

Roger Khan - I Don't Want Sympathy - Just a Chance to Present the Evidence

Shortly before midnight on 27 October 2010 Nasim Ahmed returned by car to his home in Newton Abbot. He'd been at a restaurant he part-owned with his brother-in-law, Faruk Ali. As he headed down the steps to his house, two men came and attacked Nasim. They beat him badly, using metal bars – and seemingly also a knife – as weapons. Following the attack Nasim was still able to talk to his wife, daughter and the police. But once at the hospital the extent of his injuries became clear. He had a bone deep cut to the face. His skull had been shattered. Part of his brain was exposed to the air. Nasim's wife told police she saw the assault after hearing screams and looking out from an upstairs window. She described seeing two men wearing hooded tops, both taller than her husband, beating her husband on the ground. She immediately told the police that her husband had not seen either of the attackers' faces and "he had no idea who had done this to him".

Police then canvassed the area to see if anyone had seen the assailants' faces. Neighbours described seeing two young white men running from the scene at speed. Police searched the crime scene for evidence. They found a white handled knife, which Nasim's wife and daughter said had been brought out from the kitchen for protection. In addition, they recovered a metal bar. Sometime later a blue baseball cap was also found. A police tracker dog was used and appeared to indicate that the assailants had run to a vehicle parked just around the corner from Nasim's house.

Nasim's family members and restaurants staff, including Faruk, then arrived at his house after hearing the news of the attack. At some point in the conversation with police, the subject of a silver BMW with a certain number plate came up. The next morning on 28 October, a police officer spotted a silver BMW with a matching number plate and began following it. The vehicle came to a stop without prompting and the officer arrested the man inside, whose clothing was wet and muddy, on suspicion of attempted murder. The man's name was Abul Ali and his wife was the sister of Nasim's wife. Abul declined to speak beyond saying that he "was going to drive himself to a police station anyway", according to police. In the BMW, police lifted fingerprints and took items for DNA testing. The police asked Nasim's wife if Abul was one of the attackers. She did not identify him as such, but indicated he was the same size as one of them. Police put the fingerprints lifted from the BMW through the national database. They matched Abul's uncle, Roger Khan. Although Roger did not fit the descriptions given by the witnesses at the scene, by virtue of simply being in that same car Roger now became the police's second prime suspect.

Earlier in the day on 27 October, Abul Ali had called his uncle Roger Khan to ask him if he would help him with a long drive from London to Devon in return for some cash and a train ticket back to London. Roger agreed, seeing it as a chance to get out the house, where he was spending a lot of time due to illness. When they arrived in Newton Abbot in Abul's silver BMW, Roger was dropped off by the Penn Inn Roundabout. He was unfamiliar with the town and he stopped in a pub for a drink. He was told that he had missed the last train back to London, and so he went for another drink, picked up some tins and then slept in a park under a shelter. He returned back to London the next day, having never been to Nasim's house and taken no part in his attack. The police then tracked him down at his partner's home and arrested him.

The Past - This was not the first time Roger found himself arrested for a crime he main-

tains that he did not commit. In 1987, he was convicted of one armed robbery charge but cleared of four others. He has always insisted that the charges were pinned on him by a police officer after he refused to become an informant. The officer was subsequently disgraced for selling information from the Police National Computer. He was also a member of the Catford police, who as BBC Panorama exposed recently, were notoriously corrupt in this era. Roger's case was investigated by the late Private Eye journalist Paul Foot as a miscarriage of justice. "I did ten and half years for a crime I did not commit," Roger explains. He went on hunger strike in protest against his conviction and on one occasion had to be resuscitated. "They offered me parole and to go home from the hospital but I said no as that would be admitting I did it." Still weak from the hunger strike, Roger was then moved to HMP Highpoint, where he describes being surrounded and threatened by three unfamiliar prisoners, resulting in a later brawl in which Roger stabbed two of them. "I regret it to this day," Roger says. He pled guilty.

After his eventual release in 1997, Roger led a quiet life. He did his best to deal with the anxiety and panic attacks he suffered from. He would work odd jobs, mostly helping out with plumbing and electrics. By 2010, he was spending the majority of his time with his partner Marie (not her real name), who he loved dearly. Roger would often take her dog, a Jack Russell called Angel who was "good as gold", for walks. He would also pick Marie up when she finished work and the pair would go to the park or the woods together. This quiet life ended abruptly when Roger found himself arrested once again for a crime he did not commit.

The Puppet Master - Faruk Ali, co-owner of the restaurant with the victim Nasim Ali, has a history of violence. He was convicted in 2007 for attacking a customer in his restaurant with a metal bar. In 2014, he was even branded "Britain's cruelest husband" in the Mail on Sunday because of his manipulative treatment and domestic abuse of his ex-wife Laura Lyons. Faruk is also the brother-in-law of Nasim Ahmed, the victim. Before the attack, both Abul Ali and Faruk had apparently been engaged in some sort of campaign of extortion against Nasim. Faruk also co-owned restaurants with Nasim, and stood the most to gain financially if Nasim passed over his business interests. Indeed, the local press' write up of the story at the time stated: "Mr Ali said Mr Ahmed's future within the business is in doubt and he may retire when he is back to full health, leaving his brother-in-law in control of the business." In addition to evidence that Faruk might have a motive for the attack, there are certain facts which should have seen him become a prime suspect in the case. The silver BMW which Abul was arrested in, for instance, was registered to Faruk's address. It was found to contain passport related documents that may have related to illegal workers in Faruk's restaurant. Yet in what would be one of many missteps in the police's investigation, Faruk did not become the prime suspect alongside Abul Ali. Instead, the focus was diverted to Roger Khan, even though he knew nothing of the family vendetta against Nasim and had never even met him before.

The Police: Why did the police's investigation pay little serious attention to Faruk Ali?

One clue has since emerged: Faruk appears to have been a close personal friend of one of the officers on the case. It turns out that officer's daughter worked in one of Faruk's restaurants while the officer's partner did work on the windows of Faruk's house. There was even talk, in fact, of the officer purchasing Faruk's home. Most remarkably, the officer was scheduled to go out for dinner with Faruk the night after the attempted murder on Nasim. Troublingly, this connection with a key player in the case did not stop this officer having primary responsibility for the phone evidence in the investigation. Such enquiries might have confirmed what the victim Nasim Ahmed had told police: that Faruk had called to find out about his where-

about the night of the attack. Even more worrying, even though they eventually had one of Faruk's phones in their possession, the police decided not to examine it further.

Years later, the Criminal Cases Review Commission – the miscarriage of justice review body – said it was satisfied that the connection between the officer and Faruk did not mean that the police had any conflict of interest. They said that the officer declared the links to her superior and “appropriate safeguards” were put in place – although it did not identify what exactly those safeguards were. This simply cannot be good enough. The police investigation into the attack on Nasim was also handicapped by a series of blunders. For instance, they did not secure the crime scene, meaning anyone could have tampered with it, including Faruk, and they failed to make reasonable efforts to track down the victim's phone which had gone missing from the scene.

Roger's previous experience of being mistreated and in his terms “fitted up” by the police influenced the way he acted in the interview. He was cagey and reluctant to give police definite answers, not wanting to do something that would amount to informing on his sister's son, Abul, who he knew was in custody. “I'm really apprehensive,” he told them. “I've already been through all this once you know, I've answered when I'm innocent.” Roger ended up shutting down – something that would later be used to portray him as a liar – not realising how crucial it was to give a full account of his movements, as he knew he was innocent and assumed this would soon be established. While Roger was being grilled, the duty solicitor sat there apparently distracted, drawing doodles on his notes.

The Defence: In theory, legal aid guarantees that whether a person accused of a crime is rich or poor they will be provided with a legal team work on their behalf to test or even challenge the case put against them. It is an essential part of making sure people get a fair trial in an adversarial system, especially when they are accused of the most serious crimes. In practice, however, the situation is very different. Criminal legal aid spending declined from £2.4bn to £1.6bn in the last Parliament as the hourly rates paid to lawyers defending the poor tumbled. On top of this, disincentives to providing the highest quality legal representation to clients are built into the fee structures. Page count parameters and fixed fees mean that it pays more to do less work for the accused, even if it might prove their innocence. Roger Khan told the first solicitors assigned to his defence that he was innocent and that he wanted them to obtain CCTV footage from pubs and betting shops from around Newton Abbot which would support his alibi. However, the firm never did the work. It seems they did not believe in their client - in their letter to counsel, the solicitors did not even mention the fact that Roger was maintaining his innocence.

After losing faith in these representatives, Roger asked for new ones. A new firm was assigned to his defence, though not the London firm he had wanted. Once again, these new solicitors did not make any efforts to secure CCTV evidence of his innocence or do further investigation. Extremely dissatisfied, Roger asked the judge for new representatives to replace them. “I don't trust them,” Roger told the judge. The lawyers portrayed Roger's complaint about their lack of investigation as a grievance to do with bail. The judge accepted this account. He told Roger he would not be providing him with any other representation: it was the lawyers he didn't trust or nobody. Roger decided to sack the lawyers. “Anyone would, when they wasn't doing the things that needed to be done,” he explains.

The Judge decided not to have Roger assessed for competency to conduct his own defence. Had he done, he might learned that Roger had been diagnosed with dyslexia and taught himself to read aged 17 using Commando comic books. “It would be lucky if I got more than three years in school. I got a street education,” Roger recalls. Since the Judge did not take this step, Roger would now have to represent himself at an attempted murder trial

without any kind of legal training – and without the ability to take notes. One of the world's richest countries had failed provide him with lawyers who would investigate his defence or even give him the presumption of innocence that was supposed to protect him.

Roger now had four and a half months to prepare his case from inside his cell at Exeter prison. Although he was never given the pub and betting shop CCTV footage, a few weeks before the trial began the police did give Roger DVDs with 790 hours of video from various town cameras where footage could still be recovered. Although Roger was unfamiliar with Newton Abbot, he would now have to review the video to see if he could track his movements in a way that would prove his innocence. What resources were provided to Roger to help him with this mammoth task, which those who have worked with CCTV footage will tell you requires a thorough, systematic review? He was allowed one or two hours a day in prison to review the DVDs. He was forced to try a “lucky dip” approach whereby, fingers-crossed, he might be able to find himself in 790 hours of footage, without knowing any of the street references. To make things worse, Roger recalls: “I could not see the videos as my glasses in prison were of the wrong prescription and falling apart”.

Roger having to singlehandedly review the CCTV evidence is particularly concerning because it appears the police's review of footage was not as thorough as was suggested to the jury. Although the police presented footage of Roger outside ASDA the morning after the crime, they failed to provide any images of him on the way to the supermarket - even though he would surely have been recorded on other cameras. This lends support to the view that the police's treatment of CCTV evidence was in some way selective and missed out footage that could be helpful to Roger. On top of having to analyse the CCTV footage, Roger, who has no background in science, had to analyse the findings of highly technical analysis of DNA evidence for himself, without the help of experts. And the police only ordered some of the evidence tested – once they had a link with Roger, the testing stopped. But Roger had an innocent reason for his DNA appearing on items from the silver BMW he had travelled in with his nephew on the long drive to Newton Abbot.

The Trial: Roger and Abul Ali's joint trial for attempted murder began at Exeter Crown Court in July 2011. As a litigant in person, Roger was bombarded with new disclosure from the prosecution as it came in and he had to question witnesses all by himself. This task, which would have been challenging to most lawyers, was made all the more difficult for Roger after he decided to go on hunger strike after the Judge rejected his argument that there was no case to answer. “How can I look at three bin bags of papers and be on hunger strike and meeting with the prosecution and run my own case?” Roger asks. “I felt like saying to hell with it all. The paperwork felt like it was coming out the back of your head.” Not eating left Roger dizzy and unable to concentrate. It got to the stage where he passed out in the cells and missed out on some of the proceedings. The Judge was adamant about going forward regardless, saying: “I have already expressed my serious anxiety about this declining state of health, but I am not going to let this trial be held to ransom. We will get to the end of this case, one way or another.” The judge did not inform the jury that Roger was refusing to eat, something that Roger believes was unfair. He thinks “they should have been told about it as my manner and frustrations could easily of been misconstrued as being down to something other than the fact I wasn't eating or drinking throughout my trial.”

The only legal advice Roger received during his trial was from a barrister unfamiliar with the case who was asked to talk to Roger about certain legal issues. This barrister could not remedy the complete failure of the solicitors to secure evidence of the alibi. Furthermore, the junior Crown barrister was made to visit Roger in the cells to discuss what would happen next, and what the questions Roger wanted to ask would lead to. Plainly, neither could protect Roger's interests.

Roger struggled to question witnesses. He could not meet with them pre-trial and the only way he could get them to attend was by asking to have them arrested if they did not obey a court summons, which was hardly likely to ensure their co-operation on the stand. One individual Roger had wanted to testify was Faruk Ali's then wife, Laura Lyons. However, he was never given this opportunity. Laura was called to testify, but as she was pregnant and afraid. In the previous month she was again attacked by Faruk and received head, chest and stomach injuries which left the hospital struggling to find a heartbeat of her unborn child. "When I was called to testify I had moved out and was trying to avoid any further involvement with Faruk or his immediate family," she recalls. "I was subjected to terrible abuse from him even whilst I was pregnant with our daughter and I was in total fear that any further involvement with him or this case could have been life threatening to both me and my unborn child. I could not take that risk and had to put my unborn child's safety first," she says. "I told the police that I was in fear for my life, which is why I never gave statements to the police previously about the attacks that took place on myself. Deep down I think the police knew I wouldn't attend court and testify. I don't know what they told the court. My doctor provided a letter that said that calling me to court in my condition and given the history was not acceptable. To have given an account about what was going on at that time would have had serious implications on myself, my family and my unborn child. I was not prepared to sacrifice anyone's safety."

The lack of experts at his disposal also hindered Roger's ability to effectively challenge the case against him. A prime example was when the prosecution presented a spreadsheet to the jury to argue that there had been a large number of calls between Roger and Abul leading up to the crime, as they were planning the attack. The sheet listed each call twice, incoming and outgoing, including attempted calls, giving the impression of a much larger number of calls. In fact, the call data showed that Roger and Ali may have spoken to one another or left messages on 19 occasions in the month of October, with no call lasting more than two minutes and forty-eight seconds. But the impression from the spreadsheet was of an intense series of contacts, which the prosecution argued suggested planning of the crime.

To make matters even harder for Roger, he had to deal with the presence of the victim's family members in the courtroom, including some who would later be called as witnesses. Among these individuals was Faruk Ali. Roger was made to defend himself while the man who masterminded the attack watched from the public gallery. Eventually, Roger was able to question Faruk on the stand. Unsurprisingly, he could not get Faruk to admit his involvement in the attack. But had the case been investigated by solicitors and Roger been represented in court, Roger's counsel could have caught Faruk out in any number of lies and thoroughly undermined his protestations that he was not involved.

At the start of the trial Roger's co-defendant Abul had been denying any role at all in the attack on Nasim. However, he then amended his defence case statement to say that in fact he had met two men in the silver BMW and paid two men money to go and "persuade" Nasim to take a lie detector test. Abul said the plan had been for him to stay at Faruk's that night, since Faruk had been doing the arranging. Then, just a couple of days before the trial ended, Abul change his statement again, this time saying that the two thugs had been sent simply to menace Nasim. According to the summing up, Abul claimed to have met two white men after dropping Roger off at the Penn Inn roundabout. Abul said that he paid them some money, and one of the two men borrowed Abul's Helly Hansen jacket. After the men left, Abul claimed he took a nap and then Faruk entered the car. Faruk left after a while, saying he would return, but never did. Then, the two thugs returned one at a time, conceding that they had messed up but nevertheless

demanding the rest of the money. Abul then claimed that he had a struggle with one of the men, and the other pulled a knife, threatening him with reprisals against his family if he spoke to the police. Abul had effectively confessed to responsibility for the crime. But Roger was in no position to be able to deal with this dramatic change in his co-defendant's story. It was the kind of bombshell that would have tested the ability of skilled counsel. Whether it was Faruk and Abul who did the actual beating, or hired thugs, is still unclear. But what is clear is that Roger's trial was unfair and his conviction is unsafe.

"At trial it was frustrating. You can't say what you need to say; it's like your hands are tied... I am stuck inside – I can't go and get any evidence," Roger recalls. "Sitting there in the dock, with the police, the jury, the judge, the witnesses, the prosecutor – they all seemed connected and they were all coming for me." Roger's ordeal left him with a clear conclusion that should unsettle all those who want the British justice system to be the best in the world: "It was a kangaroo court."

The Jury: To Roger, everyone in the trial seemed to be against him: the judge, the prosecution, his co-defendant and the hostile witness allowed to roam the courtroom. Was the jury at least impartially observing the evidence before them? It appears doubtful. Juror number 5 told the court just after opening remarks that she knew Faruk Ali's then wife, Laura Lyons. The Judge questioned her and seemed to be satisfied that it was merely a "passing acquaintance". Roger, concerned that having a juror be dismissed would delay the trial and assured that it was not a close relationship, decided not pursue their dismissal. Without legal representation, no one told Roger that discharging a juror would not necessarily cause delay. Then signs began to emerge that it was not merely a "passing acquaintance" and that juror 5 had several connections to players in the case. She worked at the GP practice where the victim went daily to have his dressing changed following being discharged from the hospital. Her son worked on IT in a civilian capacity for the police. Her brother was in relationship with Faruk's mother in law. Certainly any juror aware of Faruk's propensity for violence would have concerns about acquitting Roger, as if it wasn't Roger in the dock, there was a strong argument that it should be Faruk. Eventually, having spent three weeks associating with the rest of the jury and with only a week left of the trial to go, the juror was finally dismissed.

The Forensics: What did the physical evidence in the case suggest about who carried out the attack on Nasim Ahmed? Can it tell us for certain who was responsible? No, but it strongly suggests that Abul Ali was telling at least part of the truth in his account that he and Faruk Ali were in the silver BMW car plotting mayhem. Faruk could not be excluded as a minor contributor to DNA found on a cloth cap and snood found in the car. There is nothing in the physical evidence that proves Roger was at the scene of the beating. There is the blue baseball cap found at the crime scene, which belonged to Abul Ali, and had the DNA of at least three people on it. This included blood of the victim, Nasim Ahmed. "Wearer" samples from the band showed what Roger readily admits: that he had borrowed and worn the hat on the drive up from London before giving it back. As for the minor DNA contribution, Faruk Ali could not be excluded as the donor. Hair, fibres and debris recovered from the hat were not examined further – the police stopped testing once they had included Nasim and Roger. But clearly this was an object which several people had been in contact with, and should have been subjected to further testing to see if additional profiles could be established.

Next, there is the Helly Hansen jacket that also belonged to Abul Ali and was found in the silver BMW. Blood on the right sleeve of the jacket was tested, coming back showing Nasim as the major contributor. There is an incomplete profile within the stain identified as blood on the jacket sleeve that does not come from the victim, Mr Khan or Abul. A neck area sample

from the jacket generated a mix profile of up to three people, with Abul as the major contributor. Again, many of Faruk's DNA components were observed on the jacket, meaning he it could not be excluded that a trace portion of the DNA originated from him. When Faruk got word of this, he went to Abul's lawyer and made a false statement that purported to explain away any DNA found on the jacket that was his. He said that the jacket had been in various protagonists homes over the previous year and had been transported between them by him, Faruk. This statement was never presented. On the metal bar presumed to have been used to beat Nasim, biological material was tested and DNA found from at least two people. The major contributor was, unsurprisingly, the victim. The minor component was considered to be too small to make meaningful comparisons with.

What the forensics offered, then, was nothing that proved Roger took part in the attack. Yes, his DNA was found on the headband of his nephew's baseball cap, but given Roger wore it in the car, it is a moveable object and the crime scene was not secured, this is not enough evidence to find a man guilty beyond a reasonable doubt. Instead, the physical evidence left wide open the possibility of someone who was not Roger being at the scene and involved in the beating, such as a hired thug or thugs, or Faruk.

The Appeal: Roger wrote his initial appeal himself, with a solicitor looking it over after a journalist tried to help him find one. A single judge reviewed his application and denied it, mistakenly believing that the evidence against Roger had been "overwhelming" and misapprehending the volume of phone contact between Roger and Abul Ali in the run up to the attack. Roger's next shot at an appeal, this time considered by three judges, was also rejected. Without all the information in front of them, the Court dismissed the difficulties Roger had faced in preparing his own defence, finding that: "The resources of the police were made available to him in... playing CCTV footage in the format he wanted." But Roger never got the footage he most wanted and had just hour or two a day to analyse 790 hours of video of a town he was totally unfamiliar with from behind bars. Moreover, the full panel's decision contained straightforward errors. It talked about how "the defendants were linked by a large number of emails" - despite the fact the emails concerned were with other parties and did not concern Roger. A solicitor advocate was present at this full court hearing, but "I wasn't allowed to be in court for the hearing or to be on video link," Roger remembers. "The blood and most of my grounds were not answered and they called it a hearing. I call it yet another cover up where yet again I never got a fair hearing. Is that justice?"

The CCRC: The Criminal Cases Review Commission should have been Roger's saviour. The body was established in 1995 to investigate alleged miscarriages of justice and refer unsafe convictions to the Court of Appeal. In Roger's case, getting his application considered by the CCRC took three years. His application was originally submitted in 2013. He was told it would take 17 months to process so he withdrew it and went straight to the Court of Appeal, not realising that this would mean that he would lose his place in the Commission queue.

When it did finally reach a decision, the CCRC said that it would not refer Roger's case because it felt there was no real possibility that the Court of Appeal would find his conviction to be unsafe. It is Roger's representatives' view that the CCRC's decision placed undue reliance on the flawed Court of Appeal proceedings, and also failed to appreciate the significance of the fresh evidence presented. The CCRC was created to correct the mistakes made by the courts at trial. However, for Roger it has to date failed in this role. "At trial I felt totally alone. In some ways I still do. Nothing has changed. I am still in prison. They [the CCRC]

say wait. Then they say trust us, we checked," he says. "I have been here for five and a half years. How long do I have to serve for a crime I didn't do? When am I going to get my life back with Marie? Are we going to be racing each other around the corner on our Zimmer frames?" Roger's experience of trying to end his wrongful imprisonment by getting his conviction quashed has left him with straightforward view: "There is no justice in this system."

The Present: Roger is currently one of 450 inmates at HMP Whitemoor, a maximum security facility in March, Cambridgeshire. It is considered one of the harshest prisons in the England and Wales. In 2015, for instance, it was revealed that one prisoner there had been kept in isolation for two and a half years, even though a governor can usually only segregate a prisoner for 72 hours. Last year also saw a riot squad called into Whitemoor to end a nine hour siege where a prisoner had taken another inmate hostage and started a series of fires. It is in this environment where Roger, despite his innocence, is now six years into a thirty-year sentence. "I am banged up 21 hours a day," he says. He is also apart from Marie, who just wants him back. "I don't want no one else," she says. "I'm waiting for him to come home. I love him." Roger's wrongful conviction, Marie says, has transformed her life. "I'm waiting for him. He's a good guy. He's in there for nothing and I'm not going to let him down." Marie talks to Roger everyday on the phone and sends him letters once or twice a week.

Currently Roger is represented by the Centre for Criminal Appeals, a non-profit law office which relies on grants and donations to carry out the investigation on cases that the Legal Aid Agency is unable to fund. His solicitor, Emily Bolton, thinks Roger's case is symptomatic of a justice system in which it is now all too easy for an innocent person to find themselves swept into a prison cell. "Roger is ultimately a victim of politicians trying to do justice on the cheap and of the absence of a culture of defence investigation in this country. Where I used to work, in the United States, a good lawyer would have got the court to order the CCTV of the pubs Roger was in produced, and their in-house investigator would have trawled through it to find Roger," she says. "With legal representatives willing to investigate on his behalf and the assistance of forensic experts, Roger could have had a fair trial that ended with an accurate result. Instead, we ended up in a situation where public safety is at risk. We have locked up an innocent man, and at least one of the culprits of this terrible crime is still at large. That does Roger an injustice, but it also does the victim of the crime an injustice. The CCRC took years to begin looking at Roger's case and refused to carry out the in depth investigation the case needs, including an investigation of the relationship between Faruk Ali and certain officers in the Devon and Cornwall Police. If we care about public safety and want a justice system that gets accurate results and rectifies mistakes quickly, we have to signal to our politicians that this is something worth paying for. In light of the CCRC's decision, Roger now needs the public's support more than ever to secure justice." The CCRC's decision decision is currently being challenged through judicial review.

As for Roger, he remains desperate for an opportunity to prove his innocence to the Court of Appeal so he can secure his release and be reunited with Marie. "I don't want sympathy, I just want a chance to present the evidence," Roger says of his case. "Just look at the DNA. I wasn't there, so why am I here? At the end of the day we need to get everything out. Let the people decide." Roger would like to thank everyone for the messages of support he's received to date: "I just wanted to say a big thank you to everyone for the messages of support. It was a close as you can get to a good day in prison to get those messages.

Roger Khan (A5724AY), HMP Whitemoor, Longhill Road, March, PE15 0PR

"Why do Some Defence Lawyers Regard Their Clients as 'A Problem'?"

Daniel Newman: How do lawyers treat their clients? For me, this question is at the heart of issues of access to criminal justice. Of course, lawyers do not need to like their clients or sympathise with them in order to offer high quality representation. Dr Daniel Newman on his research into the lawyer-client relationship. Indeed, there is the risk that too close an affinity between lawyers and clients can actually dilute a lawyer's potency. All the same, the lawyer-client relationship is inherently a social one and the state of the lawyer-client relationship can be held up as a key indicator of procedural justice in the English criminal courts. Access to criminal justice requires access to lawyers: the principle of the equality of arms means the criminal justice system presupposes roughly equal resources and expertise on both sides of the equation. The self-referential nature of the legal system, with its complex web of technical language and internal rules, acts to overwhelm and alienate defendants. In order that those suspected and accused of crimes can comprehend what is going on and, thus, properly be said to take part in their own cases, they need a lawyer to act as a translator. The court system removes the defendant from the criminal process in significant ways: they become definitively a client, losing the ability to be active players, as they are rendered reliant upon lawyers. They are locked into a process of legal dependency. Reducing justice to the exchange between lawyers and their clients means it is imperative to pay due attention to the social side of this relationship.

My social research into criminal legal aid lawyers involved a research method called ethnography, combining participant observation with formal interview. In short, I followed lawyers around then talked to them about their work. This took place with three firms in the same city over the course of one year. This is a small sample compared to the overall number of criminal lawyers in practice, one involving less than fifty lawyers in the same practice area. The approach taken, though, allowed for a deep engagement with criminal defence lawyers and, in academic terms, is considered one of the most significant engagements with practitioners in England and Wales in the past few decades. One of the most interesting findings of my research was how the accounts of the lawyer-client relationship I obtained from interviews and observation were so markedly different.

In interview, lawyers gave a glowing description of their relationship with clients. The lawyers felt they occupied a crucial position helping to deliver justice for all and thus saw themselves as noble professionals representing a public service ethos that one practitioner branded a 'social agenda'. This social agenda entailed the lawyers claiming to practice for, what were often referred to as, 'altruistic' reasons, with lawyers stating that they 'wanted to be on the side of the underdog', 'standing up for the vulnerable' or 'fighting for the little guy'. The lawyers saw themselves as part of the welfare state, providing a vital public service; facilitating a public good. There was a clear theme running throughout the interviews that their work was 'important to society' and 'supporting those who are forgotten by society'. In order to meet the social agenda, it was apparent that client-centred practice was the ideal these lawyers professed to adhere to. At some stage of the interviews every lawyer highlighted that their practice was solely focused on meeting the wants and needs of those suspected or accused of crime. Overall, then, the interviews presented client-centred practice across all the firms with lawyers who placed great stock in their public service role serving the vulnerable and needy.

In contrast, lawyers under observation displayed deeply negative feelings toward their clients. The lawyers treated clients as if they were idiots, with all at some point referring to an individual client by such condemnatory terms as 'stupid' or 'moron'. Again and again, lawyers would comment on the 'type' of client, sneering about how 'low' or 'vile' clients were and that they were a 'waste of space'. While pleasant to a client's face, lawyers were keen to com-

municate their distaste for the client when they were out of earshot. Lawyers would pass judgment on the clothes clients were wearing or the way they looked. Some clients were damned for the area they came from ('have you seen what comes from that estate?'), others for their family ('I wouldn't expect anything different, I know his mother too...she's a sight').

Seeing clients as representatives of an 'underclass', lawyers were willing to condemn the moral culpability of those who presented themselves to them at court. Beyond simply believing clients guilty, I saw every lawyer push clients to plead guilty, in many cases despite the client asserting their innocence and wanting to plead not guilty. There are numerous reasons why a lawyer might convince their client to plead guilty, including systematic factors such as communicating the sentence discount, the expectation for guilty pleas and the Criminal Procedure Rules. Another possibility is financial incentives, whereby it is efficient for a lawyer to conclude a case early with criminal legal aid increasingly a volume-based industry. As such, I saw defence lawyers effectively serving the interests of the state (not necessarily the client) in ensuring a conveyor-belt of guilty defendants. Overall, the lawyers under observation showed a practitioner-centred practice in which the clients were, at best, a bothersome irrelevance, and, at worst, a problem to be eliminated.

Contradictions: So, I was presented with contradictory data, which led me to reflect on how to reconcile these differences. Many who have seen my research suggested that the lawyers were lying and I admit that this seems a common sense approach. The events shown in the observation are the reality of lawyer attitudes while their interviews represent an attempt at image management to cover up any malpractice. Lawyers would need to attend to the bad impression created by their practice. It would be easy for me to say that the lawyers had been lying but that seems unkind and simplistic so was not a satisfying way for me to leave this research. I spent some time thinking through alternative explanations for the results I had. Ideally, any such explanation would allow us to progress the debate about how to improve the lawyer-client relationship and maximise access to criminal justice. Calling one side liars would only ever shut down dialogue and would be unhelpful in bringing about change.

I searched for a more useful explanation and think I found it in psychological theory; in particular the psychoanalysis of Freud and Jung. I used this theory to explore the attitudes that the lawyers were revealing towards their clients and found evidence of defence mechanisms on display. Of course, I am not making some clumsy attempt at diagnosing individual illness here. Rather, I have identified what – heuristically – could be considered an institutional pathology. I am proposing we use this psychoanalytic lens as a means to further understanding as to how the lawyer-client relationship functions. I use Freudian theory to identify how his concepts of rationalisation and displacement can be viewed in the approach of the lawyers who were being studied. Rationalisation allows an individual to protect their ego from pain by fabricating a false narrative when the reality of a situation would be too damaging for their self-esteem. In regard to these lawyers, the limitations of the social agenda might be explained by it representing a fiction the lawyers told themselves to help soften the blow of their not being valued as professionals. The lawyers in my research were aware to the point of obsession that they were not paid as much as their peers from law school who went into other areas of practice, earned less than other professionals outside law and might actually be trumped by some tradespersons (the anger that on call plumbers could charge more than on call lawyers was disarming). Claiming that they did not practice for the money but for the respect of providing a social good meant the lawyers did not have to admit they were not paid the salary beholden of a professional and thus not financially valued as professionals.

However, that criminal practice invariably involves association with criminals meant that the lawyers were tarred by association, earning a low social standing with many looking down on these practitioners, judged as they were for taking part in, what we would call in sociological terms, 'dirty work'. Lawyers bemoaned the lack of respect they got for the hard work they put in – and were particularly aware that lawyers in commercial practice barely recognised them as the same profession. Displacement sheltered them from realisation of the failure of their social agenda to give them any standing of note. Such displacement involves transferring the pain and displeasure brought about by a dangerous object onto one considered safe. There were several targets that could have been identified for the lawyers' ire if they were reeling against the undermining of their social agenda. These include the media who created a populist anti-defendant line, the public that bought into this and demanded action, the government that reflected this in their policy-making, judges who convict innocent defendants, prosecutors who bring unjustified charges and police who may lie. All contributed to the debasement of the practice of these lawyers by ensuring that those suspected and accused of crimes were generally looked down upon and little respect was given to those who represented them. These were powerful groups and largely beyond the reach of the lawyers when they were satisfying their emotional drives while displacement involves selecting a weak, vulnerable and readily accessible victim to cast as a scapegoat. Criminal clients provided the perfect soft target.

As a final consideration, Jung's understanding of psychoanalysis offers a neat way to tie together the themes described. For Jung, an attitude can be understood as, 'the readiness of the psyche to act or react in a certain way'. Jung states that attitudes are organised in pairs: one conscious, the other unconscious. Neurosis reflects an unresolved tension between opposing attitudes of the conscious and the unconscious. They arise when the conscious attitude cannot reconcile elements deemed important to the unconscious attitude. As a result, a duality emerges between abstractism and concretism. These represent two ways of thinking and feeling – the former more sophisticated, rational and logical, and the latter more primitive, based entirely on perception and feeling.

Following Jung, these lawyers suffered from a neurosis; a split between their consciously professing positive attitudes and unconsciously propagating negative attitudes. Lawyers were differentiating between the client and a client: the general and the particular. The client was that considered in abstract, regarded in theoretical terms through the lens of access to justice and, as such, reflecting the social agenda discussed in interview. On the other hand, a client was the concrete experience, that client dealt with in the here and now, connected with the pain and displeasure of their professional standing, which they subsequently appeared to resent under observation. When thinking objectively – detached and reasoning – the lawyer held positive attitudes towards the client. This is what happened in the interviews where lawyers were given time and space to reflect thoughtfully. It was only when lost in the moment – reacting to demanding situations, working on instinct – that the lawyers displayed these negative attitudes towards a client. It was thus that the observation showed the unfiltered image of the lawyers in action and without time for deep and meaningful pontification.

This process necessitated a further act of rationalisation on the part of these lawyers. To resolve the tension that separated the negative attitudes shown as lawyers engaged in their routine practice with the higher ideals signified within the positive attitudes, they were acting out an elaborate fantasy. In this way, lawyers were able to show complete disdain for their clients, while still able to assert to holding positive attitudes as long as they felt they were doing their best in the job. As a result, the lawyers could actually believe they held positive attitudes, allowing them to claim to be realising the social agenda and, therefore, meet the ideals set out by their egos. Lawyers were also able to

feel proud and experience a sense of accomplishment. The rationalisation defence mechanism thus had a double value here, protecting the lawyers from the realisation that they had failed to achieve high remuneration or be valued for upholding the social agenda. The reality of their two failures was successfully rebutted keeping their egos free from pain or discomfort.

Returning to the idea that the lawyers may have been lying to me, then, this consideration makes it entirely reasonable to suppose that they were lying without realising it rather than being malicious or self-serving. They were not simply lying to me, though, they were lying to each other and, crucially, to themselves. I was treated as one of their own, which meant presenting a professional, positive attitude in theoretical terms but showing the opposite in reality. When given the opportunity to muse at length on their attitudes to clients, the lawyers were thinking in the abstract thus falsely convincing themselves that this abstract was something more than a self-justificatory myth. I also saw the concrete and, as a result, have been able to document the discrepancy that existed between the two. What becomes important going forward – and this the value of moving beyond easy answers such as lying lawyers – is that we can begin to make plans on how to ensure that lawyers do not develop such bad practices. Ideally, criminal legal aid lawyers would be paid better – but even that may not be enough to reverse such trends and, while addressing the unacceptable financial degradation of criminal legal aid is necessary to improve the quality of representation, it must be accompanied by improved ethical training for law students and practitioners. Lawyers must be hard-wired to take a client-centred approach. There is no need to adhere to the admittedly speculative psychoanalytic readings offered here to be concerned by the results of my research. It suggests a disconnect between the theory and the practice of law, a disjuncture that seems to be reflected in the mismatch between what lawyers say and what they do but is also a wider issue about the lack of communication or comprehension between the academic study of law and the pragmatic, messy, compromised world of legal practice.

Janet Alder: Police Forced to Hold Gross Misconduct Hearing For Two Officers

The IPCC has directed Humberside Police to hold gross misconduct hearings for two police officers, following its independent investigation into the police's surveillance of Janet Alder in 2000, the sister of Christopher Alder who died in custody in Hull in 1998, and another person. The IPCC investigation followed a referral by the force in August 2013, following a request from the Home Secretary that all police forces check their records for evidence of surveillance relating to the investigation into the 1993 murder of Stephen Lawrence and the subsequent inquiry into his death. Humberside police did not discover any such evidence but their searches revealed evidence of surveillance into Ms Alder and another person. The IPCC investigation, which was completed in January 2015, found evidence of a case to answer for gross misconduct for two detective sergeants. The report was referred to the Crown Prosecution Service who concluded earlier this year there was not enough evidence to provide a realistic prospect of conviction against each defendant in relation to the surveillance carried out. Humberside Police did not initially share the IPCC's view that the two officers should face a gross misconduct hearing. However, after careful consideration, IPCC Commissioner Cindy Butts wrote to Humberside Police to direct them to hold hearings for the officers and the force recently confirmed that they accept this decision. The dates for the hearings will be confirmed in due course.

IPCC Commissioner Cindy Butts said: "The decision to direct a police force to hold disciplinary hearings is not taken lightly. Taking into account the serious and sensitive nature of the allegations and the weight of the evidence presented to me, I felt it was essential for public confidence that the officers concerned account for their actions." The IPCC will consider publishing its findings in full, once all proceedings have been concluded.

Hope For Egypt's Scorpion Prison Inmates

Human Rights Watch: The State Commissioners' Committee, which is part of the country's administrative courts, has formally accepted a complaint by prisoners' families and seven non-governmental organizations asking that the government shut down Cairo's Tora Maximum Security Prison, known as al-Aqrab (Scorpion) prison. The commissioners, who are preparing their non-binding opinion for the case's judge, ordered on Tuesday, October 24, the creation of a committee of medical, engineering, and human rights experts from Cairo University to assess the prison's "suitability" to host inmates. Hundreds of families whose loved ones have been inside the prison for years may now have some cause for hope.

A September 2015 Human Rights Watch report showed that detainees, who mostly sleep on cement floors without mattresses and who are sometimes beaten, are deprived of families' and lawyers' visits for months at a time. Utensils, even toothbrushes and basic hygiene items, are forbidden. Windows are tiny, and ventilation is terrible, ignoring that cells bake in Egypt's hot summers and freeze in winter. Perhaps worst of all, many inmates are deprived of medicine and proper medical care, which may have contributed to some inmates' deaths. Six inmates died in just five months, between May and October 2015. Any truly independent and impartial scrutiny of Scorpion prison, run by the Interior Ministry, will conclude that abuses are rampant.

One of the prison's current inmates is lawyer Essam Soltan, deputy head of the moderate al-Wasat Party. He was detained in July 2013, weeks after the army orchestrated the forcible removal of then-President Mohamed Morsy. Soltan was charged with attempting to overthrow the new government and incite violence at the Rab`a sit-in, where Morsy's supporters gathered to protest the military takeover. Soltan fainted during his trial on Tuesday – the same day as the commissioners' report and one week after he began a hunger strike to protest months of solitary confinement, deprivation of exercise, and lack of clean water. But the presiding judge, who by law can inspect the prison or order investigation of the possible ill-treatment but never did, said dismissively, "bring the defendant biscuits." The gap between despair and hope in today's Egypt lies between a judge calling for biscuits and another judicial entity deciding to assess whether the Scorpion prison is fit for human habitation. For the audacious lawyers, activists, and inmates' families who have pressed this far, the battle continues.

Early Day Motion 475: Safety in Custody Statistics October 2017

That this House is concerned by the recently published Safety in Custody statistics which indicate a continuing rise in incidents of self-harm, assaults and violence across the prison estate in England and Wales; notes that self-harm incidents reached a record high in June 2017 with 41,103 recorded, up 12 per cent from the previous year and a 10 per cent rise in the latest quarter; further notes that assaults and serious assaults have continued to rise reaching record levels with 27,193 incidents recorded up 14 per cent from the previous year; is further concerned that assaults on staff have increased by 25 per cent from the previous year with 7,437 incidents recorded and serious assaults on staff up 14 per cent on the previous year; is also concerned that prisoner on prisoner assaults have risen by 10 per cent over the past year with 19,678 incidents recorded and serious assaults up 18 per cent since 2016; understands that death in custody figures have dropped slightly yet remain too high with 300 recorded in the past 12 months; further notes the increase in the prison population to over 86,000 in recent months leading to a further strain on the service; and calls on the Government to act urgently to address the continuing deterioration of safety across the prison estate and to meet with front-line staff and inmates to coordinate a safe and stable workplace and living situation for all.

Hate Crime Offences

In 2016/17, there were 80,393 offences recorded by the police in which one or more hate crime strands were deemed to be a motivating factor. This was an increase of 29 per cent compared with the 62,518 hate crimes recorded in 2015/16, the largest percentage increase seen since the series began in 2011/12. The increase over the last year is thought to reflect both a genuine rise in hate crime around the time of the EU referendum and also due to ongoing improvements in crime recording by the police. The Office for National Statistics have stated that increases in recent years in police recorded violence against the person and public order offences have been driven by improvements in police recording. Around nine in ten hate crime offences recorded by the police are in these two offence groups. There was a further increase in police recorded hate crime following the Westminster Bridge terrorist attack on 22 March 2017. The number of hate crime offences in 2016/17 for the five centrally monitored strands were as follows: - 62,685 (78%) were race hate crimes; - 9,157 (11%) were sexual orientation hate crimes; - 5,949 (7%) were religious hate crimes; - 5,558 (7%) were disability hate crimes; and - 1,248 (2%) were transgender hate crimes.

N. Ireland: Prisoners Get £700k in Pay-outs for Assaults, Falls and Human Rights Claims

Kate Buck, Belfast Telegraph: Prisoners in Northern Ireland have received compensation pay-outs adding up to more than £700,000 over the last five years. Figures obtained by the Belfast Telegraph reveal there were more than 1,800 injury claims, resulting in payments of £696,348. Since 2013 some 160 claims for lost or damaged property have been lodged, leading to pay-outs totalling £19,148. It already costs £53,408 per year to keep someone locked up - more than double the average salary in Northern Ireland. Statistics released under Freedom of Information show a sharp rise in claims put forward at Magilligan Prison near Limavady, a medium to low security facility for male prisoners with less than six years on their sentence. It currently has 425 inmates and a capacity of 570, but in 2016 there were 690 injury claims costing the taxpayer £196,255 in compensation payments. This was almost 10 times the amount that had been paid out the year before - in 2015 there were only 99 injury claims and £19,900 paid out. The claims include assaults by prisoners and staff, trips and falls, smoke inhalation and unsafe working facilities. The steep rise in figures is driven by mass claims from prisoners that their human rights have been breached in Magilligan. In 2013 and 2014 there were fewer than 10 'breaches of human rights' claims, and a rise to 62 in 2015, but 2016 saw this figure rise to 638, an increase of 929%.

It is thought that some of these may be historical claims from former prisoners who have taken action after their release. The Northern Ireland Prison Service has said that 90% of these claims relate to the sanitation at Magilligan, where prisoners have been slopping out, meaning that they have been forced to use chamber pots instead of functioning toilets if a member of staff is not present to take them to use the facilities. TUV leader Jim Allister expressed concern at the compensation payments. "It's not just the £700,000, because all of those claims will be legally aided and it will be a much higher figure than what these show," he said. "I think the fault lies with the legal aid situation and prisoners are given unquestioning legal aid, making it easier for them, meaning that the balance is in the favour of the prisoners, as it is cheaper for the State to pay for them instead of paying for the legal and court costs."

The Prison Service said: "The Prison Service receives various claims for compensation from prisoners. "Each claim is dealt with individually and resolved appropriately. "Claims in recent years by prisoners in Magilligan have largely been due to unsatisfactory sanitation in a number of accommodation areas of the prison. However, this accommodation is being

upgraded to ensure it meets with the required standards. "While compensation payments do place pressures on financial resources, every effort is made to address issues in a way which negates future claims." Out of the three prisons in Northern Ireland, Hydebank Wood, which accommodates young offenders and female offenders, had the smallest amount of claims over the five years. A total of £30,250 was awarded in compensation.

Louth Surgeon Found Not Guilty on Four Charges of Indecent Assault

Dundalk Democrat:: A jury has acquitted retired surgeon Michael Shine of four counts of indecently assaulting young male patients. Mr Shine (85) of Wellington Rd. in Dublin had pleaded not guilty at Dublin Circuit Criminal Court to seven charges of indecently assaulting five patients at Our Lady of Lourdes Hospital and at his private clinic, both in Drogheda, Co Louth, on dates between 1964 and 1991. The jury of four men and eight women told Judge Cormac Quinn it had reached majority verdicts on some of the counts. They acquitted Mr Shine of four charges which cover alleged offences against three teenagers on dates in 1964, 1970 and 1976. Mr Shine has denied ever seeing these patients and there were no medical records to confirm that he had seen them on the dates of the alleged assaults. The five complainants were all teenage boys at the time they allege Dr Shine touched them in their genital areas while treating them for injuries such as cuts to a knee, an injury to a finger and an injured toe. The remaining three counts cover alleged assaults on two teenage patients on dates between 1974 and 1976. Mr Shine admits attending to these patients but denies that anything inappropriate was done during the medical examination.

The jury foreman told Judge Quinn that the jurors were "relatively entrenched" in their position on the remaining charges but were happy to continue deliberations on these. In his charge to the jury on Monday Judge Quinn said that corroboration evidence – credible independent evidence of the alleged acts which implicate the accused in those acts – did not exist in relation to any of the complainants. He warned the jurors: "It is dangerous to convict on the uncorroborated evidence of any of the complainants" but added that they are nevertheless entitled to find the accused guilty beyond reasonable doubt once they have taken this warning into account. "You have to exercise special care on whether you believe each complainant. You have to exercise caution before acting on unsupported evidence," he said. He told the jury that it could decide there were similarities in the accounts and evidence of the five complainants. He said the defence position was that the complainants were not independent, may be colluding and were motivated by civil actions. He said there was an inherent improbability of several persons making up exactly similar stories. He said the jury must take each count separately but that if it found Mr Shine guilty beyond reasonable doubt on one count, it could consider it more likely that the account of another complainant of a similar incident was true.

Ireland: High Court Judge Seeks Further Information on Conditions in HMP Maghaberry

Alison O'Riordan, Ireland INA: A judge of the High Court in Dublin is seeking further information on the conditions in a Northern Ireland prison before deciding whether to extradite a Belfast man wanted there in connection with the murder of a mother-of-three. Raymond O'Neill is facing charges of murder and arson over the death of Jennifer Dorman, 30, who was found stabbed to death in her burning house in west Belfast in August 2015. The 38-year-old, with a previous address in Belfast, was arrested by gardai in Dublin on 3 February 2016 on foot of a European Arrest Warrant issued by Northern Ireland authorities. Mr O'Neill is also sought for prosecution for another unrelated matter. Delivering her judgment Ms Justice Aileen

Donnelly said that the respondent raised three identical objections in respect of both European Arrest Warrants. The first point concerned the impact of Brexit. She said this point had been rejected already in a previous case but was subject to an appeal pending before the Supreme Court. The Court said because of this it will not finalise the determination on the Brexit point at this juncture. The second point of objection concerned an insufficient linkage of Mr O'Neill to the offences in the warrants. The judge rejected this submission and said that both European Arrest warrants contained "sufficient detail". The third point of objection was that there was a "real risk" that Mr O'Neill would be subjected to inhuman and degrading treatment in Maghaberry prison if he was surrendered. Mr O'Neill claimed that the fact that he is wanted for trial, that a significant custodial sentence is involved if convicted at trial, that he is vulnerable due to his medical situation, and that there is an extant threat to his life all combine to make him "especially vulnerable" to a breach of his Article 3 ECHR rights. Ms Justice Donnelly said that a 2016 Report on Maghaberry Prison showed an improving position but stated that the levels of violence "remained too high" and that a significant amount of work was still outstanding to make the prison safer. The judge said Mr O'Neill is a "vulnerable prisoner" because of the offence with which he will be charged and, more particularly, because there are specific threats to his life. She said she was satisfied that the 2016 report established that there are "specific deficiencies" in Maghaberry prison concerning the safety of vulnerable prisoners and this gave rise to concern that there is a "real risk" that Mr O'Neill, by virtue of his vulnerabilities, would be subject to inhuman and degrading treatment. She said the Court would seek further information from the UK authorities as to the conditions in which Mr O'Neill would be held should he be surrendered to the UK. Furthermore, Ms Justice Donnelly said that on the proposed date for delivery of the judgment on October 20, counsel for the respondent gave the Court an updated report on the prison ("the 2017 report"). The judge said she is not satisfied that the 2017 Report sufficiently addressed her concern about the risk of the respondent being subjected to inhuman and degrading treatment because of his vulnerabilities. Last November, the High Court heard that Mr O'Neill was in a "critical condition" in prison after taking a drugs overdose in his cell in the Midlands prison. A resumed hearing will take place on December 12 and Mr O'Neill was remanded in custody until that date.

Naked Selfies - HMP Edinburgh Prisoners Online

Prison authorities are urgently investigating how Edinburgh prisoners managed to access the Internet and post nude photos of themselves. The offenders are believed to have used secret mobile phones to upload bizarre racy snaps to Facebook and Instagram. Several prisoners are pictured sitting naked in the prison's kitchen sink. One video uploaded from prison shows an inmate lining up to be punched by someone who the Daily Record believes to be John Reid, who was jailed in 2010 after inadvertently killing a man with one punch. In social media posts, prisoners brag about how easy it was to get online

Hostages: Sally Challen, Naweed Ali, Khobaib Hussain, Mohibur Rahman, Tahir Aziz, Roger Khan, Wang Yam, Andrew Malkinson, Michael Ross, Mark Alexander, Anis Sardar, Jamie Green, Dan Payne, Zoran Dresic, Scott Birtwistle, Jon Beere, Chedwyn Evans, Darren Waterhouse, David Norris, Brendan McConville, John Paul Wooton, John Keelan, Mohammed Niaz Khan, Abid Ashiq Hussain, Sharaz Yaqub, David Ferguson, Anthony Parsons, James 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 Coleman, Neil Hurley, Jaslyn Ricardo Smith, James Dowsett, Kevan & Miran Thakrar, Jordan Towers, Patrick Docherty, Brendan Dixon, Paul Bush, Alex Black, Nicholas Rose, Kevin Nunn, Peter Carine, Paul Higginson, Robert Knapp, Thomas Petch, Vincent and Sean Bradish, John Allen, Jeremy Bamber, Kevin Lane, Michael Brown, Robert 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.