

# Index

- Access to the process, 5, 35, 155–159, 181–184
- Accountability, 1, 30, 91  
inquest system, 102, 139–143  
legitimacy, 124  
potential gap, 9–10  
principles, 4–5  
punishment, 76  
State actions, 142
- Administrative duty/obligation, 13–14, 17
- Adversarial, 24  
apology, 75  
criminal court system, 142  
defined, 128  
fair and effective participation, 60–61  
legal representation, families, 170–171
- Amin (R. (on the application of Amin (Imtiaz)) v Secretary of State for the Home Department)*, 11–12, 26–27
- Apology, 75, 89–90, 195–196
- Article 2  
compliant, 5–6  
European Convention of Human Rights (ECHR), 9, 10–22  
evolution, 3  
inquests, 5–6, 10, 36, 153, 201  
investigations, 3, 25–41  
obligations, 29–30, 115  
requirements, 23  
violation, 27, 89–90
- Association of Chief Police Officers, 12–14
- Bias, 66  
fairness, 121  
outcomes, 68  
perceptions, 132–133
- Civil claim, 74
- Closure, 84–85, 92, 196
- Compensation, 1–2, 25  
apology, 72  
civil case, 74–75  
financial, 89–90
- Complicated grief, 81–82, 83–84, 92–93, 196
- Coroner, 5, 23–24  
inquests, 32–33  
investigations, 31–32  
Rules, 24
- Coronial system, 23–24, 24–25, 137, 164
- Cross-examination, 34–35, 106, 167–168
- Culpability, 3–4, 22, 26, 91, 141
- Custodial institutions, 32–33, 51, 63, 190
- Delays, 31–32  
disclosure, 176  
families, 41  
inquest process, 196  
participants, 92
- Detention, 16, 63, 144
- Director of Public Prosecutions (DPP), 186

- Disclosure
  - Article 2, 175
  - coroner, 38
  - delays, 39
  - police witness statements, 40
  - preinquest, 40
- Disproportionality, 137–138
- Duty of care, 4–5, 13, 15, 91, 136
- Effective participation, 153–154
  - access to documents, 174–178
  - equity, 162–163
  - fair treatment, 161
  - legal representation, 163–174
  - respectful treatment, 160–161
  - right to participate, 154–159
- Enhanced procedural duty/obligation, 9–10, 18, 21, 26–29
- Equality of arms, 161, 162
- Equity
  - Article 2, 36
  - and independence, 147–148
  - legal representation, 162–163
  - parties, 147–148
- European Convention on Human Rights, 10–22
- European Court of Human Rights (ECtHR), 12–15, 26–27, 201
- Evidence
  - access to documents, 37, 167
  - CCTV, 107, 110
  - empirical, 4–5
  - forensic, 112–113
  - Home Affairs Committee (HAC), 24
  - inquest, 62–63
  - scrutinising, 107
  - State failures, 9–10
- Exceptional Case Funding (ECF), 192–193
- Fairness, 39
  - and equity, 191
  - family perception, 162–163
  - perceived, 108–109
  - procedural, 42, 145–148
  - process, 119–122
- Fair treatment, 124–125, 161
- Family Liaison Officer (FLOs), 156, 169
- Family participation benefits
  - accountability, 139–143
  - increased perceptions, 145–148
  - procedural fairness, 145–148
  - public confidence, 143–145
- Formality, 36, 159
- Four component model, 147–148
- Four-component theory, 122
- Grief narrative, 85–86
- Grief process
  - bereavement, 84–88
  - grief theory, 81–84
  - positive light, 86–88
- Hill v Chief Constable of West Yorkshire*, 16
- Human Rights Act (HRA), 12–13, 69, 191–192
- Independence, 106
  - legitimacy, 145
  - system, 130–133
- Independent Police Complaints Commission (IPPC), 50
- Influence the outcome, 5
  - families, 184–187
  - opportunity, 60
  - right to, 63–69
- Influence the process, 59–60, 91–92, 184–185
- Inquest system, 2
  - access to documents, 37–41
  - accountability, 139–143
  - Article 2, 5–6, 10, 25–41
  - article 2 investigations, 25–41
  - bereavement, 84–85
  - complex, 5–6

- contentious, 48
- custody, 47, 165
- England and Wales, 22
- enhanced procedural duty, 27–29
- family involvement, 31–33
- family participation, 33–41
- impact, 130–137
- legal representation, 36, 162
- legitimacy, 124–128
- outcomes, 101
- participating, 3–4
- purpose, 101–105
- reforms, 23–25
- representation funding, 36–37
- right to influence, 63–64
- right to participate, 61
- State response, 114–115
- state to account holding, 29–30
- Inquisitorial, 36
  - adversarial, 170–171
  - coroner, 129
  - decision-making processes, 128
- Instrumental impact, 101–111
- Interested party, 32, 69, 155, 181–182
- Interpretative Phenomenological
  - Approach (IPA), 47–49
- Intrinsic impact, 118, 130–137, 197
- Investigations, 1, 3, 9, 19–21, 25–41, 65, 66–67, 72, 102, 130–131, 133, 140, 143, 184, 185
- Investigatory bodies, 55, 65–67, 110, 117–118, 132–133, 140, 146, 154, 175, 181–182, 185, 198, 200
- Jamieson (R. v HM Coroner for North Humberside and Scunthorpe Ex p. Jamieson)*, 20
- Jordan v United Kingdom*, 18, 29, 30, 32–33, 35, 40–41, 115, 140
- Legal Aid, 22, 37, 115–117, 155–156, 171, 173–174, 182, 191–193, 199
- Legal Aid Agency (LAA), 115–116
- Legal representation, 163–174
  - adversarial, 170–171
  - asking questions, 167–169
  - assess evidence, 167
  - bereaved families, 189–193
  - challenges, 170–174
  - early access, 164–165
  - funding, 173–174
  - getting access to documents, 166–167
  - inquest and custody processes, 165
  - legally complex, 165–166
  - specialist, 171–173
  - support, 169–170
- Legitimacy, 1, 2–3, 5, 101–111, 115–117, 139, 145–148, 194, 196–198, 200, 202–203, 101
  - coroner, 128–130
  - fairness, 119–122
  - fair process, 135–136
  - independence, 130–133
  - intrinsic impact, 130–137
  - intrinsic value, 124–128
  - procedural justice, 124–130
  - process, 136–137
  - State actions, 123
  - transparent process, 133–135
  - trust, 137
- Letts (R (Joanna Letts) v Lord Chancellor)*, 3, 22, 35, 59, 90–92, 116, 140, 142, 196, 202
- Liability, 9–10, 21, 30, 75, 103, 113, 142–143
- Managing expectations, 192–193
- McCann v United Kingdom*, 11–12, 18, 29, 140
- Middleton (R. (on the application of Middleton) v HM Coroner for Western Somerset)*, 27–29, 115, 140

- Moral norms, 149
- Next of kin, 25, 31–33, 40, 81, 117, 153–158, 173–174, 181–182, 192
- Normative values for justice, 119
- Operational duty/obligation, 13, 14–15, 18
- Osman v United Kingdom*, 14, 15
- Participation, 1, 10, 31, 33–35, 59–61, 81, 86, 92–93, 101, 105–111, 119–122, 130–137, 139–140, 145, 148, 154–159, 181, 194, 202, 203
- deaths in custody, 62–63
- families, 61
- grief process, 92–93
- legitimate interests of families, 89–92
- Police, 5, 36, 63, 87, 90, 94–95, 103, 106, 142, 162, 171, 185, 198
- Positional Asphyxia, 140–142
- Post-mortem, 31–33
- Prevention of Future Deaths (Reports), 61
- Prison, 36, 62–63, 73–74, 93, 95, 119, 125–127, 136, 202
- Prisons and Probation Ombudsman, 40, 50
- Procedural duty/obligation, 17–18, 26–29, 34, 116
- Procedural Fairness, 42, 59–60, 124–125, 139, 145–148, 160
- Procedural Justice Theory, 4–5, 119, 124, 137–138, 147–148, 188–189, 197, 198, 202–203
- Public confidence, 2, 26, 35, 136, 139, 143–145
- Public interest, 148
- Qualitative interviews, 3, 46
- Qualitative research, 45, 54
- Quality of decision-making, 115, 122, 124–125, 128, 146, 187
- Redress, 1–2, 59, 74, 77–80, 89–90, 195–196
- Respectful treatment, 1, 160–161
- Scope of inquest, 30, 73, 102–103, 165, 168–169, 189–190
- Semi-structured interviews, 48–49, 52
- Social Contract, 123
- State bodies, 102, 117–118, 133, 136–137, 145–148, 169, 171, 188–189
- State duty of care, 136
- State-initiated, 9–10, 17–18, 22, 25–26
- Stigma, 82, 83–84, 88, 93–95
- Substantive duty/obligation, 11–12, 14, 17–18
- Terminology, 159, 165, 190
- Transparency, 125–126, 131, 136–137, 145–148
- Trust, 2, 60, 92, 119, 122, 125–126, 134–135, 137, 147–148, 188–189, 200, 203–204
- Truth
- apology, 75
- civil case, 74–75
- failings identification, 75–79
- public record, 77–79
- punishment, 75–79
- right, 72–73
- verdicts, 73–74
- Use of force, 11–13, 18, 30–31, 94–95
- Voice of the deceased, 3–4, 87, 93, 154, 154, 200