

Teams when Kesia moved to the Tameside area at the end of October 2013.

Kesia's mother Martina Brincat Baines said: "We are devastated as a family and we hope that the Inquest will provide some answers to allow us to come to terms with this terrible tragedy"

Deborah Coles, co-director of INQUEST said: "This is a very troubling death of a vulnerable child who should never have been locked up in a police cell. INQUEST is sadly working on far too many cases involving deaths of children and young people with mental health problems where the very systems that should be in place to protect them have failed. This inquest must ensure the most robust scrutiny of all those with responsibility for Kesia's treatment and care to expose any failings and ensure that no other family has to lose a child in these disturbing circumstances."

INQUEST has been working with the family of Kesia Leatherbarrow since her death in 2013. The family is represented by INQUEST Lawyers Group members Gemma Vine from Lester Morrill solicitors and Martha Spurrier from Doughty Street Chambers.

Opposing the National Crime Agency in Northern Ireland a Folly *Belfast Telegraph*

The opposition from the SDLP and Sinn Fein to the National Crime Agency operating in Northern Ireland would be farcical if it was not so serious. While the PSNI is doing its best to curb the activities of the organised crime gangs – there may be up to 160 of them in the province – it does not have sufficient powers to be really effective and anyway is struggling to carry out its duties while facing a budget cut of around £50m before the end of the year. The NCA – dubbed the UK's FBI – was set up with the resources and powers to tackle drug smuggling, human trafficking, money laundering, sexual exploitation and any other crime which crosses national and international boundaries. But it is blocked from operating here because Sinn Fein and the SDLP are concerned about the agency's accountability.

The folly of this stance is becoming more and more evident. The latest damning evidence came from Deputy Chief Constable Drew Harris who told the Policing Board that around £13m worth of assets accrued by crime gang bosses – mainly loyalist paramilitaries in east Belfast – cannot be seized because the PSNI does not have that power. It resides solely with the NCA. This must be bringing a huge smile to the faces of the gang bosses. In their world money is the key to power.

They need these assets to continue their nefarious operations and to live their affluent lifestyles. If these assets were seized then, at the very least, the gangs would be hampered in their activities. They would not be able to fund their criminal enterprises and that would greatly aid the law enforcement bodies' fight against organised crime.

The one glimmer of hope is that the SDLP has been engaged in talks aimed at making the NCA more accountable to the Policing Board and to the Chief Constable of the PSNI. It should conclude those discussions as quickly as possible, drop their opposition to the NCA and leave Sinn Fein

Hostages: Jamie Green, Dan Payne, Zoran Dresic, Scott Birtwistle, Jon Beere, Chedwyn Evans, Darren Waterhouse, David Norris, Brendan McConville, John Paul Wooton, John Keelan, Mohammed Niaz Khan, Abid Ashiq Hussain, Sharaz Yaqub, David Ferguson, Anthony Parsons, James 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, 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, Patrick Docherty, Brendan Dixon, Paul Bush, Frank Wilkinson, Alex Black, Nicholas Rose, Kevin Nunn, Peter Carine, Paul Higginson, Thomas Petch, 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, 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 Email: mojuk@mojuk.org.uk Web: www.mojuk.org.uk

MOJUK: Newsletter 'Inside Out' No 511 (08/01/2015) - Cost £1

Ricky Tomlinson Vows to Whinge on Until Police & State are Made to Pay'

It is more than 40 years since Ricky Tomlinson spent Christmas in prison. In December 1973 the actor was a young painter and decorator, married with two small sons, when he was sentenced to two years for his part in picketing a national construction workers' strike. After more than a year behind bars, much of it in solitary confinement, he walked free – only to find he'd been blacklisted by the building industry and was unemployable.

Whether prison worked for Tomlinson is an interesting question. Unable to get work as a builder, he had a go at standup in the local pubs and clubs instead, landed a bit part in Alan Bleasdale's Boys from the Blackstuff, and in 1982 became a household name as Bobby Grant in Brookside. He could do kitchen-sink grit in Riff-Raff and Raining Stones for Ken Loach, or comic ribaldry in a cheesy caper like Mike Bassett: England Manager; he also starred in many of the flagship British dramas of the past two decades – Cracker, Hillsborough, Clocking Off – and has come dangerously close to national-treasure status as Jim Royle in The Royle Family. If he hadn't been jailed, he cackles cheerfully, "I'd probably still be skimming walls."

Whether jailing him worked out so well for the authorities is more doubtful. If the prosecution's intention was to crush a leftwing firebrand, it didn't go to plan: Tomlinson went into prison a not particularly educated or well-known rightwinger, and came out a well-read socialist and soon-to-be star who would become the trade union movement's popular champion for the next four decades. We meet in Liverpool, where he lives, at the cabaret club he co-owns. I find him in a corner chair of the cafe area, looking exactly as you would expect – an appealingly dishevelled mein host, eating a cheese and ham toastie and holding court to the stream of passersby, all of whom he appears to know. At 75, he is still working, has survived a quadruple heart bypass, enjoys a long and happy second marriage, and can afford to give so much money to charity that he gets quite sentimental just talking about it.

In view of how everything has worked out, some might wonder why he doesn't just leave his conviction in the past. "What? Get out of it!" he hoots incredulously. "I'm not letting it go. I'm a whingeing scouser, and I will whinge until they're made to pay." Tomlinson was one of 24 trade unionists convicted for affray and intimidation while picketing a building site in Shrewsbury during the 1972 strike to protest against dangerous working conditions. The youngest is now nearly 70, and several are no longer alive, but for the past few years a campaign to overturn the Shrewsbury 24's convictions has been gathering pace, and the case is now with the Criminal Cases Review Commission.

Their big problem is the government's refusal to release all the official documents relating to their case. The cabinet office has withheld or redacted crucial papers, refusing to release them on the puzzling grounds of "national security". As far as Tomlinson is concerned, this only proves what he has known all along: that the prosecutions were a politically motivated plot that the authorities have been trying to cover up ever since. "It's simple, really simple. Back then they were afraid of what the miners were going to do. So they needed someone to make an example of. They couldn't use the dockers or the railway industry, because they were organised – they could call a strike at the drop of a hat, they could paralyse the country. But we couldn't. So they thought: we'll pick on the building workers."

On the day of the Shrewsbury picket, more than 70 police officers were present, and no com-

plaints or arrests were made. "I'd seen more hostility," Tomlinson later wrote in his autobiography, "at a kiddies' Christmas party." When two detectives turned up at Tomlinson's council house to arrest him five months later, he could barely take the charges against him seriously. They included a charge of conspiracy under an arcane 1875 law, which carried a possible life sentence.

It transpired that after the national strike had ended, West Mercia police had been tasked with producing evidence of violence and intimidation by the pickets, and had interviewed more than 800 potential witnesses in their hunt to find it. When the trial began, Tomlinson was flabbergasted to hear some of these witnesses, who included the building site managers, describe a rampaging mob of armed picketers, and identify him as a chief culprit. But now he shows me a document unearthed from the National Archives in Kew. It records the minutes of a meeting between the crown prosecutor and chief constables that took place two weeks before the trial began. Many of the witnesses' original statements, it notes, had been "destroyed after a fresh statement had been obtained. In most cases the first statement was taken before photographs were available for witnesses, and before the officers taking the statements knew what we were trying to prove."

Tomlinson has more documents – some signed by the then prime minister Ted Heath and his home secretary – all of which strongly suggest a political prosecution. Even so, the jury took a long time to convict. "And when I got my sentence," Tomlinson recalls, "the foreman of the jury and another fella jumped up and started physically fighting." The foreman later explained to Tomlinson's wife that the jury had been stuck at 8:4 when a court official came in and told them the punishment would only be a £50 fine, which the trade union would pay – and so two jurors changed their verdict to guilty. "The jury foreman's son came to see me years later. I was doing a show in Shrewsbury, of all places." During the interval, Tomlinson invited him to his dressing room. "And he said: 'My dad's never had a proper night's sleep after you went to jail.'"

Despite everything, he still believed in "the land of hope and glory" when his sentence began. Born in 1939, he'd grown up in a true-blue, protestant, "loyalist, royalist" working-class Liverpool family. "The only time I see my dad cry, I can remember coming home from school, I'd have been around 12 or 13, and he had tears in his eyes. And he said, 'The old king's dead, the old king's died.' He was so royal it was untrue." Tomlinson was so rightwing in his youth that he even joined the National Front. His membership didn't last longer than a year, and he looks slightly embarrassed when it comes up, but says: "Do you know what, this is going to sound corny to you, but they were lovely, genuine fellas, like myself, just didn't know the score. There was only one that was a bit of a crackpot. They were real nice guys who were just concerned about immigration in them days. Jobs, mostly. But also, people seemed to come in and get houses on the council estates who weren't, as far as I'm concerned, entitled to them."

So his exuberant refusal to comply with any prison regime seems to have owed more at first to personality than to political ideology. He set about systematically defying every rule he could with an ungovernable belligerence that makes me wonder whether a bit of him didn't rather enjoy prison life. To have nothing to do but apply himself to beating the system rather suited him, didn't it? "I suppose so," he chuckles. He was obviously quite good at it, judging from his anecdote about an exasperated governor appearing late one night in his solitary confinement cell and pleading: "Tomlinson, give me my fucking prison back." Insubordination and dissidence landed him in solitary confinement a lot of the time, where he discovered Radio 4, wrote diaries on toilet paper, and read voraciously. His political conversion to the left was sealed when he read *The Ragged-Trousered Philanthropists*. "It said the only thing they can't get hold of and sell you is the air that you breathe. If they could they would. I mean, they make a profit out of everything. We own nothing." He's been a socialist ever since.

cial demonstration squad.

Theresa May SSHD: Operation Herne is conducting a criminal investigation into the conduct of former special demonstration squad officers, and that work is continuing. As I said in my statement to the House on 6 March 2014, there will be a public inquiry into undercover policing and the activities of the special demonstration squad and I will update the House on the public inquiry as soon as it is appropriate to do so.

Duncan Hames: I thank the SSHD for her attention to this matter. It has taken the Met nearly two years to reply to my FOI request about their theft of dead children's identities for undercover policing. From only three out of 18 year groups had a child's identity not been taken for the purpose of legend building. The so-called legends are broadly as likely to have been stolen from dead children as to have been invented from scratch. Given their feet dragging on this matter, what confidence can the Home Secretary have that police attitudes to undercover practices have truly changed?

Mrs May: I believe that one of the assistant commissioners from the Metropolitan police gave very clear evidence to the Home Affairs Committee on the fact that the approach to the use of dead children's names and identities has changed within the Metropolitan police. They are very clear that this should not be happening now, and as I say, they have changed the action they take.

Inquest into Death of Kesia Leatherbarrow Following Arrest by Manchester Police

In the South Manchester Coroner's Court, Mount Tarbor, Mottram Street, Stockport SK1 3PA, 5 January 2015 before HM Area Coroner Joanne Kearsley (the inquest is expected to last for 5 weeks) - 17-year-old Kesia Leatherbarrow had a long history of self-harming and mental health problems. She was arrested in November 2013 after she broke a window trying to enter a residential care home for people with learning disabilities to visit a friend. On arrest, officers found a small quantity of cannabis on her.

Kesia was kept in the cells all weekend, where she became very distressed, banging her head against the wall and making threats of suicide. Although she was seen in custody by nurses from Medacs, no formal mental health assessment was carried out, she did not have an appropriate adult for over sixteen hours and the police did not contact her mother, health professionals or social services. She was sent to court on Monday where she was bailed to return the next day due to the fact that the Youth Court did not sit on Mondays. Although she was bailed to her father's address she left the Court alone and did not return there. The next morning Kesia was found dead in a friend's garden.

In the summer before her death Kesia had spent five weeks in a hospital mental health ward for adolescents, after her mental health deteriorated and her self harming behaviour became a concern. In October 2013 she was arrested for breach of the peace by Lancashire Constabulary after she threatened suicide and self harm. After being kept in a police cell overnight, she was released and Kesia shortly after left the family home threatening to take her own life. The police were called again and she had to be removed from a motorway bridge by police.

The family hope the inquest will address the issues around the way in which Greater Manchester police dealt with Kesia before and during her time in their custody. In particular, the family hope to explore whether the police took appropriate steps to protect Kesia from the risk that she posed to herself whilst in custody and following her release, in light of the fact that they were aware she had threatened to take her own life. They also hope that the quality of support she received from the mental health services, social services and the Youth Offending Team will be a subject for scrutiny, in particular the transfer of information between Lancashire NHS Trust and Pennine Care NHS Trust and the two different Youth Offending

January 3, 2015, four months after receiving payment, Dan Gristwood died from lung cancer.

Law to Disconnect Prisoners' Mobile Phones

Phone networks will be compelled to block mobile phones and SIM cards by the courts if they are being used in a prison, as part of the government's proposed amendment to the Serious Crime Bill. The amendment – which was discussed in Parliament on Monday 5th December – will be a powerful new tool in the fight against illicit mobile phone use in prisons.

Illicit mobile phones in prisons can lead to bullying and disorder, as well as being used by serious and organised criminals to continue their illegal activities, such as drug smuggling from behind bars. Building on the recently introduced blocking technology and thorough searching processes that have already helped to increase seizures, the new legislation will take advantage of cutting-edge detection equipment that will allow prisons to identify unauthorised mobile phones and SIM cards being used within prisons.

Prisons Minister Andrew Selous said: "We will never tolerate the use of mobile phones in prisons and will continue to clamp down on their illicit use. Our range of tough security measures has already successfully seen the number of seizures increase, but this proposed new legislation will significantly increase our ability to tackle this problem. By ordering a phone to be cut off once it is identified, we will be able to reassure victims and prevent further criminal activity faster and wider than ever before".

The Ministry of Justice (MOJ) has worked closely with the Home Office to develop the amendment to the Serious Crime Bill. If approved, the legislation will mean that once a phone has been identified, the Prison Service will be able to apply to a court for it to be disconnected without needing to seize the phone or prove it is being used by a specific prisoner. Prisons already use a comprehensive range of robust searching and security measures to detect items of contraband with intelligence-led searches, body searches, use of x-ray machines, metal detectors and CCTV surveillance cameras, as well as body orifice scanners all helping to tackle the use of mobile phones. Building on existing legislation and the serious and organised crime strategy, the Serious Crime Bill will enhance the ability of law enforcement agencies to pursue, disrupt and bring to justice serious and organised criminals.

NOMS uses a range of measures to prevent unauthorised phones getting into prisons, as well as measures to identify and seize phones in the possession of prisoners. However, there are currently no legal obligations on mobile network operators to disconnect unauthorised phones in prisons. This proposed power is in part a response to a request by operators for a clear legal instrument to support disconnection. The Offender Management Act 2007 made it a criminal offence to convey specific items, including mobile phones and associated equipment into or out of a prison or to transmit sounds or images from within a prison. In March 2012, the Crime and Security Act 2010 also made it an offence, with a penalty of up to 2 years' imprisonment and/or an unlimited fine, to possess an unauthorised mobile phone or other electronic equipment or component element that can receive or transmit information electronically within a prison. The Prison (Interference with Wireless Technology) Act 2012 enabled the Secretary of State to authorise prison governors and directors to use blocking technology to detect and investigate the use of mobile phones in prison. In 2013 a total of 7451 seizures were made of illicit mobile phones or SIM cards in prisons.

Special Demonstration Squad

Duncan Hames : What assessment she has made of the implications for her policies of the findings of the investigation by Chief Constable Mick Creedon into the activities of the spe-

His memories of his National Front days do nevertheless help him to make sense of Ukip's rise: "For everyone who's been out of work for a couple of years, with no hope for a job, and then they see people coming in and working for less than the rate – it must make them angry, and if we pretend it doesn't we're kidding ourselves. You see where Nigel Farage is scoring – he's playing on this. He's absolutely playing on this. So you have got to talk about immigration, you can't just attack someone because you disagree with what they say. And when firms advertise jobs in Poland and not here, that's bang out of order. If there's jobs available it should be available for everyone. And I don't believe some of the stuff that people in this country won't work. I won't have that."

How does he explain why the coalition narrative about workshy benefit scroungers has gained such traction? "They can say what they want," he exclaims. "But I tell you what, why don't we have a thing like this? Say to them on benefits: 'Don't sit in bed all day, don't watch Jeremy Kyle, come to this place, go in, sign in, then go home and we'll give you £300. Because that's what they do in the upper chamber, isn't it? They go in and sign on,'" he says indignantly, getting louder and louder, "and they get £300. Why don't we do that? No one would sit in bed all day. They'd all get up and go in and sign in and get £300. Just think of the amount of money we'd have circulating!"

In full cry now, he goes on: "The world's bonkers. We're in debt, America's in debt, Cyprus is in debt. Spain's in debt." He raises his voice another notch. "Who are we in debt to? The World Bank. Well, who is the World Bank? Why don't we just say: fuck off, we're not paying you. Why don't we say that? We're not paying you, you've had enough." Today's Labour party is a terrible disappointment, he reflects glumly. "I feel sorry for the Labour party because it doesn't know where it's going. We've got no firebrands any more. I'm only sorry that Arthur Scargill's not in parliament. There's someone else with a load of backbone." For a brief but thrilling moment before the last general election Tomlinson threatened to stand in Liverpool for the Socialist Labour party, but had to withdraw when his son became unwell. He's pretty sure he would have won. "I would think so, yeah." How does he think he would have got on in parliament? He considers this for a moment. "Well," he grins, "I would have had to sit next to Dennis Skinner."

Tomlinson was in parliament at the start of this year to see MPs vote 120 to three in favour of full publication of all documents about the Shrewsbury 24. The justice secretary, Chris Grayling, had earlier ruled that their release would not be considered until 2021 – but following the Commons vote, the justice minister Simon Hughes promised a new review in 2015. Tomlinson intends to make him keep his promise, and believes this will be the year when justice is finally done. "I've had a great life," he says. "But one of us, he's been a Labour councillor, he's been on the police authority for years and years, he's even been the lord mayor of Flint. But he can't get a visa to go to America, because of his three-month suspended sentence. And me being a whingeing scouser, I'm not going to let it lie."

Organised Crime And Conflict: The New Challenge For Peacebuilding

1.5 billion people (a quarter of the world's population) continue to live in fear of violence. War, characterised by peace agreements and U.N. peacekeeping operations, is being replaced by insecurity caused by urban and cross-border crime, such as drugs, human trafficking and gun trade. Such violence poses one of the biggest threats to development in the 21st century. In addition, experts are warning of a new epidemic caused by a rise in the number of "fragile cities" in the world – spaces where violence is flourishing and creating humanitarian crises on par with war zones. In the "fragile states" more familiar to peacebuilding organisations (Mali, Colombia and Afghanistan, etc) the new cocktail of motivations for violence presents new challenges.

Jeremy Bamber on The Human Rights Act

I am beyond shocked by David Cameron's pledge to scrap the HRA if he becomes Prime Minister at the next election. The UK one of the first countries to give formal consent to the European Convention of Human Rights in 1951, when it was passed through Parliament, championed by Sir Winston Churchill. We live in a democracy that is loosely based on utilitarianism, i.e. the belief that the greatest happiness of the greatest number of people should be the guiding principle of those that rule us. I know certain cases ruled upon by the ECtHR have upset many people because they seem overtly wrong. For instance, the idea that prisoners can vote.

The media seem to think that once a person goes to jail that they should never be permitted to be a citizen again upon their release. Yet more than half of all those currently in jail will be free within five years. Why, upon their release, should they not have a voice with which to speak with a Member of Parliament? If they should be permitted to talk with an MP, then why shouldn't they have a right to choose whom that MP might be. Simply missing the election because of being in Jail shouldn't prevent them choosing their MP. Being holier than thou over this appears irrationally prejudicial. But I do agree other odd cases that have won in the ECHR need to be vetoed in some way. Nevertheless, to do away with human rights could certainly have an impact on the liberties we currently enjoy, without even being aware of it. I wanted to go through the Acts with some discussion on how these Articles might impact our lives if they are taken away and not replaced with a closely fitting alternative under the Tories proposed, "British Bill of Rights."

Article 1 Respecting Rights: This is the agreement by the Signatory Countries that they will secure the rights of their citizens as stated in the following Articles within their jurisdiction.

Article 2 Right to Life: The Right to Life will disappear. At the moment everyone's right to life is protected by law. When this is not in place the State can exterminate its citizens if it so chooses as Pinochet did. On September 11th in 1973 General Pinochet seized power of Chile in a bloody military coup. In almost two decades of his dictatorship he became notorious for his abuse of Human Rights. Under his rule, more than 3,200 people are known to have disappeared or been executed, with thousands of others being detained, tortured or exiled. Article 2 prevents human rights abuses on this scale happening in Europe.

Article 3 Prohibition of Torture: No one shall be subjected to torture or to inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment. The media often reports on alleged British involvement or complicity in torture and rendition sometimes conducted by the USA. In 2012 a criminal investigation into M16 officers involvement of torturing Libyan dissidents, under Tony Blair's leadership, was carried out. More recently, in the wake of the 9/11 attacks on the World Trade Center, the US Senate has produced a report on torture of suspected terrorists. Malcolm Rifkind has requested access to redacted passages of the report, which might detail the UK's part in breaking Article 3 of the Human Rights Act. More commonly, in countries outside of Europe, appalling acts of torture still happen. The UK has always prided itself on having the highest standards of human rights. I'm afraid all this would slide without Article 3 in its current form, and incidents of the UK becoming involved in torture would become more frequent.

Between 1971 and 1975 the authorities in Northern Ireland exercised a series of extrajudicial Powers of Arrest, detention and internment of terrorist suspects. Arrests and convictions during this time included The Guildford Four, Maguire Seven and the Birmingham Six, all later proven to have been wrongly convicted. Although the claims of torture and police brutality they endured were not brought before the European Court of Human Rights, many more were, including the 'Hooded Men Case', where it was found that five interrogation techniques were used on suspects. This included forcing detainees to remain standing 'spread eagled' in

indicator of prisoner sexual assault is the culture of the facility, not the number of inmates or security cameras. "Really it's about how the facilities are managed, in terms of institutional culture," Beck said.

When Lastocy stepped into Camp Branch, a minimum security women's prison in Michigan, in 1998, she was facing as much as 10 years in prison for attempting to embezzle several thousand dollars from her employer, ABO Security. As she adjusted to the discovery after her arrest that she had bipolar disorder, rape quickly became a fact of life. Like many prison rape survivors, she feared that the guard who raped her could extend her prison stay by writing her false tickets for breaking prison rules if she reported him. He was later convicted of sexually assaulting several inmates, including Lastocy. When she learned she may have been his first victim, she felt guilt for not speaking up. The passage of the law, however, gave her hope there would be fewer victims. But like other advocates, she's been frustrated by the pace of change at correctional institutions throughout the country.

So far, seven states have opted out of the law, and stand to lose 5% in federal money that goes toward prisons. Two states – New Jersey and New Hampshire – say they are in compliance, and 41 others are working to meet the law's requirements. The law's backers say Cornyn's proposal would essentially gut the penalty because little, if any, federal grant money actually goes toward prison administration, operations and constructions. Those are funded by state and local governments. To take the provision out "would totally obliterate the incentive states have to comply with" the law, said US district judge Reggie B Walton, the chairman of the former National Prison Rape Elimination Commission.

The commission developed the law's requirements, which range from increased training of staff about sex abuse policies to screening new inmates to determine if they're likely to commit sexual assault or to be assaulted. In Texas, which has six facilities among those nationally with the highest prevalence rate of sexual assaults, officials used nearly \$2.6 million in federal money to install extra cameras in some facilities and develop a sexual assault awareness curriculum. The state has since opted out, and faces an \$800,000 loss in federal funding. Jason Clark, a corrections spokesman, said a requirement to prevent guards from seeing inmates of the opposite sex naked in the showers or during strip searches wouldn't work because 40 percent of the correctional officer workforce is female. Many states have trained staffers and educated inmates about how to spot and report sexual assault. Addressing sexual assault and caring for victims "decreases the likelihood of an offender becoming a victim again and committing a violent act once he or she returns to the community," said Norah West, Washington state's corrections spokeswoman.

Eight state correctional facilities comply with the federal law, West said. Nine more are set to be audited in 2015. For Lastocy, the trauma didn't end when she left prison. She struggled with terror as she watched her teenage daughter begin to navigate the dating. She worked to repair her wounded marriage, trying to explain to her husband why she didn't tell him, or anyone, about the rapes. She still has nightmares, 15 years after her ordeal. "I know the judge did not sentence me to be raped," Lastocy said. "As much as I despise him, I don't even wish my rapist would be raped while he is in prison, because nobody deserves it."

Wrongly Convicted NY Man Dies 4 Months After \$7.5M Compensation

Dan Gristwood was convicted in 1996 of attempted murder for beating his wife with a hammer. He signed a confession, that he did not write, after 16 hours of interrogation by the NY State Police. In 2003, the real attacker, Mastho Davis, came forward and confessed. Gristwood was released in 2005, and ultimately awarded \$7.5M for his nine years of wrongful incarceration. Sadly, on

detaining and at all times when the issue of continuing detention had to be considered, precisely what power was being used to detain and how that power should have been correctly exercised. I suspect that the problems which have arisen following the provision of answers to those requests for particulars indicate that insufficient consideration (if any at all) was given in the past by the officers in the Defendant's department to the necessity at all times to be clear what power of detention was being used. The Claimant's case is that that was not done and that the Defendant is unable to justify the detention."

Furthermore, His Honour Judge Bidder QC held that; "The second deportation order was both unlawful when made and that detention in the period from its making to the date of release of the Claimant was unlawful. Overall, I find that the Claimant's detention from 18th October 2010 to the 13th November 2013 was unlawful and that he was falsely imprisoned and imprisoned in breach of article 5 of the ECHR during that period".

Toufique Hossain, Public Law Director at Duncan Lewis, who represented the Claimant stated; "This is an exceptional victory. The Home Secretary has been found to have acted unlawfully in falsely imprisoning our client for over three years. The Home Office's woeful failure to justify detention on any basis is contrary to one of the established pillars of English law: the right to liberty unless lawfully justified".

United States: Prison Rape Survivors Fear Changes to Law

When Jan Lastocy was repeatedly raped by a Michigan state prison guard, she felt she had become invisible. There was no rape crisis centre hotline. She had been warned that inmates were never believed over guards. She was among roughly 216,000 prison rape victims not included in America's national rape statistics. So when Congress passed a law in 2003 aimed at ending sexual assault in US prisons, jails and juvenile detention centres, survivors like Lastocy hoped it would help solve the long-ignored problem.

Lastocy and a coalition of inmate advocacy groups and evangelical groups had worked for years to convince policymakers and corrections officials that rape behind bars should not be accepted, even if the public had little sympathy for its victims. "I felt vindicated because I had been fighting so hard, and for so long, to bring attention to this issue and get justice for myself and for all survivors," said Lastocy, who was repeatedly raped by a guard while serving time for embezzlement. Now, some advocates worry a proposal to reduce the law's financial penalties will severely damage it. The measure failed this fall but its sponsor, Senator John Cornyn of Texas vows to re-introduce it in the new GOP-controlled Congress. Cornyn said the funds include grants for worthy programmes, such as ones that support rape and domestic violence survivors. He said the law should be more narrowly tailored to affect money for prison construction, operations and administration.

The proposal has put some prison rape survivors on the opposite side of those who survived sexual assault on the outside. Nearly two dozen organisations, including prison industry groups and the Rape, Abuse and Incest National Network (RAINN), have lauded Cornyn's efforts. They say they trust prison officials to work vigorously at reducing rapes even without financial penalties. "There's no desire to do anything less than help victims," said Rebecca O'Connor, RAINN's vice-president of public policy, adding that her organisation just wants to make sure the law is applied in a way that doesn't harm existing programs. Advocates say the measure is the latest sign that the law's implementation is too slow.

Federal statistics show about 216,000 adult and juvenile inmates are sexually assaulted each year, compared to 238,000 people living outside of correction facilities in the US. Allen Beck, a statistician with the US Department of Justice who researches the incidence of prison rape, said the biggest

stress positions for hours on end, putting hoods over their heads, subjecting them to loud continuous noise and deprivation of food, drink and sleep. The European Court of Human Rights held that these techniques caused, if not actual bodily injury, at least intense physical and mental suffering, and were humiliating and degrading. As such, the UK was held to be in breach of Article 3 by allowing its security forces to use such techniques.

Article 4 Prohibition of Slavery and Forced Labour: Abolition of this Human Rights Law would mean the State could force those they wanted to work for nothing. Everyone knows slavery is wrong, but abolish human rights and what's in place to prevent the State enslaving a section of its citizens to work for nothing should it so choose? Modern day slavery takes many forms and occurs in many more countries than you could imagine. The victims are the most vulnerable in society, women and children forced into prostitution, migrants trapped in debt bondage, and sweatshop or farm workers, usually foreign nationals, who are paid little or nothing. This does not just happen in third world countries but also here in the UK. Without the protection of Article 4 it's worrying to imagine how the money hungry could exploit British Citizens even more in this way.

Article 5 The Right to Liberty and Security: This means the State shall be forced to justify depriving a citizen of their liberty and entitling citizens to take proceedings against the State by which the lawfulness of his or her detention shall be speedily decided. Without Article 5, the police could arrest and detain a suspect for however long they choose. This Article also ensures that if you were to be arrested, the charges against you would be explained promptly in a language you understood, and a trial held within a reasonable period of time. This Article also protects the rights of people in hospital, and in care homes, particularly people who have mental health problems.

Article 6 The Right to a Fair Trial: The State already wants to do away with juries in some cases. It also allows certain evidence to be concealed from a defendant using Public Interest Immunity (PII). This is acceptable if it is used correctly, but if the police/lawyers choose to abuse PII without article 6, the fairness of a trial would undoubtedly be lost.

Article 7 No Punishment without Law: This seems an obvious thing, but without human rights, the State could simply punish a citizen if it wanted to, without them having broken any laws. For example, because he or she is part of a minority group. UK Human Rights Laws have already been eaten away by terrorism bills, so that suspects can be held in prison or under house arrest for many years without charge, or knowing what the evidence against them is. This erosion to civil liberty is already having an effect on our society and without Article 7 it will get worse.

Article 8 The Right to Respect for Private and Family Life: David Cameron often speaks about his love of family life, but without Article 8 the State could choose to interfere with a citizen's family unit. Either someone British born or an immigrant could be affected, for example, if as a family unit it might not fit with the States ideals. Without this Act in place, prisoners could be denied the right to have contact with their families. The impact of this on the children and relatives of those in prison would be huge, not to mention hindering the rehabilitation of prisoners. Currently, prisoners are denied photographs with their family. The prospect of a child growing up without photographs of its father or mother could result in unimaginable upset to the child and subsequently cause untold damage to that child's sense of identity.

Article 8 also covers areas such as respect for your sexuality; the right to make choices for yourself; respect for private and confidential information; the right not to be followed or recorded by the Government; the right to have confidential, unlimited communication with others; and the right to control how information about your private life is shared. These are all vital and basic rights that everyone should have.

Article 9 Freedom of Thought, Conscience and Religion: Without human rights the State may choose to punish people whose thoughts and beliefs they don't agree with. Citizens might no longer be allowed to choose how they behave based upon their conscience. For instance, being a vegetarian could be banned by the State. Furthermore, the State could abolish certain religions and force its citizens to practice a religion that it has chosen. The Spanish Inquisition shows how things can go so terribly wrong. The Spanish Inquisition held some parallels to Nazi rule. It was a group within the Roman Catholic Church, which tried to suppress heresy. Baptized members of the Church who held opinions contrary to the Catholic faith were systematically tortured and executed, simply for following a different religion.

Article 10 Freedom of Expression: The media should beware. No human rights, and citizens can't speak about what they choose; therefore the press can be completely controlled. Freedom of Speech allows us to voice our opinions, no matter how strong, verbally or in writing. We can use social media to express ourselves, such as Twitter, Facebook, via E-mails or through public speaking, to name a few. Fortunately there is a limit on this, and freedom of expression does not, allow you knowingly to reveal information given to you in confidence, nor can you say anything that would threaten public safety, national security, or undermine the legal system. This means however strongly you feel on an issue, you cannot for example, encourage people to commit crime, incite a riot or display expressions of racial or religious hatred.

Article 11 Freedom of Assembly and Association: Without our human rights there will be no right to march against the issues people believe in and no gathering together of like-minded people. If the State doesn't like it, then if it chooses, without human rights, the state will prevent it from happening. Earlier this year, thousands of Solicitors and probation workers staged numerous walkouts and marches in protest at the Government's decision to cut £215 million out of the annual criminal legal aid budget, cuts that would affect every UK citizen. These people protested under the Freedom of Assembly and Association Law.

Article 12 Right to Marry: It seems such a basic human right, but without it, the State may choose to stop any type of marriage, it could prevent UK Citizens from marrying those from other countries.

Article 13 Right to Effective Remedy: At the moment, the State is held accountable, and there's always a method by which citizens can seek remedy if the State gets it wrong or fails its citizens. There may be certain things done by the State that are above the law. Perhaps medical negligence, for instance, the NHS might become exempt from official scrutiny. In the UK, people who have had their convictions overturned are seldom entitled to compensation. They're innocent enough to be released but not innocent enough to be compensated by the State. Particularly shocking are cases where there's police misconduct but no compensation is offered.

Another example might be that if a prison officer damaged the personal property of a prisoner but there is now no recourse for the prisoner. This might be okay with some people, but the same applies on the outside. If the police damaged your property for whatever reason, maybe they crashed through a water feature in your garden while doing a car chase, there would be no way you could recoup compensation.

Article 14 Prohibition of Discrimination: All our rights and freedoms contained within the Human Rights Act must be protected and applied with no discrimination. This simply means that the Human Rights Act is there for everyone, irrelevant of age, sex, race, colour, language, religion or sexual orientation.

Articles 15, 16, 17 and 18: Derogation in Time of Emergency; Restrictions on Political Activity by Foreigners; Prohibitions on Abuse of Right and Limitation on use of Restrictions on Rights. These

Woman Jailed for Breaching Court Order by Hugging Granddaughter

A 72-year-old woman jailed for hugging her granddaughter in breach of a court order banning contact has been freed by a judge. Kathleen Danby appeared in custody to make a case against her three-month jail sentence, handed down earlier this year at Birmingham's court of protection. In April, a judge sent Danby, from Orkney, to prison in her absence after watching CCTV evidence of her greeting the teenager, who cannot be named for legal reasons, with a hug outside a pub. Reducing the sentence to time already served, Judge Sally Dowding said: "I am satisfied she fully appreciates the difficulties of her position and what she must do, and I am confident she will comply in future."

Danby's solicitor, Sarah Huntbach, said her client, dressed in a large red overcoat, "sincerely apologised" for being in the town where her granddaughter now lives. She said the pensioner was there for the day to meet a friend and, as she waited outside a pub, her granddaughter – who has a learning disability and emotional difficulties – approached her. She did not intend or want to be in breach of these orders, or dishonour the court in any way," said Huntbach. While not accepting that she had intended to meet her granddaughter, Danby "apologised for any nuisance that has arisen as a consequence". Dowding said it was "very sad" that Danby had failed to comply with the court orders, which evidence showed had resulted in "a detrimental effect" on the granddaughter's behaviour, "with consequences serious and profound".

Danby has been in custody since her arrest on Sunday in Liverpool, where she had been enjoying a performance by the comedian Ken Dodd. She was escorted into court by four security officers, and wearing handcuffs. Contempt of court proceedings were brought against Danby by Derbyshire county council, which is responsible for looking after the 19-year-old. The local authority had alleged Danby was in breach of court orders made in September 2013 and in January and April 2014. The orders banned Danby from any communication, save a single supervised monthly phone call, or visiting the granddaughter's home town or college, or going within 100 metres of the girl.

Dowding said she noted the judgment in April of Judge Martin Cardinal, who had been satisfied Danby "had engineered a meeting" with the granddaughter – named only as B – despite what the pensioner's solicitor had said in mitigation. "There is very clear evidence these events brought about a detriment in B's behaviour and the consequences were serious and profound," added Dowding. She said it had never been the case the local authority was "seeking to isolate the child from her family", pointing out that the granddaughter's maternal family "have regular contact".

Outside court, Danby said she had been put through "a humiliating ordeal". Asked if she had been scared in jail however, she laughed, replying: "No, I wasn't scared. "I don't scare easily." Asked about what her views were on the county council's decision to apply for contempt of court proceedings, she replied: "You really don't want to know - there aren't words to describe what I think of Derbyshire County Council." Guardian, Wednesday 31 December 2014

SSHD "Acted Unlawfully" in Three Year "False Imprisonment"

The Claimant, a Portuguese national, was subject to two deportation orders from the SSHD. The Claimant claimed that "the Defendant (SSHD) was not entitled to make a second deportation order on the 9th July 2013 following the revocation of an earlier order, an order quashing the second deportation order and damages for false imprisonment for a violation of his article 5 rights in respect for his detention from September 2010 to November 2013."

At the hearing on the dates of the 28th and 29th October, His Honour Judge Bidder QC stated that: "It is for the person detaining to justify the detention and to show that there was a power to detain and that that power was exercised properly. The Defendant should clearly have considered prior to

Tuesday 13 January. Further dates will be agreed once the Bill Committee has met, although Bill Committees usually meet on Tuesdays and Thursdays. The Public Bill Committee is expected to finish and report the Bill to the House by Thursday 22 January 2015.

Aims of the Bill - The stated principal objective of the Bill is to ensure that law enforcement agencies have effective legal powers to deal with serious and organised crime. The Bill would give effect to a number of proposals and commitments made in the Government's Serious and Organised Crime Strategy (published in October 2013). The Bill also contains provisions relating to: child abuse; female genital mutilation; violence in prisons; and terrorism. The Government also announced during the Second Reading debate that it intended to table amendments in Committee to: strengthen the protection afforded to the victims of domestic abuse; extend the powers of the UK courts so that those who prepare or train for terrorism abroad can be prosecuted should they return to the UK; and confer a power on the civil courts to require mobile network operators to disconnect unauthorised mobile phones in use in prison. The Bill is in six parts.

Part 1 of the Bill would make changes aimed to strengthen the law on the recovery of the proceeds of crime. Would amongst other things: allow the Crown Court to make a determination on the extent of the defendant's and any third party interests in property when making a confiscation order; reduce the maximum time a court could allow a defendant to pay the full amount of a confiscation order; provide for the victim surcharge to be paid ahead of any confiscation order; enable courts to make compliance orders to impose restrictions, prohibitions, or requirements (including a ban on the defendant's travel outside the UK) for the purpose of securing that a confiscation order is effective; increase the maximum default sentences imposed where a confiscation order for more than £500,000 remains unpaid past its due date; and change the test applied for a restraint order to be made from "reasonable cause to believe" a defendant has benefited from their criminality to "reasonable grounds to suspect".

Part 2 of the Bill would amend the Computer Misuse Act 1990. The Bill would update existing offences to ensure sentences for attacks on computer systems deemed to have damaged national security, human welfare, the economy or the environment reflect the damage they cause. It has been introduced following a review designed to ensure existing legislation, such as the Computer Misuse Act 1990, remains relevant and effective and transposes the EU Directive on attacks against information systems into UK law.

Part 3 of the Bill would: create a new offence of participating in the activities of an organised crime group; apply Serious Crime Prevention Orders to Scotland, and allow them to be extended beyond five years or replaced in certain circumstances; and broaden the definition of a gang used when making injunctions.

Part 4 would provide new powers to enable law enforcement agencies to enter and search premises for drug-cutting agents, and to seize and detain any chemical substance that is reasonably suspected of being intended for use for such purposes.

Part 5 would make various amendments to the offence of cruelty to children under 16 and make it an offence to be in possession of any item that contains advice or guidance about abusing children sexually. Part 5 would also amend the Female Genital Mutilation Act 2003 to extend the extra-territorial offences, provide anonymity for victims of the offence, create a new civil protection order and create a new offence of failing to protect a girl from FGM.

Part 6: create an offence of unauthorised possession in a prison of any article that has a blade or is sharply pointed or any other offensive weapon; provide for extra-territorial jurisdiction for two offences under the Terrorism Act 2006: preparation of terrorist acts and training for terrorism.

four rights set out when and why certain human rights can be modified or set aside, such as when a country is at war, or during such times that emergency situations threaten the lives of the nation.

David Cameron thinks it's a vote winner to tell British Citizens that they no longer have these rights. Maybe you agree with him, but at least if you've read this you will have had the opportunity to think about it a little more. Human rights are often essential to the most vulnerable members of our society or those who are in minority groups. From my perspective, I often see and feel how extremely vulnerable prisoners can be, and more so recently without Legal Aid to help them fight injustice.

Important thoughts for us all this New Year 2015, Jeremy Bamber

Death of Tanisha Anderson in Police Custody Ruled a Homicide *Huffington Post*

Anderson died in November following an encounter with Cleveland police. The woman's family had reportedly called the cops for help after the 37-year-old began having a mental health episode. When the police arrived, the family is said to have agreed to let them take Anderson to a hospital to undergo a psychiatric evaluation. Police have said that Anderson began to struggle with officers who were attempting to escort her to a police car, before she suddenly and inexplicably became limp. The woman's family, however, told Northeast Ohio Media Group that an officer performed a "takedown move" on Anderson, roughly wrestling with the woman before putting his knee on her back as she lay prone on the ground.

According to Friday's medical examiner's office report, Anderson suffered a "sudden death associated with physical restraint." In the months since her death, Anderson has become a symbol in the ongoing conversation about police brutality in America, sparked last year by the deaths of Michael Brown, Eric Garner and others. On Friday, Anderson's family released a statement "demand[ing] justice for Tanisha, a thorough criminal investigation and an independent prosecutor that results in accountability by the police officers and the Cleveland Police Department," per WOIO. Just last month, the Justice Department released a report accusing the Cleveland police of using excessive or unnecessary force at a "significant rate," per CNN. The report -- the result of a two-year investigation -- added that officers were also found to have used excessive force on those "who are mentally ill or in crisis." According to The Associated Press, the Cleveland Police Department has said in a statement that it is conducting an investigation into Anderson's death. Two officers involved have reportedly been placed on restricted duty.

Miscarriage of Justice Victims Will Find it Harder to get Compensation

Victims of serious miscarriages of justice will find it harder than ever to receive compensation from the government in the wake of a key test case, lawyers and campaigners are warning. Lawyers claim that those wrongly convicted may now only receive compensation if someone else is convicted of the crime of which they were accused. Victor Nealon, aged 53, a former postman, was convicted of attempted rape in Redditch in Worcestershire in 1996. He served 17 years, 10 years more than his recommended tariff, because he continued to protest his innocence.

A year ago in December 2013 his conviction was quashed after fresh DNA evidence, taken from the blouse and underwear of the victim, pointed to "an unknown male" as responsible for the crime. But now Nealon, who came out of prison penniless, has been told that he is not entitled to any compensation, although others wrongly convicted in the past and who served similar long sentences, have been paid hundreds of thousands of pounds. The Ministry of Justice is declining to compensate him on the grounds that his innocence has to be proved "beyond reasonable doubt". An initial appeal against the decision through a judicial review was unsuccessful.

successful, so now Nealon's legal team is seeking a fresh hearing in 2015 to challenge the refusal.

"The justice department are being completely resistant to offering any compensation," said Mark Newby, Nealon's lawyer, who commissioned the DNA tests that led to his client's freedom. "They are making it virtually impossible for anyone to be compensated unless someone else is convicted of the crime. The Criminal Cases Review Commission have apologised to us for the delay in taking on his case in the first place. It seems that everyone is very sorry but no one wants to compensate him." An MoJ spokesperson said: "There is no automatic entitlement to compensation but every application is considered on its merits. It would be inappropriate to comment on the details of any individual's case."

Nealon said he was determined to pursue the action for compensation as his life was ruined by the conviction. "I am going to keep on fighting for this," he said. He was homeless and had only £46 to live on when he first emerged from prison. Applications for compensation following the quashing of convictions are currently considered under the Criminal Justice Act of 1988 and the justice secretary is responsible for deciding whether compensation is payable. Since 2008, payments have been capped at £1m in respect of cases involving detention of 10 years or more, and £500,000 in all other cases. An independent assessor decides on the exact sum.

In 2014, the government introduced new legislation providing, for the first time, a statutory definition of what constitutes a miscarriage of justice for the purposes of determining eligibility for compensation. This definition now means that compensation is only paid where the new fact which led to the quashing of an applicant's conviction shows beyond reasonable doubt that they did not commit the offence. At his appeal in 2013, Nealon's barrister, Peter Willcock QC, argued that had the DNA evidence been provided at the original trial it would have been "explosive". The prosecution argued that the DNA evidence was neutral as samples could have been from other sources, such as the shops where the victim bought the clothes.

The challenge to the new compensation rules come at a time when there have been fresh developments in two other high profile cases, both involving nurses, which lawyers and campaigners claim are also miscarriages of justice. Last month, BBC's Panorama programme came up with fresh medical evidence on behalf of Colin Norris, who was jailed for life in 2008 for the murders of four patients in a Leeds hospital. A juror in his trial, when shown the new evidence by the BBC, said that he would not now have voted to convict Norris. The case of Benjamin Geen, jailed in 2006 for 30 years for murdering two patients and seriously harming 15 others, is also coming under renewed scrutiny. His legal team is now arguing that the respiratory arrests suffered by his patients were not the "extremely rare events portrayed at his trial". Both men claim that no murders took place and that there is a medical explanation for the deaths. *Duncan Campbell, Guardian*

Hidden Assets? How do you Prove you Haven't Any?

My story is a woeful one I was a practicing solicitor and now in HMP Oakwood, I was convicted for fraud and money laundering earlier this year and am acting in person currently in a) my appeal and b) threatened with confiscation under Proceeds of Crime Act 2002 (POCA). I am and will continue to maintain my innocence, as I am not guilty of the crimes I have been convicted of.

The solicitor who I say is guilty of these crimes was charged alongside me and then two months before the trial was suspiciously NFA'd [CPS decision not to take further action]. How ironic is it that in October this year this same solicitor [name withheld] was before the Solicitors Disciplinary Tribunal and pleaded guilty to controlling the law firm and transactions that the prosecution had said in the trial that I had done. In essence, due to I believe, some dodgy

deal, I was tried in the criminal courts, whilst he was tried in the civil tribunal! The judge did not allow me to produce the law society report and allegations against [name withheld] at trial due to rules on 'hearsay' and therefore the jury could not be told about [name withheld]. Not being a criminal lawyer I knew nothing about hearsay and must admit still don't.

This has devastated my life as I am a youngest son of parents in their mid 80's and now have a partner with a 1 and 3 year old child. My partner has literally come onto the streets and is claiming benefits due to my conviction. The prosecution then started confiscation proceedings against me and are saying that they want the full value of the fraud which is a couple of million [despite them accepting that I did not benefit from this] as they say I have hidden assets. Their main basis for saying I have hidden assets is laughable and is as follows:

[1] You had access to solicitors client accounts and due to the volume and nature of the movement of funds it is not possible to know where these funds went', and [2] 'because the prosecution have been unable to find me owning any assets I therefore must have hidden assets'.

Considering the above I would be very grateful if anyone could assist on the following:

1. Any cases in which hidden assets were successfully challenged and won against the CPS.
2. Are there any articles/journals/comments about how I can practically challenge hidden assets? For example, there must be some universal things that I could do to show I do not have any hidden assets? This is the most important for me at present to challenge.
3. Is there any such thing relating to POCA as an 'asset checklist'? This would be something similar to what insolvency practitioners would go through with you to ensure that you have no assets before they declare you bankrupt or accountants would go through when carrying out due diligence on you to see what assets a person has etc.? My aim is to get such a list and then see if I can go through it to show that I have none of these assets.
4. Does anyone have contact details of any persons or their solicitors who are challenging confiscation in their cases?
5. Does anyone know of any articles they have been written on challenging hidden assets?
Kamran Malik: A8207DC, HMP Oakwood, Oak Drive, Featherstone, WV10 7QD

Serious Crime Bill - Currently Going Through Parliament - Definitely Serious

The Seriousness of this Bill Cannot be Understated. One of its' aims is to extend POCA Proceeds of Crime Act 2002 to family/friends of anyone convicted under POCA. Family/friends could lose everything they have got, if the court/CPS imagines they have accumulated wealth from the convicted and court/CPS don't have to prove they have, the courts/CPS imagination will be enough. Extend powers to jail those who prepare or train for terrorism abroad. Have no doubt this will be aimed at British Muslims and not at British Christians (paramilitaries protestant and catholic from Northern Ireland, have trained abroad, particularly in Libya, since the 70's). Any individual/group, can submit evidence

Call for written evidence: Serious Crime Bill [HL] - Do you have relevant expertise and experience or a special interest in the Serious Crime Bill [Lords], which is currently passing through Parliament? If so, you can submit your views in writing to the House of Commons Public Bill Committee which is going to consider this Bill.

The Serious Crime Bill was initially published in the House of Lords and completed its Parliamentary stages there on 5 November 2014. The Bill was presented to the House of Commons on 6 November 2014 and had its second reading debate on 5 January 2015. This Bill has now been committed to a Public Bill Committee which will hold its first meeting on