

Between:

CHIEF CONSTABLE OF THE GREATER
MANCHESTER POLICE

Applicant

- and -

SCOTT CALDER

Respondent

JUDGMENT

1. On the 4th April 2014 the Chief Constable of the Greater Manchester Police (the applicant) applied for an injunction to be granted directed to Scott Calder (the respondent) :
 1. Requiring him to reside at a specified address - his home - (residence requirement);
 2. Requiring him to be present within his home for specified hours of the day (curfew requirement);
 3. Prohibiting him from associating in a public place with 9 named people (specific association prohibition);
 4. Prohibiting him from entering a specified zone in Greater Manchester, which encompassed his home, (zone prohibition) except when travelling to and from his home along a specified route;
 5. Prohibiting him from travelling with or being in the company (in a public place) with any person under the age of 18 (general association prohibition).

The application included a request that breach of all prohibitions should carry a power of arrest. The application was made, without notice of it being given to the respondent, and was granted by His Honour Judge Platts on the 4th April, on an interim basis, in relation to 1, 2 and 3 only, but with a power of arrest

- attached to 1 and 2, together with a requirement that the respondent be given notice of a further hearing on the 11th April.
2. It may be apparent from the foregoing, without adding that some of the named people were relations and without knowing that the prohibited zone was a large part of the north east of Greater Manchester, that the requirements and prohibitions sought would restrict the respondent's freedom of movement and association to a significant degree. That was the purpose of the application. The attachment of a power of arrest would allow the police to detain the respondent without the usual pre-conditions ('reasonable cause to suspect ...') for lawful arrest being satisfied. Mere absence from a required place or presence at a prohibited place would suffice. There is no doubt that such an injunction would be a useful tool in any programme to disrupt the respondent's part in any gang-related violence, but also to hamper his participation in drug trafficking (which the police suspect is his principal occupation and source of spending power, which has no other visible origin).
3. Following several further intended or actual hearings, which do not bear directly on the matters with which this judgment is concerned, the application came before me on the 3rd July 2014 for trial.
4. The legal foundation for such curtailments of the respondent's liberty is Part 4 ("Injunctions: Gang-related Violence") of the Policing and Crime Act 2009 ['the Act'] and in particular sections 34 to 36, which provide –
- "34. Injunctions to prevent gang-related violence
- (1) A court may grant an injunction . . . under this section if 2 conditions are met.
- (2) The first condition is that the court is satisfied on the balance of probabilities that the respondent has engaged in, or has encouraged or assisted, gang-related violence.
- (3) The second condition is that the court thinks it is necessary to grant the injunction for either or both of the following purposes—
- (a) to prevent the respondent from engaging in, or encouraging or assisting, gang-related violence;
- (b) to protect the respondent from gang-related violence.
- (4) An injunction under this section may (for either or both of those purposes)—
- (a) prohibit the respondent from doing anything described in the injunction;

(b) require the respondent to do anything described in the injunction.

(5) In this section "gang-related violence" means violence or a threat of violence which occurs in the course of, or is otherwise related to, the activities of a group that—

(a) consists of at least 3 people,

(b) uses a name, emblem or colour or has any other characteristic that enables its members to be identified by others as a group, and

(c) is associated with a particular area."

5. In addition applications for such injunctions must be considered in light of the "Statutory Guidance: Injunctions to Prevent Gang-Related Violence" (December 2011), issued pursuant to s.47 of the Act ["the Guidance"] and also to Section VIII of the Civil Procedure Rules [CPR], Part 65.42-49.

6. When considering the scope of the legislation, it is unnecessary to have resort to material outside that expressly enacted or authorised by Parliament.

Paragraph 2.1 of the Guidance includes the following:

"During the 2009 Act's passage through Parliament, it was made clear that gang injunctions are only intended to be used to prevent violence related to gangs. All applications must focus on gang-related violence rather than, for example, acts of anti-social behaviour, acquisitive crime or drug dealing involving gangs."

There is no statutory definition of a gang. The applicability of the Act is by reference to the definition of gang-related violence, from which the meaning of gang can be derived. Thus, s.34(5) is very important, in defining a gang for the purpose of the Act.

7. Paragraph 2.7 of the Guidance emphasises that criminal offences committed in circumstances falling within s.34(5) should, if possible, be prosecuted as such, but that the Act can be used pending such a prosecution or in circumstances where proof of a criminal offence (to the higher standard required) may not be possible, but proof on the balance of probabilities is possible. In my judgment, neither the Act nor the Guidance prohibit the application for or granting of injunctions simply because the criminal law may have been engaged in some aspects of the activity which the injunction is intended to suppress. For instance the mere arrest of suspects in relation to an attack on the respondent in January 2014 should not inhibit the granting of a civil remedy intended to

reduce the risk of retributive criminal offences by the respondent and the risk of further violence to him.

8. The nature and extent of the proposed positive and negative obligations fall to be considered under the 'necessity' test in s.34(3) and paragraph 7 of the Guidance.

Application of law to the alleged facts

9. On the issue whether the first condition is satisfied, I heard the evidence of Detective Constable [DC] Wrench and the respondent.
10. It was common ground that on the 12th January 2014 the respondent and his mother had been shot while they were sitting in a car outside a bingo hall in Härpürhøy, Greater Manchester. Although not common ground, I am satisfied by DC Wrench's evidence that, as a result of the attack, three men were arrested and charged with attempted murder. The respondent's evidence is that he was surprised by the attackers and so shocked that he can say almost nothing about the circumstance and that he does not know why he was attacked or by whom. The applicant invites the inference that the attack is consistent with allegations that the respondent is involved in criminal activity in relation to drug-dealing and that the attack was probably a reprisal for the respondent's involvement in 'taxing' (stealing) drugs from a competitor in that field of endeavour. Although I floated the idea that there may be other reasons why a person might be the victim of such a shooting (including but not limited to 'mistaken identity' and sexual jealousy), the respondent does not suggest any motive at all. He accepts that he feared further violence (see below). He denies theft of drugs and any other similar motive for the attack. He denies involvement in drug trafficking and of being a member of a gang or an organised crime group [OCG], (see below).
11. The applicant does not argue in relation to that shooting, viewed in isolation, that the respondent was other than the victim. So viewed, it seems to me that the respondent could not be said to be 'involved' in gang-related violence even if it was proved (which it was not) that the attacker/s belonged to a gang. Otherwise the unintended victim of a stray shot would be 'involved', which plainly was not contemplated by the legislation. It seems to me that the protection offered by s.34(3)(b) is aimed at discouraging inter-gang violence directed at a victim who is a member of a gang. The applicant argues that the evidence shows that the respondent is involved in, at the very least, encouraging others to use such violence.

12. In relation to violence by the respondent or threats of violence made by him, it is common ground that on the 5th April 2014 (as it happens the day after the 'without notice' application for the precursor to this injunction and before service of the interim order) the police found the respondent in possession of a 'Lucozade' bottle containing 'industrial strength' ammonia (in the sense that it was in a car of which he was the driver), as a result of which he had been arrested on suspicion of being in possession of an offensive weapon. In his evidence for this application the respondent accepts that he was so arrested, but no more. He is not recorded as having anything to say about that allegation, at the time. The applicant asserts, and the respondent admits, that on the following day (and having been served with the interim injunction at the police station before being released on police bail for the alleged 'ammonia offence') the police arrested the respondent again, when a knife was found concealed in his car. On this occasion the respondent is recorded as having asserted to the arresting officers that he had been shot and that the concealed knife was for his protection. That arrest was at 23:15. The respondent was not at home as required by clause 2 (curfew requirement) of the interim injunction. The respondent's written evidence seeks to exculpate him by asserting that he did not understand the restrictions in force despite having made at least 2 requests that police officers explain the terms of the injunctions, which explanations had not led him to believe that a curfew existed. I am not concerned with the allegations of breach, which have not been pursued. Prima facie the two events appear to be recognition by the respondent that he was at risk of a further attack upon him after the shooting.

Associates

13. Five days after the respondent was shot John Leslie Calder, a brother, was kidnapped and assaulted. He, like the respondent, has not co-operated with the police in the prosecution of those alleged to have carried out that attack.
14. On the 28th March 2014 Jamie Leonard Cook was shot in the leg by one of two masked men.
15. The applicant relies on the convictions of a number of men with whom the respondent is said to be associated, for very serious criminal offences, including violence.

Hearsay - Intelligence

16. In addition to facts proved by direct evidence or admitted, the applicant relies on intelligence, the sources for which have not been disclosed. It is hearsay, recounted by DC Wrench. It may contain hearsay founded itself on hearsay. Plainly that is a deviation from the general rule in CPR Part 32.2 that, at trial, any fact which needs to be proved by the evidence of witnesses (as distinct from documents) is to be proved by those witnesses' evidence given orally in public. The intelligence is not overtly founded on witness statements by the sources of the intelligence. The sources are not identified even generically. By inference the material is of a type which provides the police with lines of enquiry which may lead to the obtaining of direct evidence or upon which they can act to detect or prevent crime. I am conscious that the respondent says that, even if he knew who had attacked him; he would be disinclined to reveal such information to the police, for fear of reprisals. It seems to me that it is reasonable to infer that some of the sources of intelligence have comparable reasons for wishing to maintain their anonymity.
17. No notices have been served for the purposes of CPR Part 33. Having regard to the admissibility of hearsay in civil proceedings, the purpose of the rules in relation to notice and counter notice is to enable the other party to call for an explanation for the absence of an identified or identifiable witness or to challenge the non-identification of any witness and thus to invite the court to take account of the reasons in assessing what, if any weight, should be attached to the evidence.
18. DC Wrench's evidence exhibiting a summary of the intelligence available and a key to the classification codes used to indicate its reliability (its age being inferable from its content) complies with paragraph 6.6 of the Guidance. Ultimately it gives no insight into the types of sources giving rise to the classification.
19. In the course of the hearing I ruled the 'intelligence' elements of DC Wrench's evidence admissible. Mr Adam Wagner, counsel for the respondent had argued that even though these were civil proceedings in which the Act prescribed proof of 'Condition 1' facts only to the civil standard, that is to say 'on the balance of probabilities', the restrictions on the respondent's liberty and the potential consequences of any proven breach were such that strict compliance with the rules relating to hearsay should be required by the court. Breach of any part of the proposed injunction (in relation to which the facts must be proved to the criminal standard, that is to say so that the court 'is sure' of those facts) was a contempt, carrying a criminal type of sanction. The power of arrest provides for

instant complete loss of liberty. From that – which I accept – he argued that scrupulous compliance with the rules relating to preparing the ground for the receipt of evidence must be followed and the evidence excluded. My decision was based on my appraisal of the evidence. Provided caution is exercised in relation to the weight to be attached to assertions made on the foundation of material of which even the general nature of the source has not been disclosed and provided that weighing included a review of the classification of intelligence, to which I will come, the issue remains one of weight, not admissibility. I accept the argument made on behalf of the applicant that if the rules had been followed the information available to the court for the purpose of evaluation would have been as they are now. For the reasons already articulated I could reasonably infer that the sources were hidden for fear of reprisal rather than in an attempt to cover for the shortcomings of the potential witnesses or their patent unreliability. Most of the material has a fairly low classification in terms of reliability. Even the information which comes close to the admitted facts has not been rated very high.

20. My conclusion is that the intelligence material is sufficient to raise a reasonable suspicion that the respondent is a member of a group of people, centred on other members of his close family, which it is suspected, take part in serious criminal activity. It is their sole identifying characteristic, a point to which I will return.
21. The general purport of the intelligence is that the shootings and kidnappings are connected with inter-gang rivalry concerned with drugs and that the respondent is under some pressure to revenge the attack of the 12th January and demonstrate that his family are not to be trifled with. Leaving aside the 'gang-related' element of such intelligence, there is a clear inference that certain groups probably are involved in serious and organised criminal activity related to drug trafficking, resulting in street violence.
22. DC Wrench, whose evidence I accept on these issues, says that gangs operating in the outer areas of Manchester are territorial. Historically, gangs have used items of clothing, in specific colours, and tattoos to identify their members. Police recognition of such devices has apparently resulted in reduction in their use.
23. DC Wrench proved the factors used by statutory agencies in Manchester to identify and define gangs:
 - a. A relatively durable, predominantly street based, group of young people;

- b. seen by them and by others as a discernible group;
- c. engaging in a range of criminal activity;
- d. identifying and/or laying claim to identified territory;
- e. having some form of structural feature;
- f. in conflict with other, similar gangs.

It seems to me that 'c' is wider than the definition derived from s.34(5), but 'f' results in a narrower definition. Mr Wagner proposed that a number of these characteristics coincide with those used by the Association of Chief Police Officers to define an 'organised crime group' [OCG]. DC Wrench exhibited a diagram illustrating the conclusions drawn by the police about the respondent's relationship with an OCG centred on John Leslie Calder. The structure is that of family allegiance. The shooting of the respondent's mother is thought to be a particular spur to retributive action. The diagram is founded on intelligence.

24. The respondent denies being in a group which can be classified as a gang. He accepts the family relationships alleged by the police, but does not admit any criminal activity by them or him and certainly not as part of a predominantly street based group which is discernible by others. The mere fact that several members of a group which the police have identified as such have been convicted of serious offences does not lead to the conclusion that they are within the locally used working definition or s.34.

Respondent's lyrics for his 'Grime' music.

25. The applicant argues that the content of Grime music originated and performed by the respondent should be seen as his (true) claim to be a member of a gang and that he intends and threatens, with the support of the gang, violent retribution for the attack on the 12th January 2014.
26. The respondent accepts that he performs Grime music and that the lyrics in his videos (published on You Tube) are his. His ambition is "to become an MC ('Master of Ceremony') in Grime." He accepts that some of his lyrics appear to glorify violence, but says that "my lyrics and online persona are in fact 'make believe'" and are not aimed at anybody.
27. The applicant does not accept that explanation, and invites the inference that certain words in videos appearing soon after the respondent was shot, are plain references to that event and are the respondent's public announcement that he seeks revenge by recruiting the assistance of others, with whom he claims association as a gang member.

28. Before examining what the respondent said and when, I should mention that it was common ground between these parties that Grime lyrics, generally, do make copious references to violence in gang-related settings. The respondent relied on the evidence of Professor Tim Lawrence, Professor of Cultural Studies in the University of East London's School of Arts and Digital Industries. He provided a witness statement dated 30th June 2014 addressing issues raised by both parties. I will treat it as an expert's report, albeit the document does not allude to and therefore comply with the requirements of CPR Part 35.

29. Professor Lawrence reviewed the origins of Grime (which he describes as a form of rap-orientated, syncopated electronic music) including the introduction of 'MCing' in which an MC talks over music selected by a DJ. From gentler origins he traced the introduction of themes dwelling on gang culture, drugs and violence. I need not rehearse the history here. Most importantly he opines:

"15. . . . In Grime as in Rap, forming crews to make and perform music provides young participants with an alternative to the harsher climate of gang culture and drug dealing. But although largely distinctive in their origin and pursuits, Grime crews, like Rap crews, ape the discourses and postures of gang culture, blurring the distinction that exists between the two phenomena."

I accept that the blurred distinction between real and imaginary exists in Grime just as it exists in many other longer-established art forms. Professor Lawrence says that Grime MCs are competitive and tend to brag and exaggerate. Grime describes several situations: mundane life; making music; gang culture. The last is the quick route to notoriety – and thus a following leading to fame, if not fortune. I am not concerned with the socio-political purposes of Grime. The question is: was that style and content of his Grime music used by the respondent to convey a real message about what had happened to him and what would happen to others as a result of it?

30. Grime incorporates older forms of slang with "a new vocabulary". I remind myself here of the respondent's evidence that he, like others, would invent a word spontaneously when the pressure of producing an answer to another competitor in a face to face, live, 'clash' at venue deprived him of the time to think of a suitable recognised word. He said that on such occasions the competing MCs in freestyle will insult and threaten people in their presence. The respondent's evidence was that such threats and insults are not real. They are used for effect and to create excitement.

31. Professor Lawrence identifies some of the common words found in Grime and their meanings. Many different words are used to convey the same meaning. Although it is possible to find words used in Grime, which are provocative, there is little evidence that much violence is actually provoked. Words set to music, just as dramatic productions portraying violence, can be enjoyed by those who would be horrified by such an event affecting their lives. It is proposed that much boastful referencing of violence is simply a 'marketing pose'.
32. DC Wrench and Professor Lawrence have provided their interpretations of the meaning of some of the words used by the respondent which are to be found on You Tube. My starting point is to note that the respondent uses the name 'Demon'. The first reference in evidence is to a video published on the 24th October 2013; in which the respondent, using the name Demon, apologises for the poor quality of the video and excuses it as his first attempt.
33. I will consider some of the phrases used; bearing in mind that most of the exhibited material describes violent situations. It will be seen that my interpretation is closer to that of DC Wrench than that of Professor Lawrence. I doubt whether any definitive view is possible when considering the meaning of words used in such a fluid form.
34. The applicant relies on a video identified as BarzRusTV – Demon – Grime Freestyle [REUPLOAD]. It contains, amongst other phrases -
- A. *"Couple of shots in your frame make your Ma look Sad"*.
Professor Lawrence suggests that shots could be photographic or gun shots. It seems to me that the use of shots and frame might carry either meaning, but "in" suggests gunshots into 'your' body (frame being commonly used to mean the human body). Further: why would framed photographs (or a photograph alone for which frame is a synonym) of the subject cause the subject's mother (Ma) to be sad? A couple of bullets fired into a son's body would be more likely to have that effect on many mothers. Although I agree with Professor Lawrence that the subject matter of 'your' is not identified, if one hypothesises that the message is directed to the person who shot the respondent (whether or not the respondent knows the identity of those who shot him and his mother) the subject will be able to identify themselves as the subject/s of a threatened retributive shooting.
- B. *"Run around on the block with a Glock get jacked up and then get grounded. Get tied up and then get drowned."* I do not agree

with Professor Lawrence's interpretation. He ignores 'run around on the block' before the words 'with a Glock' which together appear to describe someone roaming a neighbourhood with a Glock pistol. I accept that getting 'jacked up' and 'grounded' may have several meanings, but might include being hijacked (taken prisoner) and then being harmed by being tied up and drowned.

- C. *"Kids involved in some Dangerous Shit, Lick man down never once has demon been shown up."* It is possible to interpret (in context, but subject to what follows) the shooting of the respondent as the dangerous shit in which the kids had been involved, followed by bravado: if (as DC Wrench proposes) lick man down means to beat someone up, demon (the respondent) has never been shown up in a confrontation.

There follows a series of overt threats of violence, expressed in the first person singular. The difficulty with the foregoing analysis is that the video is labelled as having been first published on the 4th January 2014, that is to say some 8 days *before* the respondent and his mother were both shot. Thus what at first sight appears to be founded on a real event, it is not the event giving rise to this application.

35. A video titled BarzRUsTV- Demon Grime Freestyle Pt 2 (published 11th February 2014, therefore about 3 days after the shooting) contains many references to 'Man Dem'. The respondent said that 'dem' could refer simply to a person. Hence 'Man Dem' or 'Girl Dem' mean simply a friend of either gender. DC Wrench proposes that 'Man Dem' means gang and that there are gangs known as Fallowfield, Levenshulme (in the Manchester area) and Tottenham (London) 'Man Dems'. On balance I accept DC Wrench's interpretation, because the context does not fit with a reference to an individual or series of individuals – see below.
36. The meaning of Man Dem is important. If it means a gang, then later references to "My Man Dem" as in "are rolling deep" [per Professor Lawrence 'not to be messed with'] and "are on this", where "this" is a reference to capturing "you", holding the subject in a basement and 'scolding' and burning them (plain and obvious threats of violence and death), are by inference clear references to the narrator's gang being engaged 'on' that job. I doubt Professor Lawrence's conclusion that that is a non-specific threat. However, it was published several days before the attack on the respondent's brother and thus has no link. In my judgment it is possible to interpret this video as an overt

gang-related threat of violence. Is it real or merely an idle boast, without substance or only connected to real events by coincidence?

37. I discount the first video, for the reasons given above. Nonetheless, and despite the undermining effect of the earlier video being more likely to be fiction than fact, I find that it is more likely than not the purpose of the later video was to issue threats to those who had attacked the respondent. I am satisfied that the threats were not mere fantasy, albeit probably born of anger and bravado. They were intended to carry the message of threat to people who would recognise that they were the subject of those threats. I reject the respondent's explanation that this was simply routine Grime content and meaningless. It does not follow that the respondent was in a position to make good his overt threats; nor that he was a member of a gang or that he could utilise the services of a gang falling within the definition of the Act. Some of the intelligence suggests that the respondent's family doubt the wisdom of the circumstances giving rise to the attack on the respondent.
38. If, in fact, the respondent had summoned assistance from a gang, which was intended to involve the use of violence of the general type threatened in the videos, he would have encouraged gang-related violence. He said: My Man Dem are on this.
39. It is unnecessary to rely on the intelligence available to the police beyond the suspicions mentioned above. It is enough for present purposes to know that the respondent is related to at least 3 people who have relevant convictions for violence and that he cannot explain why he was shot.

Identification

40. In my judgment the most significant impediment to the application is the definition of gang related violence. The whole thrust of the legislation is the suppression of violence perpetrated by a group which can be identified by others as a group.
41. s.34(5)(b) provides 3 specific examples of identifying features: name, emblem, colour. When the legislation was promoted and passed, as DC Wrench observes, gangs tended to have some or all of those recognisable features. The applicant does not argue that any group of which the respondent is a member has any of those features. Instead counsel for the Chief Constable argued that it had another recognisable 'characteristic' which enables its members to be identified as a group. That characteristic is that the group is a family which runs a drug dealing network.

42. Mr Wagner, counsel for Mr Calder, argues that the evidence might show that the group is an OCG, but that it is not externally recognisable by those who do not know the family, its membership and its activities.
43. My judgment is that whether the characteristic relied on by the applicant is within s.34(5)(b) depends on who is included within "others" and what steps are legitimate/required for the purpose of identification. I am not persuaded, even on the balance of probabilities, that the characteristic relied upon by the applicant would enable a member of the public, unfamiliar with the drug-trafficking scene locally or more widely, to identify any of the group as a group associated with a particular area of Greater Manchester, or any other area. However, if 'others' includes police constables, they might be able to identify members of the group. DC Wrench would fall squarely into that category, assuming without finding for present purposes, that the intelligence available to him is accurate. Similarly, a locally based constable might be able to identify members on the basis of where they were seen and what they were doing. In my judgment such specialised knowledge is not within s.34(5)(c). The whole thrust of s.34(5) is to deal with readily identifiable bodies of people who terrorise the streets. I find support for that in a sentence in paragraph 2.2 of the Guidance:

"Gang injunctions are intended to be used against members of violent street gangs."

44. I am satisfied that a good deal of violence, at the extreme upper end of the range, has already occurred. It is of the type which (without knowing anything about the personalities involved) is inherently likely to give rise to both threats of and actual violence in return. That in itself gives rise to the risk of innocent bystanders being harmed, leaving aside the general desirability of maintaining law and order. I am satisfied also that the restrictions sought in the injunction are appropriate and necessary to curb the conduct which it is aimed at suppressing and fall within s.34(3)(a). While the respondent remains in custody, whether on remand or during any subsequent sentence for a proven criminal offence, the injunction is not necessary to prevent gang-related violence. If he is acquitted (as has happened in the past) there will be no licence terms. I am not convinced a licence at the conclusion of a sentence of custody would provide the restraints sought by this injunction. In those circumstances I am satisfied that an injunction would be necessary within s.34(3)(a) for the prevention of all 3 of the types of participation. In my judgment the mere fact that such necessity is contingent on the respondent's

- release from custody is not good reason for concluding that the injunction (which cannot be obtained at a moment's notice) is not needed now against that contingency.
45. I am satisfied that the group identified by DC Wrench contains at least 3 people and that is associated with north east Manchester (s.34(5)(a) and (c)).
46. Nonetheless, my judgment is that, whatever the general merits of the application, the requirement of s.34(5)(c) is not fulfilled and that that is fatal to the application. The first condition, s.34(2), is not proven.
47. It follows that the application must be and is dismissed and that any remaining interim injunction is discharged.

Date and form of judgment

48. This written judgment will be handed down in open court in the County Court at Manchester on Thursday 31st July 2014 and will be effective pursuant to CPR Part 40.7 on that day.
49. The judgment will be published to the solicitors for each party in advance. It is not embargoed from immediate publication to the parties.
50. In the event that consequential matters - such as the form of order arising from this judgment and costs (in principle, if not amount) - have been agreed and made the subject of a written draft order signed by the parties or their solicitors, filed with the court by 4pm on Monday 28th July, the parties need not attend the hearing or be represented. In the event that argument is required on consequential matters the issues must be identified in writing by each party to the other and to the court by 4pm on 28th July, together with an agreed estimated length of hearing. If a hearing is required and the respondent remains in custody and wishes to attend, his solicitors should make the necessary arrangements with the Governor of the prison in which he is held.
51. I direct, pursuant to paragraph 6.1 of CPR 39A PD, that no tape recording of this judgment shall be made. This written judgment, when signed and handed down may be treated as authentic shall stand as the only necessary record of it.

Keith Armitage QC

KEITH ARMITAGE QC

Circuit Judge

17th July 2014

*Handed down in Pt. 36 UCC at Manchester CC
 17.7.14. No party present at judgment.*