of boys working in one of the serveries were boisterous and cheerful - probably a bit of a handful - but even they were more subdued and troubled when I came across them individually later. A group of cleaners on one of the units, comfortably ensconced in a store room, appeared very pleased with themselves and needed better supervision.

ble hardest, with student tuition fees and the scrapping of the education maintenance allowance widely cited causes of resentment. But although such sentiments cannot be entirely discounted, they carry a whiff of after-the-fact justification for behaviour which smacked as much of greed and opportunism as of politics by another means.

The conditions that allowed them to flourish are unlikely to be replicated, not least because the police have learned vital lessons about how to nip unrest in the bud before it spreads, paying more attention to the use of social media and refining tactics for deploying officers on the streets. The severe sentences handed out to rioters will also act as a powerful deterrent. And then, of course, there is the change to the collective mood brought on by, first, the Jubilee and, now, the Olympics.

Fears of a repetition of the events of last summer seem unduly alarmist, then. But that is no excuse for the circumstances around the death of Mark Duggan to remain so unsatisfactorily explained. One year on, those are the questions that still demand answers.

Brothel Keeper was Acting Police Officer

Philip Tate a Northumbria police officer has been charged with keeping a brothel, misconduct in a public office and a drugs offence, his employers have said. Tate, 37, faces nine charges and has appeared before Newcastle Crown Court after being charged on May 28. He faces five counts of misconduct in a public office, one of supplying a class C drug, one of money laundering, one of keeping a brothel and one offence under the Consumer Credit Act, a force spokeswoman said. At a preliminary hearing held previously, Tate and two co-accused were granted bail. The Pc, currently suspended, will appear before the same court in October for a plea and case management hearing.

USA: Chavis Carter Handcuffed-Shooting Case Under Supervision Of FBI

Police say the 21-year-old shot himself in the head while he was handcuffed in the back of a police car in Arkansas Matt Williams in New York. Chavis Carter died on Saturday 28th July after being picked up in a traffic stop in Jonesboro, Arkansas, during which drugs were discovered in his vehicle. The 21-year-old black man had been searched twice by officers, but a handgun that officers say the suspect later used was not found. Questions have also been raised as to how the left-handed Carter was able to deliver a fatal shot to his right temple while in restraints, as it has been claimed. Chavis died from a single gunshot wound to the head on Saturday night. He had earlier been detained – alongside two other suspects – by officers searching for drugs in the back of a truck they had noticed parked in the street with its lights on. Having found a set of scales giving off a strong smell of marijuana and a bag containing a white substance, a check was run on Carter revealing an outstanding warrant for the Mississippi resident, according to a copy of the police report posted online. The suspect was then handcuffed with his hands behind his back and led to the back seat of a patrol car. It was while in restraints and in the police car that Carter is reported to have shot himself.

The incident has raised questions, not least over how officers apparently failed to find the gun on Carter during an initial search. The FBI confirmed to the Guardian that local police had shared "investigative information" relating to the incident and that federal agents would "monitor and assess the situation". The FBI says it is "monitoring" the case of a police suspect who officers claim fatally shot himself in the head despite having his hands cuffed behind his back in the rear of a patrol car.

In an apparent copy of the official incident report posted online by TheGrio.com, an officer stated that he heard a "loud thump and a metallic sound" while speaking to the two other suspects. But

he dismissed it as the sound of a car driving over a piece of metal on the roadway. It was only after the two other suspects were sent away that Carter's body was discovered, one officer recorded. "We went to the rear passenger side door, opened it and I observed Carter in a sitting position slumped forward with his head in his lap. "There was a large amount of blood on the front of his shirt, pants, seat and floor. His hands were cuffed behind his back." According to the police report, officers tried, but could not remove Carter's handcuffs due to the position of his body. Meanwhile a small handgun was discovered, the officers said.

The incident has raised questions, not least over how officers apparently failed to find the gun on Carter during an initial search. It has also been said that the suspect died as a result to a gunshot wound to the right temple. Carter was left-handed and handcuffed at the time.

The dead man's mother, Teresa Carter, has accused police of a cover-up. "I think they killed him, my son wasn't suicidal," she told WREG-TV. "They searched him twice. I just want to know what really happened, that is all I want to know."

Jonesboro police chief Michael Yates has reportedly said that the incident "defies logic at first" but that footage from a dashboard video camera and witness statements do seem to back up the officers' account. Meanwhile, the police department has asked the local FBI to assist its investigation. Special agent Kimberly Brunell told the Guardian: "We are monitoring the situation and we have received certain information, investigative information has been shared with us." *guardian.co.uk, Friday 3 August 2012*

USA: Immigrants Prove Big Business For Prison Companies Associated Press, 02/08/12

Locking up illegal immigrants has grown profoundly lucrative for the private prisons industry, a reliable pot of revenue that helped keep some of the biggest companies in business. And while nearly half of the 400,000 immigrants held annually are housed in private facilities, the federal government — which spends \$2 billion a year on keeping those people in custody — says it isn't necessarily cheaper to outsource the work, a central argument used for privatization in the first place.

Associated Press, seeking to tally the scope of the private facilities, add up their cost/amounts the companies spend on lobbying/campaign donations, reviewed more than 10 years' worth of federal and state records. It found a complex, mutually beneficial and evidently legal relationship between those who make corrections and immigration policy and a few prison companies. Some of those companies were struggling to survive before toughened immigrant detention laws took effect.

A decade ago, just 10 percent of the beds in the nation's civil detention system were in private facilities with little federal oversight. Now, about half the beds are part of a sprawling, private system, largely controlled by just three companies: Corrections Corporation of America, The GEO Group, and Management and Training Corp. And the growth is far from over, despite the sheer drop in illegal immigration in recent years.

CCA was on the verge of bankruptcy in 2000 due to lawsuits, management problems and dwindling contracts. Last year, the company reaped \$162 million in net income. Federal contracts made up 43 percent of its total revenues, in part thanks to rising immigrant detention. GEO, which cites the immigration agency as its largest client, saw its net income jump from \$16.9 million to \$78.6 million since 2000. At the same time, the three businesses have spent at least \$45 million combined on campaign donations and lobbyists at the state and federal level in the last decade, the AP found. This seismic shift toward a privatized system happened quietly. While Congress' unsuccessful efforts to overhaul immigration laws drew headlines and sparked massive demonstrations, lawmakers' negotiations to boost detention dollars received far less attention.

because family relationships had broken down.

- Walking round the establishment, the vulnerability of some of the young people held was obvious. Introduction from the report: At the time of this inspection, HMYOI Wetherby held 340 boys, most of whom were aged 16 and 17, although a few were a year younger or older. Forty-eight young people were held on the self-contained Keppel Unit which we have inspected and reported on separately. The most striking feature of Wetherby was the wide range of the young people held, the challenge some of them posed and the extreme vulnerability of others. Some of the most challenging were also the most vulnerable. It is in this context that the report should be read.

Most young people were reasonably safe at Wetherby but there were areas that needed attention. It was not acceptable that the new escort contract was still causing problems. Some young people arrived very late which risked the most vulnerable young people at the most vulnerable time not getting the attention they needed. This has plagued a number of establishments, has gone on too long and needs to be sorted out.

Reception processes were also marred by the automatic strip searching of all new arrivals who had not come from another Prison Service establishment - so a young person arriving from a privately run secure training centre would be strip searched; a young person arriving from another young offender institution would not. Not all staff had their names visible on their uniform which was a particular problem for new arrivals. It was hard to understand why staff were reluctant to do this as notice boards with staff names and photos were on display in the units.

Staff were positive about the new 'ABC' anti-bullying strategy which appeared to be having a positive impact. The ABC policy addressed both the behaviour of the bully and provided support for the victim. Fewer young people said they had been bullied than in comparable establishments or than at the time of the previous inspection. Staff were vigilant about intimidatory shouting out of windows at night and good monitoring had reduced bullying around the use of the shop. The use of force was subject to detailed scrutiny and had reduced considerably over the previous six months.

Suicide and self-harm prevention was generally sound, although the quality of documentation was variable. An initial action plan had been developed in response to a self-inflicted death the previous year and was regularly reviewed. Child protection procedures were efficient but some elements currently lacked sufficient independence; however, we were pleased that local authority involvement had increased and the imminent addition of three social workers would strengthen the arrangements further. A member of the safeguarding team checked all complaints which was good practice.

The care and separation unit was, in reality, an old-fashioned segregation unit, whatever the title. Its use had been reduced but nevertheless young people were still sent there as a punishment. The environment was bleak, young people spent most of the day locked in their cell and there was little effort to address their behaviour or prepare them for reintegration back onto the main units. Governance of the unit was not part of the remit of the safeguarding committee and this needed to be corrected.

The environment was generally satisfactory and young people's perception of their relationships with staff had improved since the last inspection. There was some good work on diversity. Most young people from black and ethnic minority backgrounds reported similar experiences to their white counterparts, with the exception that a much greater proportion said they had been victimised by staff. We did not find evidence to support this perception but the reasons for it and some monitoring data needed to be investigated further. There was very good support for foreign national prisoners who were accommodated together on one unit, which also housed an impressive cultural centre.

clear strategy, we recommended that the role and function of the Keppel unit was clarified with clear, consistent support from the centre. These recommendations had not been fully achieved. The recent recently published YJB strategy for the secure estate' includes the development of specialist units and that is welcome. However, it will inevitably be several years before the Keppel unit becomes just one part of specialist provision for very vulnerable children in custody. In the meantime, there needs to be improved monitoring and support of the Keppel unit from the National Offender Management Service (NOMS) and the YJB.

Monitoring of the overall throughput of the unit is critical. The YJB placement protocol states that the Y JB and the unit will review the situation onsite regularly to ensure that the most appropriate young people are on the unit, but we found no evidence that this took place. The influx of eight young people with histories of serious self-harm over a two-week period in January made it very difficult for staff to complete all the required assessments and initial care plans within the timescale required. It also affected their capacity to sustain the high level of support required for the vulnerable young people they were already caring for. At a strategic, national level, we could find no system in place to monitor referrals to the unit or acceptance or rejection of referrals for fairness. Ninety-five per cent of young people on the unit were white British.

Support from the centre is equally important. The establishment's placement protocol with the Y JB outlines the process of referral, assessment and acceptance for a place at the Keppel Unit and states that staff should be trained and experienced in working with young people with specific needs. In this report we point to areas where additional resources are needed, for example learning support to meet the high level of need of the population. External support may also be needed to improve family contact since long distances from home and difficulties in maintaining family contact is an obvious consequence of the Keppel unit's status as a single national resource. We had concerns about the response to the significant increase in self-harm we found. There was no evidence that any consideration had been given by either the Y JB or NOMS centrally, to assess whether additional resources were required to help the unit to manage this additional risk.

Keppel unit staff at all levels are to be commended for their collective and individual commitment to the care of this vulnerable group of young people. It is welcome that the Y JB are committed to developing further specialist units in the long-term. In the meantime, we believe that a review is needed of the central support and resources provided to the Keppel unit as the sole national resource for particularly vulnerable young people who have different needs to the population in mainstream young offender institutions. That needs to be done without further delay.

Report on an announced inspection of HMYOI Wetherby

Inspection 30 Jan – 3 Feb 2012 by HMCIP. Report compiled May 2012, 03/08/12

Inspectors were concerned to find that:

- the new escort contract was still causing problems and some young people arrived very late which risked the most vulnerable not getting the attention they needed;
- reception processes were marred by the automatic strip searching of all new arrivals who had not come from another Prison Service establishment;
- Not all staff had their names visible on their uniform which was a particular problem for new arrivals.
- care and separation unit was, in reality, an old-fashioned segregation unit, was bleak and there was little effort to address young people's behaviour or prepare them for reintegration;
- 50% of young people were more than 50 miles from home, 14% were more than 100 miles
 - some young people received no or very few visits, either because of distance or

CCA and GEO, who manage most private detention centers, insist they aren't trying to influence immigration policy to make more money, and their lobbying and campaign donations have been legal. "As a matter of long-standing corporate policy, CCA does not lobby on issues that would determine the basis for an individual's detention or incarceration," CCA spokesman Steve Owen said in an email to the AP. The company has a website dedicated to debunking such allegations. GEO, which was part of The Wackenhut Corp. security firm until 2003, and Management and Training declined repeated interview requests.

Advocates for immigrants are skeptical the lobbying is not meant to influence policy. "That's a lot of money to listen quietly," said Peter Cervantes-Gautschi, who has helped lead a campaign to encourage large banks and mutual funds to divest from the prison companies.

The detention centers are located in cities and remote areas alike, from a Denver suburb to an industrial area flanking Newark's airport, often in low-slung buildings surrounded by chain-link fences and razor wire. U.S. Immigrations and Customs Enforcement agents detain men, women and children suspected of violating civil immigration laws at these facilities. Most of those held at the 250 sites nationwide are illegal immigrants awaiting deportation, but some green card holders, asylum seekers and others are also there.

The total average nightly cost to taxpayers to detain an illegal immigrant, including health care and guards' salaries, is about \$166, ICE confirmed only after the AP calculated that figure and presented it to the agency. That's up from \$80 in 2004. ICE said the \$80 didn't include all of the same costs but declined to provide details.

Prison Alone Won't Fix the US Drug Problem *Sadhbh Walshe, guardian.co.uk, 01/08/12*

The war on drugs has dealt a devastating blow to drug users, often sending them to prison instead of a treatment program. It's the wrong choice for everyone. Since the war on drugs began, the incarceration rate for women in the US has increased by more than 800%

In 1971, president Richard Nixon declared a war on drugs that was supposed to end the scourge of addiction by drastically expanding the net of imprisonable drug offenses and imposing extremely harsh sentences on anyone involved in the drug trade, including small time dealers and users. Last year, the war on drugs, which has so far cost the taxpayer \$1 trillion give or take, reached its 40th birthday – but with little cause to celebrate. The drug problem is more or less what it ever was, and the so-called war has wreaked havoc on the most vulnerable communities it was supposed to rescue, while dealing a particularly devastating blow to women and children.

Since the so called war began, the incarceration rate for women in the US has increased by more than 800%, almost double the rate of increase for the male prison population. In 1980, there were just over 13,000 women in state and federal prisons; by 2010 that number had jumped to over 112,000 women. When you combine that with the local jail population, it jumps to over 200,000. Over half of that extraordinary increase is attributable to drug offenses, including possession for personal use, stealing to feed a habit, or small time dealing often to supplement an impossibly low income. As with all things prison, the drug war has not been colour blind. White women use drugs at a slightly higher rate than black women, yet black women are three times more likely than white women to be incarcerated for drug offenses.

When in 2004, Martha Stewart was serving out her time at the Alderson correctional facility in Georgia for an insider trading charge, she was surrounded by many women caught up in the drug war net, and she rightly attempted to draw attention to their cause:

. . . . So many of the women here will never have the joy and well being that you and

I experience. Many of them have been here for years – devoid of care, devoid of love, devoid of family. I beseech you to think about these women, to encourage the American people to ask for reforms, both in sentencing guidelines, in length of incarceration for non-violent first time offenders and for those involved in drug-taking. They would be much better served in a true rehabilitation center than in prison where there is no real help, no real programs to rehabilitate, no programs to educate, no way to be prepared for life 'out there' where each person will ultimately find herself, many with no skills and no preparation for living

What Stewart was trying to point out was what should be blindingly obvious: that drug addicts need treatment, not punishment, and they certainly not need prison, which serves only to exacerbate the causes of addiction rather than cure them. A 2004 report by the ACLU titled Caught in the Net profiles the kind of women most likely to end up behind bars for drug offenses. They tend to be low income, have limited educational and work opportunities, are frequently victims of violence, and, of course, the majority are women of colour. Whoever decided that adding a prison sentence to the mix would cure these women of their problems, clearly didn't think it through.

The advantages of drug treatment rather than prison is clearly illustrated in Alisha Ruiz' story. Both of Alisha's parents had substance abuse issues while she was growing up and so, somewhat inevitably, she began using drugs herself at the age of 13 and quickly became addicted to crystal meth. This addiction and the petty crimes she committed to feed it led to several stints in juvenile detention. Shortly after giving birth to her daughter at age 15, she was arrested for a vehicular manslaughter charge and three years later, at age 18, she was sent to prison for a year. When she got out, she had nowhere to go, no job prospects and no means of supporting herself. She was rearrested soon after for drug taking and was about to be sentenced to four more years in prison when she begged the judge to send her to a treatment program instead: "If he had sent me to prison, I would barely be getting out right now. I had been in and out of jails my whole life, prison wasn't going to do anything for me. If anything, it would have made things worse."

Alisha was extremely fortunate that the judge was opted to give her a second chance, but also that he was not bound by federal mandatory sentencing rules and able to exercise discretion (in 2000, California passed the Substance Abuse and Crime Prevention Act (SACPA) that requires drug treatment for non violent offenders convicted of drug possession for personal use).

Since completing the drug treatment program, Alisha has transformed her life. She got a job working in the Homegirl Café in Los Angeles. She has regained custody of her daughter, who is now doing well at school, and is about to start a training program with a master chef. She would be the first to acknowledge, however, that she would never have been able to overcome the disadvantages which led to her drug abuse without some state intervention. A four year stint in prison would have cost the taxpayer well over \$100,000; her drug treatment cost nothing near that sum. It's so much better for her and for society as a whole that the state chose the humane and cost effective option.

Report on an announced inspection of HMYOI Keppel Unit

Inspection 13 – 16 Feb 2012 by HMCIP. Report compiled April 2012, published 03/08/12

The Keppel Unit opened in October 2008 and was designed to offer a safe and supportive environment for 15- to 17-year-old young men who could not cope in the mainstream prison system.

Inspectors were concerned to find that:

- needs of the young people remained very challenging - self-harm had increased
- proportion of young people with mental health problems remained high

- as did those with physical disabilities, previous time in care,
- learning difficulties and low levels of literacy and numeracy remained high
- More young people were a long distance from their home
- more had committed violent offences, including sex offences

Introduction from the report: The Keppel unit at HMYOI Wetherby opened in October 2008 and was designed to offer a safe and supportive environment for up to 48 15-17 -year-old young men who could not cope in the mainstream prison system. We carried out a post-opening inspection in April 2009 which was commissioned by the Youth Justice Board. At that time, we described the Keppel unit as an impressive facility, achieving a great deal with some very damaged young people with a range of complex problems. We also noted some areas for improvement and made recommendations accordingly. This inspection, carried out almost three years later, follows up on those recommendations and also addresses some issues we identified during this inspection. Short follow-up inspections focus on recommendations made at the last full inspection and so do not provide an assessment of the prison as a whole.

The needs of the young people held at Keppel remained very challenging and in some areas had increased since the last inspection. The proportion of young people with mental health problems, physical disabilities, previous time in care, learning difficulties and low levels of numeracy and literacy remained high. Levels of self-harm had increased. The population statistics provided to us by the establishment indicated that there were more young people who were a long distance from their home and more who had committed violent offences, including sex offences. We were also told anecdotally that there had been an increase in the number of young people coming directly from court.

Despite these challenges, the Keppel unit remained fundamentally safe. The living conditions were still good and staff cared for young people with a great deal of sensitivity, were appreciative of their different needs, and provided a high level of individual support. The unit continued to be a busy and purposeful place and young people who were discharged to their communities were well prepared for release. The few young people who transferred to the main prison continued to receive support from Keppel staff, as did those who transferred to young adult establishments, but in reality those young people were likely to find the adjustment from such a supportive environment difficult.

However, some of these challenges could not be met without help from other stakeholders such as the local authority children's services and the local safeguarding children board. The establishment had lost its social work support since the previous inspection but the prolonged funding negotiations had at last been resolved and Wetherby had been funded to increase its previous social work complement threefold. Additionally, the involvement of the local authority had slowly improved and the local authority designated officer (LADO) was beginning to attend safeguarding meetings and regular meetings with the governor when concerns were raised about staff. More involvement with the LADO was welcome but an appropriate level of independent scrutiny of the Keppel unit, which is a unique resource for the most vulnerable children in the YOI estate, was critical and there was still no formal agreement. That was a joint responsibility between the establishment and the local safeguarding children board which needed to be resolved.

Two of our main recommendations in the previous report were directed to the Youth Justice Board (Y JB) and related to our view that there was a need to review the needs of vulnerable young people across the juvenile estate and then have greater clarity about the role of the Keppel unit within an overarching national strategy. In addition to the development of a