



EUROPEAN COURT OF HUMAN RIGHTS
COUR EUROPÉENNE DES DROITS DE L'HOMME

FOURTH SECTION

DECISION

Application no. 61332/12
Jean Ethel SINFIELD and Others
against the United Kingdom

The European Court of Human Rights (Fourth Section), sitting on 18 February 2014 as a Chamber composed of:

Ineta Ziemele, *President*,

George Nicolaou,

Ledi Bianku,

Nona Tsotsoria,

Zdravka Kalaydjieva,

Paul Mahoney,

Faris Vehabović, *judges*,

and Françoise Elens-Passos, *Section Registrar*,

Having regard to the above application lodged on 11 September 2012,

Having deliberated, decides as follows:

THE FACTS

1. The 707 applicants are either former servicemen or personal representatives or dependents of deceased former servicemen. A list of the applicants is set out in the appendix. They are represented before the Court by Mr N. Sampson, a solicitor practising in London.

A. The circumstances of the case

2. The facts of the case, as submitted by the applicants, may be summarised as follows. For ease of reference, the term “applicants” in the following statement of facts should be taken to mean both the present applicants and the deceased former servicemen who are represented by their estates.

1. The atmospheric tests of nuclear devices

3. Between 1952 and 1958 the United Kingdom carried out a series of atmospheric tests of thermonuclear devices in the region of the Pacific Ocean. All three branches of the armed forces took part, involving some 22,000 servicemen, including the applicants. Some contemporaneous monitoring was carried out of radiation levels to which individual servicemen were exposed at the moment of detonation, but no monitoring took place of subsequent exposure to radiation in the form of fallout through ingestion of contaminated water or fish, for example.

2. Attempts to establish whether there was a causal link between participation in the tests and illness

4. In medical and scientific circles it was known since the 1940s that exposure to ionising radiation was capable of causing many forms of cancer, although the risk was generally associated with fairly high levels of exposure caused by “prompt” or “instantaneous” radiation. Subsequently, the effects of lower levels of radiation caused by fallout were studied. In the United Kingdom, public interest in the possibility that British servicemen might have suffered ill effects as the result of exposure during the nuclear tests was aroused following a series of items on a BBC television news programme broadcast in December 1982 and early 1983. These ventilated the possibility that test participants were suffering unusual levels of ill health of various forms. This interest appears to have stemmed from publicity in Scotland generated by concerns raised in the Daily Record by one of the applicants, Mr Kenneth McGinley. Mr McGinley publicly claimed that he was one of a number of nuclear test veterans who had suffered ill health as the result of exposure to radiation.

5. Soon after this publicity, a group of veterans, all of whom had served in the Pacific during the tests, formed the British Nuclear Test Veterans Association (BNTVA). Mr McGinley was their Chairman. Their objectives were to gather information about their exposure to radiation and its likely effects, to press for further research and to seek financial recompense for any harm suffered, either by claiming for war pensions or by making claims for damages.

6. As a result of the publicity described above, in January 1983, questions were raised in Parliament about the possibility that the veterans had been injured by exposure to radiation. The attitude of the Ministry of Defence (MOD) was, and is, that the men had not been exposed to excessive levels of ionising radiation. However, the Government commissioned a health survey of the men involved in the tests, to be conducted by the National Radiological Protection Board (NRPB).

7. The survey sought to identify all the men who had been present in the area at the time of the tests and to compare them with a similar sized cohort

of men of similar backgrounds who had not attended the tests. About 22,000 nuclear test veterans were identified. The survey examined death registration documents for causes of death and also the incidence of cancer using the National Health Service Cancer Register. The report, issued in November 1988, disclosed that, among the veterans, there was no excess mortality either from all causes or from all cancers. However, there was a significantly higher level of deaths from leukaemia and multiple myeloma among the participants than among the controls. The report expressed the view that this was probably a chance result, to be explained by the very low level of deaths from these causes among the control group. When the deaths among the participants were compared with the national mortality figures for those conditions, the excess among the participants was only slight. It was concluded that participation in the nuclear tests was not associated with any detectable effect on expectation of life or the risk of developing cancer. It added:

“that there may well have been small hazards of leukaemia and multiple myeloma associated with participation in the programme, but their existence is certainly not proven and further research is desirable”.

The NRPB carried out two more surveys and reported in 1993 and 2003, but the later conclusions did not differ significantly from the earlier ones. The methodology and conclusions of all three surveys were criticised by the BNTVA and subsequently by the claimants in the group action, principally on the ground that they looked only at deceased, but not living, veterans.

8. Meanwhile, in 1985 an action for damages was begun by a veteran named Melvyn Pearce. He developed a lymphoma in 1978 and alleged that it had been caused by exposure to ionising radiation during the tests. The allegations of negligence in *Pearce v. The Secretary of State for Defence and Ministry of Defence* [1988] AC 755 were based on both exposure to prompt high dose radiation (that is, as a result of proximate presence at one or more of the nuclear tests) and delayed, low dose, exposure (as a consequence of ingesting radionuclides from fallout while swimming in contaminated waters or eating contaminated fish). It was also alleged that the MOD had deliberately exposed the men to radiation as an experiment to see what the effects were. The MOD denied liability and sought to rely on immunity from suit provided by section 10 of the Crown Proceedings Act 1947. It did not plead the Limitation Act. The issue of immunity was treated as a preliminary issue and in due course went to the House of Lords which held in the Mr Pearce’s favour, leaving him free to proceed to trial. However, soon afterwards, the claim was discontinued, because the Mr Pearce’s team concluded that it could not prove a causal link between the exposure to radiation and the development of cancer.

9. In 2008, the results of a study carried out by a team of scientists led by Dr R.E. Rowland of the New Zealand Institute of Molecular Biosciences were published as “Elevated chromosome translocation frequencies in

New Zealand nuclear test veterans” (“the Rowland Study”). Using a technique called “mFISH”, which involved “painting” chromosomes enabling breaks and rearrangements to become visible, the team had examined the damage to the chromosomes of 49 New Zealand veterans who had served on board two frigates positioned between 20 and 150 nautical miles upwind from certain explosions which were part of the United Kingdom nuclear test programme. The Rowland study found that the 49 crew members examined had on average three times as many chromosomal aberrations than 50 controls who had not taken part in the tests. This finding was regarded as significant and probably attributable to long term genetic damage resulting from ionising radiation during and after the nuclear test. An attempt was made to estimate the radiation dose from the level of translocations. The median dose for the veterans was estimated to be far in excess of the median estimated dose of the controls. However, the study made no claim for any correlation between the raised levels of chromosomal aberrations and the incidence of any illness.

3. *The group action*

10. Meanwhile, in 2002, several veterans instructed two different firms of solicitors with a view to bringing claims for damages. Legal Aid was granted for the investigation of the claims. On 23 December 2004 a claim form was issued in respect of a group action brought by or on behalf of 1,011 former servicemen, including the applicants, against the MOD. Damages were sought in respect of injury, disability or death alleged to have occurred in consequence of the exposure of the former servicemen to ionising radiation as a result of their presence near, or involvement in the aftermath of, the nuclear tests.

11. In August 2005 public funding was withdrawn from the claimants on the ground that the legal merits were insufficient to justify the case being pursued at public expense. It was agreed between the parties to stay the proceedings, until the Rowland study had been published. The stay was lifted on 1 September 2006 and a different firm of solicitors took over, after arrangements had been made for the matter to proceed on a conditional fee basis. Under the conditional fee arrangement, the solicitors would be paid only if the claimants were successful. The claimants purchased an insurance policy, known as “ATE (after the event) insurance”, to cover the MOD’s costs, should they be ordered against them.

12. On 29 December 2006 Master Particulars of Claim, containing more detailed allegations, were served. It was alleged that the nuclear tests had been negligently planned and executed, in that, *inter alia*, protective clothing and equipment was not supplied, to prevent the exposure of the servicemen to ionising radiation both at the time of each blast and subsequently, in the form of fall-out, and steps were not taken to prevent servicemen from swimming in contaminated water and eating contaminated

seafood in the aftermath of the tests. In addition, it was alleged that the authorities failed properly to monitor the extent to which each serviceman was exposed to ionising radiation, both during and after each test. The claimants further claimed that they had suffered a variety of illnesses known to result from radiation exposure and relied in particular on the mFISH methodology, used by the Rowland study (see paragraph 10 above), as a reliable and specific indicator of genetic damage caused by exposure to ionising radiation. The Master Particulars of Claim included a partial list of the illnesses which the claimants, as a group, contended to have suffered as a result of their exposure to radiation, but individual medical reports were not included. In connection with the question whether the claims were time-barred, the applicants contended that it was only with the availability of the results of the Rowland study in 2007 that “scientific evidence became available that indicated that the conditions suffered by the veterans were attributable to exposure during the tests”. Furthermore, they argued that where delay had occurred, which in most cases was not great, this was explicable by funding difficulties and the MOD’s attitude of denial, and that the cases should be allowed to proceed under Section 33 of the Limitation Act 1980 (“the 1980 Act”: see paragraphs 27-29 below).

13. The MOD denied liability, alleging that all proper precautions were taken to protect service personnel from exposure to ionising radiation and that, in most cases, the actual exposure of the men was no more than the background radiation they would have experienced in the United Kingdom. In addition, the MOD contended that the claimants would be unable to prove, individually or as a group, that their illnesses were attributable to their presence during the nuclear tests, rather than other factors. The MOD also argued that the claims were time-barred under the terms of the 1980 Act, which requires a claimant to institute proceedings within three years of the date on which the cause of action accrued or “the date of knowledge (if later) of the person injured”. It was contended on behalf of the Ministry of Defence that the claimants had relevant knowledge prior to 23 December 2001 (that is, before the three-year period preceding the institution of proceedings). In relation to the discretionary power under section 33 of the 1980 Act, it was argued that the passage of time since the tests had eroded the cogency of the evidence and that the overall merits of the claim were weak, particularly in relation to causation.

14. A group litigation order was made, which decided *inter alia* that the issue of limitation should be tried as a preliminary point. On the agreement of the parties, five test cases were selected by each side for the purpose of the preliminary hearing to determine the limitation issues. On 10 April 2008 the MOD informed the veterans’ solicitor that it intended to serve expert evidence going to the weakness of the claims on causation. The following day the MOD was granted leave to serve limited expert evidence in the fields of radiobiology, epidemiology and nuclear physics. The applicants

were subsequently granted leave to serve expert evidence in the same disciplines. The selection of the test cases was completed by August 2008. Disclosure was provided by the parties, but was limited to documents relevant to the limitation issues only.

4. *The judgment of the High Court*

15. The hearing took place over ten days in January and February 2009 before Foskett J, who heard and considered expert evidence in relation to the development of scientific knowledge of the effects of ionising radiation as well as evidence from the claimants about their knowledge and belief about the cause of their injuries. He delivered his judgment on 5 June 2009. Although the claimants had complained in their Particulars of Claim of exposure to prompt radiation, it was agreed early in the trial that none of the veterans had been sufficiently close to the explosions to have been affected by prompt radiation.

16. At the hearing, without issuing any application, the MOD invited the judge to strike out the claims or, in the alternative, to give summary judgment in favour of the MOD, on the ground that the claims had no prospect of success. Foskett J declined to do so, ruling that these requests were premature, since causation was essentially a question of fact and since the facts, dependent on lay and expert evidence, had not been established at the current stage of the proceedings. Moreover, he did not accept that the claimants' case on causation was so weak that the claims were bound to fail. However, he accepted that, if any of the cases were to clear the limitation hurdle and proceed to trial, there was a risk that they might subsequently be abandoned because of difficulties in establishing causation, and stated that, if invited to do so by the defendant, he would consider how the Ministry of Defence could be protected in terms of costs and other adverse consequences should this occur.

17. On the limitation issue, the judge considered himself bound by previous case-law to hold that "knowledge" within the meaning of section 14(1)(b) of the 1980 Act in effect meant "belief", so that each claimant acquired the relevant knowledge at the moment in time when he formed the belief that his injury was capable of having been caused by exposure to radiation. Following this approach, he examined each case to determine the moment at which the veteran had manifested not merely suspicion but a firm belief that his illness was attributable to exposure to radiation. He found that five of the lead claimants had not had knowledge of their claims, within the meaning of section 14 of the 1980 Act, until less than three years before they began proceedings, so they were entitled to proceed with their claims as of right. He further considered that the claims of the other five test claimants were *prima facie* statute barred, but exercised his discretion under section 33 of the 1980 Act so as to allow the actions to proceed. In particular, he emphasised that the need to avoid an apparent

injustice, both in the minds of the claimants and of the general public, was a weighty factor to be taken into account. The judge awarded the claimants their costs, estimated at GBP 11.8 million, to be paid by the MOD.

5. *The judgment of the Court of Appeal*

18. The MOD appealed to the Court of Appeal, which gave judgment on 19 November 2010 (*Ministry of Defence v. A.B. and Others* [2010] EWCA Civ 1317). The Court of Appeal upheld the trial judge's refusal to strike out the case, but on different grounds. They considered that the pleadings disclosed reasonable grounds for bringing the case and that as there had been no abuse of process nor failure to comply with procedural rules, it would be wholly inappropriate to strike the cases out. The Court of Appeal considered that the MOD's application for summary judgment should be rejected on procedural grounds, because no formal notice had been given.

19. With regard to the limitation issues, the Court of Appeal applied broadly the same test as Foskett J, although it considered that in relation to nine of the ten test cases, he had applied too high a threshold. In the Court of Appeal's view, only one case, that of Mr Sinfield (the first applicant's husband), who was diagnosed with non-Hodgkin's lymphoma in October 2005, had been brought in time. In relation to the discretion under section 33, the Court of Appeal held that the trial judge had erred in law in holding that the need to avoid an apparent injustice, both in the minds of the claimants and of the newspaper-reading public, was a weighty factor to be taken into account. The court further held that the broad merits test should be a prominent consideration when deciding whether or not to exercise the discretion. The resource implications both for the MOD and Treasury solicitors and for the courts would be enormous, and it would be inappropriate to allow an expensive and resource-consuming trial to take place if the prospects for the claimants' success were slight. On the other hand, if the prospects of success "were even reasonable, those resource considerations fade into relative insignificance". The Court of Appeal next examined the likely strength of the applicants' case on causation. They observed that the burden of proving that the alleged tort caused the alleged injury lay on the claimant, on the balance of probabilities. In order to determine whether the section 33 discretion should be exercised, the court had to assess the broad merits of the material put before. The claimants had not produced evidence of how they intended to estimate the doses of radiation to which they were exposed and the court considered that the best they could hope for would be to show low but significant exposure. In addition, on the state of the evidence before the court, there was no prospect that the claimants would be able to satisfy the "but for" test of causation by showing that their illnesses were at least twice as likely to have been caused by their exposure to radiation during the tests than by other causes, for

example, smoking. Nor was there any possibility, on the evidence as it stood, that the claimants would be able to rely on the synergistic inter-action of two different causative agents. The foundation of medical evidence had not been laid. The court therefore concluded that the claimants' case on causation faced very great difficulties. They accepted that there was a theoretical possibility that further evidence might become available if the case were permitted to proceed, but nonetheless underlined that they had to apply the broad merits test under section 33 on the basis of the evidence which the claimants had put before the court. When considering, in relation to each of the nine time-barred test cases, whether to exercise its discretion under section 33, the Court of Appeal found that the merits of each case were weak on causation and that the prospects of success were therefore weak. In addition, the delay in bringing the claims would be prejudicial to the MOD, through the loss of available witnesses. In consequence, the court declined to exercise its discretion to allow the time-barred cases to proceed.

20. The Court of Appeal concluded with the following words:

"We recognise that these decisions will come as a great disappointment to the claimants and their advisers. We readily acknowledge the strength of feeling and conviction held by many of the claimants that they have been damaged by the Ministry of Defence in the service of their country. The problem is that the common law of this country requires that, before damages can be awarded, a claimant must prove not only that the defendant has breached its duty of care but also that that breach of duty has, on the balance of probabilities, caused the injury of which the claimant complains. These can be heavy burdens to discharge.

If we look back to 1985, Melvyn Pearce won a significant victory in the House of Lords, which established that the MOD could not rely on the immunity of the Crown from suit. Yet, within a few months of that victory, Mr Pearce abandoned his claim because his advisers recognised that they could not satisfy the burden of proving that Mr Pearce's cancer had probably been caused by radiation exposure; for his personal position, the victory was entirely pyrrhic. As we noted earlier, the abandonment of that case comprised a warning to those who wished to follow after. Causation would be a potentially difficult issue and would have to be addressed if any such actions were to have a prospect of success. Thus, it was no surprise that one of the first steps taken by [the solicitors] originally instructed by Mrs Brothers, was to seek evidence to establish causation (which was not forthcoming). Further, although the MOD raised the issue of causation both generically and, later, in the individual cases, no attempt was apparently made when the lead cases were identified to obtain specific evidence on this topic. It may be that it is not yet possible for a doctor to say that a condition such as cancer has probably been caused by radiation as opposed to any of the other possible causes but, until such evidence is available, claimants will face the difficulty which caused Mr Pearce to abandon his claim.

We have no doubt that it will appear that the law is hard on people like these claimants who have given service to their country and may have suffered harm as a result. No doubt partly with this background in mind, Parliament has provided that servicemen who have been exposed to radiation which might have caused them injury will be entitled to a war pension. Of course, a war pension is not as financially beneficial as common law damages but it is some compensation. Of particular importance on this issue, on an application for a war pension, the burden of proving

causation is reversed; thus, the MOD has to exclude the possibility that the applicant has been harmed by radiation. We cannot say that any of these claimants who have, so far, not been awarded pensions will succeed in their attempts to do so but their chances of success must be far greater with the MOD having to prove the absence of causation than they ever were while the claimants had to establish it.”

21. The claimants were ordered to pay 90% of the MOD’s costs of the first instance trial on the preliminary issues of limitation, and all of the MOD’s costs of the appeal. These costs, in excess of GBP 5.6 million, were paid by the applicants’ ATE insurers.

6. The judgment of the Supreme Court

22. The nine lead claimants who had lost before the Court of Appeal appealed to the Supreme Court, which gave judgment on 14 March 2012 (*Ministry of Defence v. A.B. and Others* [2012] UKSC 9). The Supreme Court was divided by four judges to three as to the application of the 1980 Act in this case. The minority (Lord Phillips, Lady Hale and Lord Kerr) held that the Court of Appeal had confused knowledge with belief and that, although the claimants believed that their injuries were caused by exposure during the nuclear tests at the time they issued their claim, they lacked knowledge of attributability because at that time there was no available scientific evidence. The majority (Lords Wilson, Walker, Brown and Mance) agreed with the Court of Appeal that “knowledge” should be equated to belief held “with sufficient confidence to justify embarking on the preliminaries of the issue of a writ, such as submitting a claim to the proposed defendant, taking legal and other advice and collecting evidence”. The majority found that each of the nine appellants had believed that his exposure to radiation had put his health at risk and, on becoming ill, had believed that his illness was attributable to his presence during the nuclear tests, on that each had attained the requisite state of knowledge more than three years before the commencement of proceedings. It was conceded before the Supreme Court by counsel for the claimants that they lacked evidence with which to establish a credible case that the injuries were caused by the tests. The majority also agreed with the Court of Appeal’s approach to the exercise of discretion under section 33 of the 1980 Act and upheld the refusal to allow the claims to proceed.

23. All members of the Supreme Court agreed that the claims had no real prospects of success. Lord Phillips observed that:

“The current difficulties facing the veterans in relation to causation appear to me to be very great indeed. The Rowland report assists them a little but it does not have the significance that [their counsel] has sought to attach to it.

The Rowland report shows that many of the New Zealand veterans had a raised incidence of chromosome translocation that suggested exposure to abnormal, albeit low level, fall-out radiation. But this was not true of all the veterans assayed. The assays of some show no abnormalities. This is no more than one would expect. Exposure to radiation results from inhalation or ingestion of fall-out. It may result

from swallowing sea water while swimming or eating contaminated fish. Thus it can vary from one man to the next. The most that can be deduced from the Rowland report is that it is probable that individual veterans were exposed to low level fall-out. There is currently no evidence that there is any correlation between the raised incidence of chromosome translocation of individual New Zealand veterans and the incidence of cancer or any of the other conditions of which the claimant veterans complain. ... The Rowland report results simply constitute a biomarker suggesting exposure to radiation.

The most the veterans as a group are currently in a position to establish is that there is a possibility that some of them were exposed to a raised, albeit low level, of fall-out radiation and that this may have increased the risk of contracting some at least of the injuries in respect of which they claim. This falls well short of establishing causation according to the established principles of English law. ...

For these reasons I do not believe that the veterans' claims have a reasonable prospect of success."

Lord Wilson accepted that the Court of Appeal had wrongly elevated the issue of causation to be the determining factor under section 33, but nonetheless concluded:

"It is undesirable that a court which conducts an inquiry into whether a claim is time-barred should, even at the stage when it considers its power under section 33, have detailed regard to the evidence with which the claimant aspires to prove his case at trial. But the ten claims placed before Foskett J were of particular complexity; and the nature of the submissions made to him on behalf of the appellants about the meaning of knowledge for the purpose of section 14(1) of the 1980 Act led him to undertake, over ten days of hearing and expressed in 885 paragraphs of judgment, a microscopic survey of the written evidence available to the parties, in particular to the appellants, in relation to causation. At all events the result was to yield to the Court of Appeal an unusual advantage, namely a mass of material which enabled it with rare confidence to assess the appellants' prospects of success. It expressed its conclusions in terms of the 'very great difficulties' which confronted the appellants in that regard. But, in line with the realistic concession made by [counsel for the appellants] in this court, the fact is that, for the reasons set out by Lord Phillips ... their claims have no real prospect of success. In my view it would have been absurd for the Court of Appeal to have exercised the discretion to disapply section 11 so as to allow the appellants to proceed in circumstances in which the next stage of the litigation would be likely to have been their failure to resist entry against them of summary judgment ..."

24. On 14 November 2012 the Supreme Court made an order relating to the costs of the appeal, which provided that the applicants should pay the MOD's costs of the appeal and that the stay of execution in respect of the previous costs orders should be removed.

7. Subsequent developments

25. Following the above proceedings, one of the applicants (Ms Sinfield) had an absolute right to go forward to trial, since her case had not been found to be time-barred. The other applicants (whose cases had been stayed while the ten test cases went ahead) had to consider whether, in the light of

the Supreme Court's judgment, their claims were time-barred. A certain number of the applicants' claims were not time-barred, because, like Mr Sinfield, they had become ill within three years of the commencement of proceedings. This group of applicants therefore wished to proceed to trial. The other applicants, whose claims were *prima facie* time-barred, took the view that much of the assessment of the Supreme Court, in relation to the question whether to exercise the discretion under section 33 of the 1980 Act, had been concerned with the difficulties that the claimants would face in establishing causation. However, the applicants considered that there was increasing evidence establishing that the illnesses they suffered were caused by exposure during the tests. This group of applicants also wished to proceed to trial.

26. Under the terms of the group litigation order, the MOD's costs of the preliminary limitation proceedings were paid by all the claimants within the group, in equal proportions, whether or not their claims had been brought out of time. In a letter dated 12 September 2012, the MOD insisted that, before pursuing further litigation, the applicants had to obtain ATE insurance to cover them for the MOD's costs should their claims fail. It proved impossible for the applicants to obtain such insurance, since the ATE insurers had already made large payments following the costs orders made by the Court of Appeal and Supreme Court. Legal aid, which was withdrawn in 2005, will not be re-awarded. None of the applicants is in a position to contribute to the funding of the litigation on a private basis. In consequence, none of the applicants' claims proceeded to trial.

B. Relevant domestic law and practice

27. The background to the adoption of the Limitation Act 1980 ("the 1980 Act") is set out in detail in the Court's judgment in *Stubbings and Others v. the United Kingdom*, 22 October 1996, §§ 28-37, *Reports of Judgments and Decisions* 1996-IV.

28. Section 11 of the 1980 Act deals with special time limits for actions in respect of personal injuries and, in its relevant parts, reads as follows:

"11 (1) This section applies to any action for damages for negligence, nuisance or breach of duty (whether the duty exists by virtue of a contract or of provision made by or under a statute or independently of any contract or any such provision) where the damages claimed by the plaintiff for the negligence, nuisance or breach of duty consist of or include damages in respect of personal injuries to the plaintiff or any other person. ...

...

(3) An action to which this section applies shall not be brought after the expiration of the period applicable in accordance with subsection (4) or (5) below.

(4) Except where subsection (5) below applies, the period applicable is three years from—

- (a) the date on which the cause of action accrued; or
- (b) the date of knowledge (if later) of the person injured...”

29. Section 33 of the 1980 Act further provides for discretionary exclusion of the time limit for actions in respect of personal injuries or death in the following terms:

“(1) If it appears to the court that it would be equitable to allow an action to proceed having regard to the degree to which—

- (a) the provisions of section 11 or 12 of this Act prejudice the plaintiff or any person whom he represents; and
- (b) any decision of the court under this subsection would prejudice the defendant or any person whom he represents;

the court may direct that those provisions shall not apply to the action, or shall not apply to any specified cause of action to which the action relates.

(3) In acting under this section the court shall have regard to all the circumstances of the case and in particular to—

- (a) the length of, and the reasons for, the delay on the part of the plaintiff;
- (b) the extent to which, having regard to the delay, the evidence adduced or likely to be adduced by the plaintiff or the defendant is or is likely to be less cogent than if the action had been brought within the time allowed by section 11 or (as the case may be) by section 12;
- (c) the conduct of the defendant after the cause of action arose, including the extent (if any) to which he responded to requests reasonably made by the plaintiff for information or inspection for the purpose of ascertaining facts which were or might be relevant to the plaintiff’s cause of action against the defendant;
- (d) the duration of any disability of the plaintiff arising after the date of the accrual of the cause of action;
- (e) the extent to which the plaintiff acted promptly and reasonably once he knew whether or not the act or omission of the defendant, to which the injury was attributable, might be capable at that time of giving rise to an action for damages;
- (f) the steps, if any, taken by the plaintiff to obtain medical, legal or other expert advice and the nature of any such advice he may have received.

(4) In a case where the person injured died when, because of section 11, he could no longer maintain an action and recover damages in respect of the injury, the court shall have regard in particular to the length of, and the reasons for, the delay on the part of the deceased.

(5) In a case under subsection (4) above, or any other case where the time limit, or one of the time limits, depends on the date of knowledge of a person other than the plaintiff, subsection (3) above shall have effect with appropriate modifications, and shall have effect in particular as if references to the plaintiff included references to any person whose date of knowledge is or was relevant in determining a time limit.

(6) A direction by the court disapplying the provisions of section 12(1) shall operate to disapply the provisions to the same effect in section 1(1) of the Fatal Accidents Act 1976...”

COMPLAINTS

30. The applicants complained under Articles 2 and 6 of the Convention that, despite its size, complexity and importance, neither legal aid nor any other source of funding was made available to allow them to pursue their case and exercise their right of access to the courts. They also complain, under Article 2, that there has been no public investigation into the causes of death of the deceased atomic veterans.

THE LAW

31. The applicants complained of breaches of Articles 2 § 1 and 6 § 1 of the Convention, which provide as follows:

“Article 2 § 1

Everyone’s right to life shall be protected by law. No one shall be deprived of his life intentionally save in the execution of a sentence of a court following his conviction of a crime for which this penalty is provided by law.”

“Article 6 § 1

In the determination of his civil rights and obligations ... everyone is entitled to a fair ... hearing ... by [a] ... tribunal ...”

A. The applicants’ arguments

32. Under Article 2, the applicants submitted that the Court’s case-law provided that the State should carry out a procedural investigation into the accountability of State agents for deaths occurring under their responsibility. However, the effect of the procedure employed by the MOD to have limitation determined as a preliminary issue, together with the effect of the costs orders, meant that there had never been an adequate investigation into the death of Mr Sinfield or other applicants. The applicants complained that notwithstanding the strong *prima facie* case that the veterans were exposed to ionising radiation in harmful quantities and notwithstanding the available evidence on causation, there would be no public inquiry in the United Kingdom and no further scientific investigation on the part of the State. They contended that, apart from the United Kingdom, every atomic power that had conducted atmospheric atomic tests had established a scheme to compensate servicemen suffering from certain illnesses linked to radiation exposure. Such schemes existed in the United States of America, Canada, New Zealand, France, Russia, Australia and China and some of these countries had also held public inquiries into the atomic tests.

33. The applicants accepted that the Government operated a scheme whereby veterans or their dependants suffering illnesses or death caused by

service in the Armed Forces could claim for a pension and that where a veteran applied for a military pension the onus was on the Government to show that the relevant service with the Armed Forces did not cause the relevant illness. Some of the applicants had claimed and been granted pensions; others had had their claims rejected. However, these proceedings did not involve a full inquiry into the circumstances in which the servicemen served, nor did they provide the applicants with an opportunity to make claims for their loss and damage in accordance with the normal principles of English law.

34. The applicants argued under Article 6 that the Court's case-law demonstrated that it would carefully examine a restriction on access to court based on costs to determine whether it pursued a legitimate aim and was proportionate. Moreover, legal aid could be required in civil cases to give effect to the right of access to court. In determining whether legal aid was necessary under Article 6 § 1 in any particular civil case, the Court had attached considerable weight to the rights that were at stake for the applicant in the litigation. In addition, the size and complexity of the case had been held to be an important factor. In the applicants' submission, their case had a strong public interest, because of the number of litigants involved in the group action and also the number of servicemen who had been involved in the tests and who could be similarly affected. Against this background, the Government had a particular obligation to ensure that they could exercise their right of access to court. In a more normal piece of litigation, the prospects of success would be a reasonable condition for the availability of legal aid. However, in a case such as this, the prospects of success could not be a determining factor. The complexity of the scientific evidence and the fact that research was still developing meant that establishing causation would never be straightforward. The importance and scale of the case would still justify the grant of legal aid in general. In addition, the applicants submitted that the size of the costs orders awarded by the national courts amounted to a disproportionate restriction on their right of access to court, because their effect was to ensure that none of the applicants, even those like Ms Sinfield whose claim was not time-barred, was able to take out further ATE insurance and pursue their claims.

35. In the present case, the Government (acting through the MOD) did not succeed in showing that each of the applicants' claims was statute-barred. However, by diverting all the applicants' limited resources into the preliminary issue on limitation, and obtaining costs orders, the Government had effectively prevented the applicants from continuing to trial, despite the fact that the issues about exposure of the applicants to radiation and causation of their illnesses merited examination by a court. The preliminary proceedings on limitation were extremely costly and gave rise to delay. It meant that the applicants' aim to have a full and fair hearing where they could learn the truth about what happened was frustrated. This

was despite the fact that the issue of causation could only fairly be decided when, first, the extent of exposure to radiation had been determined in the light of full disclosure of documents; secondly, the actual illnesses suffered by the applicants had been considered in the light of the exposure each suffered; and, thirdly, other potential causes had been considered, whether for synergistic effect or as competing bases of causation. The applicants contended that it was clear that further medical evidence would come to light which would assist them in proving causation. For example, the Redfearn Report, dated 16 November 2010, had now become available. This showed that the Atomic Weapons Establishment had analysed human tissue in order to assist the Treasury Solicitor, the coroner and families of deceased veterans in investigations following the deaths of atomic veterans. The Report also indicated that there was more material yet to be disclosed by the MOD that would assist in identifying causation in these cases.

B. The Court's assessment

36. The Court observes that, to the extent that the applicants complain that the procedural obligation under Article 2 entails that there should be a public inquiry into the conduct of the nuclear tests and the health consequences for veterans, it does not appear that this point was expressly raised by the applicants in the domestic proceedings. Furthermore, the events which the applicants claim should be investigated took place between 1952 and 1958, before the United Kingdom's Articles 25 and 46 declarations of 14 January 1966 (see, *mutatis mutandis*, *McGinley and Egan v. the United Kingdom*, 9 June 1998, § 68, *Reports of Judgments and Decisions* 1998-III and *L.C.B. v. the United Kingdom*, 9 June 1998, § 35, *Reports of Judgments and Decisions* 1998-III). It would therefore appear that the Article 2 complaint about failure to hold a public inquiry is inadmissible on grounds of non-exhaustion of domestic remedies and incompatibility *ratione temporis* with the scope of the Convention (compare *Varnava and Others v. Turkey* [GC], nos. 16064/90, 16065/90, 16066/90, 16068/90, 16069/90, 16070/90, 16071/90, 16072/90 and 16073/90, ECHR 2009).

37. To the extent that the applicants complain under Article 2 that, following the judgment of the Supreme Court and the adverse costs orders made against them, they have been unable further to pursue their civil claims for damages, the Court considers that this is, in essence, a complaint about lack of access to court, which does not need to be considered separately from the complaint under Article 6.

38. In connection with the Article 6 complaint, the Court recalls that in *Golder v. the United Kingdom* (judgment of 21 February 1975, Series A no. 18, pp. 13-18, §§ 28-36), it held that the procedural guarantees laid down in that Article, concerning fairness, publicity and expeditiousness,

would be meaningless if there were no protection of the pre-condition for the enjoyment of those guarantees, namely, access to a court. It established this as an inherent aspect of the safeguards enshrined in Article 6, referring to the principles of the rule of law and the avoidance of arbitrary power which underlie much of the Convention. Article 6 § 1 “may ... be relied on by anyone who considers that an interference with the exercise of one of his (civil) rights is unlawful and complains that he has not had the possibility of submitting that claim to a tribunal meeting the requirements of Article 6 § 1” (see *Le Compte, Van Leuven and De Meyere v. Belgium*, judgment of 23 June 1981, Series A no. 43, p. 20, § 44). Where there is a serious and genuine dispute as to the lawfulness of such an interference, going either to the very existence or the scope of the asserted civil right, Article 6 § 1 entitles the individual “to have this question of domestic law determined by a tribunal” (see *Sporrong and Lönnroth v. Sweden*, judgment of 23 September 1982, Series A no. 52, p. 30, § 81; see also *Tre Traktörer AB v. Sweden*, judgment of 7 July 1989, Series A no. 159, p. 18, § 40 and, more recently, *Z and Others v. the United Kingdom* [GC], no. 29392/95, § 91, ECHR 2001-V § 91 and *Roche v. the United Kingdom* [GC], no. 32555/96, § 116, ECHR 2005-X).

39. One aspect of the right of access to court is that a litigant is not denied the opportunity to present his or her case effectively before the court and that he or she is able to enjoy equality of arms with the opposing side (see *Airey v. Ireland*, 9 October 1979, § 24, Series A no. 32 and *Steel and Morris v. the United Kingdom*, no. 68416/01, § 59, ECHR 2005-II). Article 6 § 1 leaves to the State a free choice of the means to be used in guaranteeing litigants the above rights. The institution of a legal aid scheme constitutes one of those means but there are others, such as for example simplifying the applicable procedure (see *Airey*, cited above, § 26 and *Steel and Morris*, cited above, § 60). The question whether the provision of legal aid is necessary for a fair hearing must be determined on the basis of the particular facts and circumstances of each case and will depend, *inter alia*, on the importance of what is at stake for the applicant in the proceedings, the complexity of the relevant law and procedure and the applicant’s capacity to represent him or herself effectively (see *Steel and Morris*, cited above, § 61).

40. The right of access to court is not absolute. Where the individual’s access is limited either by operation of law or in fact, the Court will examine whether the limitation imposed impaired the essence of the right and, in particular, whether it pursued a legitimate aim and whether there was a reasonable relationship of proportionality between the means employed and the aim sought to be achieved. If the restriction is compatible with these principles, no violation of Article 6 will arise (see *Z and Others*, cited above, § 93). The Court has considered regulations concerning minors and persons of unsound mind, statutory limitation periods and security for costs

orders to constitute legitimate restrictions on access to court (see *Golder*, cited above, § 39; *Stubbings and Others v. the United Kingdom*, judgment of 22 October 1996, Reports 1996-IV, pp. 1502-03, §§ 51-52; *Tolstoy Miloslavsky v. the United Kingdom*, judgment of 13 July 1995, Series A no. 316-B, pp. 80-81, §§ 62-67). It has also held that it may be acceptable to impose conditions on the grant of legal aid based, *inter alia*, on the financial situation of the litigant or his or her prospects of success in the proceedings. Moreover, it is not incumbent on the State to seek through the use of public funds to ensure total equality of arms between the assisted person and the opposing party, as long as each side is afforded a reasonable opportunity to present his or her case under conditions that do not place him or her at a substantial disadvantage vis-à-vis the adversary (see *Steel and Morris*, cited above, § 62).

41. Turning to the facts of the present case, the Court notes that the applicants were claimants in a group action brought by or on behalf of 1,011 former servicemen who had been present during the nuclear tests carried out by the United Kingdom between 1952 and 1958. Legal aid was initially granted for the investigation of the claims. However, once initial investigations had been carried out, including consultation with experts with a view to obtaining evidence that the claimants' injuries had been caused by their exposure to radiation during or in the immediate aftermath of the nuclear tests, the Legal Services Commission withdrew legal aid because it did not consider that the prospects of the claimants proving their case were sufficiently strong to justify further public money being spent. Nonetheless, the claimants were able to continue with the proceedings, through the negotiation of a conditional fee arrangement with new legal representatives and the purchase of an insurance policy to cover the MOD's costs should they lose the case and become subject to an adverse costs order.

42. The decision was made by the first instance court that the question whether the claims were statute-barred on grounds of delay should be decided as a preliminary issue. This Court has recognised that limitation periods in personal injury cases serve important purposes, namely to ensure legal certainty and finality, protect potential defendants from stale claims which might be difficult to counter and prevent the injustice which might arise if courts were required to decide upon events which took place in the distant past on the basis of evidence which might have become unreliable and incomplete because of the passage of time (see *Stubbings*, cited above, § 51). Given that the claims related to events which occurred in the 1950s, it cannot be said that it was unreasonable of the national court, in 2009, to decide first to examine whether the claims were statute-barred, before proceeding to a trial on the merits.

43. In any event, the fact that the national legislation allows the judge discretion to permit claims which are time-barred but otherwise meritorious to proceed, meant that the causation of the claimants' injuries was a central

issue. Although expert witnesses were not subject to cross-examination, both sides were granted leave to file written expert evidence, which was considered in detail, particularly by Foskett J in his thorough judgment, which ran to some 885 paragraphs. The question of causation was also a key issue in the appeals to the Court of Appeal and the Supreme Court. While some of the judges in the High Court, Court of Appeal and Supreme Court differed as to how the Limitation Act 1980 should be interpreted and applied, they were all agreed that the claimants would face serious difficulties in establishing causation. Indeed, all the judges of the Supreme Court were unanimous in agreeing with Lord Phillips' assessment that the applicants' claims had no reasonable prospects of success. As Lord Brown put it in the Supreme Court, "[t]he plain fact is, despite decades spent urgently trying to assemble a viable case, on the evidence as it stands these claims (in which huge costs have already been expended) are doomed to fail". Indeed, it was conceded before the Supreme Court by counsel for the applicants that they lacked evidence with which to establish a credible case that the alleged injuries were caused by the tests.

44. Since the applicants, through the ten test cases, were able vigorously to pursue their claims as far as the Supreme Court, the Court finds it hard to conclude that they were denied access to court. To the extent that the judgment of the Supreme Court, together with the costs orders and the earlier decision of the Legal Services' Commission to withdraw legal aid, entailed a restriction on access to court, the Court considers that any such restriction pursued a legitimate aim and was proportionate to that aim. The litigation undertaken was complex and very expensive. The Court notes in this connection that the applicants' costs awarded against the MOD at first instance were estimated at GBP 11.8 million and that the MOD's costs before the Court of Appeal, paid by the applicants' insurers, were in excess of GBP 5.6 million. In addition to the millions of pounds of legal fees and expenses incurred by each side in relation to the limitation issue, the costs to the court service in time and resources must have been extensive. Against this background, it was reasonable for the State authorities to decide that no further public money should be spent on funding litigation which objectively appeared to have no reasonable prospects at all of success.

45. The applicants reason that the large number of servicemen who participated in the tests and the complexity and incomplete nature of the scientific evidence were grounds for disapplying the usual rules about withdrawing legal aid in respect of cases with no reasonable prospects of success. The Court does not accept any such requirement incumbent on the State can be derived from Article 6 § 1 of the Convention, for the reasons set out above. Moreover, it considers it relevant that an alternative scheme for the provision of compensation to nuclear test veterans has been established. In proceedings before a tribunal for the award of a military disablement pension, the burden is on the Government to prove that the

claimant's illness was not caused by his or her military service. In the Court's view, it fell within the State's margin of appreciation under Article 6 § 1 to decide to channel public funds into this alternative means of access to a court for the provision of compensation, rather than to continue to provide legal aid to the applicants in respect of further speculative and highly costly litigation in the High Court.

46. It follows that the applicants' complaints under Article 6 § 1 are manifestly ill-founded and therefore inadmissible, pursuant to Article 35 §§ 3 and 4 of the Convention.

For these reasons the Court, unanimously,

Declares the application inadmissible.

Françoise Elens-Passos
Registrar

Ineta Ziemele
President

APPENDIX

Number	Name	Date of Birth	Nationality	Place of Residence
1.	Jean Ethel SINFIELD	09/11/1938	British	Potters Bar
2.	Toni ADAMS	24/06/1935	New Zealand	Blenheim
3.	Paul AHPOY	01/06/1936	Fidjien	Suva
4.	Ngaire ALEXANDER	11/09/1933	New Zealand	Dannevirke
5.	Anne ALLAN	09/07/1936	British	Stockton-on-Tees
6.	Edward ALLEN	04/05/1938	British	Manchester
7.	Elizabeth ALLEN	25/03/1936	British	Whitby
8.	Pamela ALLEN	17/11/1936	New Zealand	Riverton
9.	W V AMUNDSEN	28/09/1935	New Zealand	Carterton
10.	Alfred ANDERSON	18/08/1938	British	Widnes
11.	Ralph ANDERSON	31/03/1937	British	Bristol
12.	Anthony ANNALL	01/02/1939	British	Beverley
13.	Sidney ANNING	03/08/1943	British	Plymouth
14.	Helen APIHAI	16/02/1928	New Zealand	Kawerau
15.	Bernard ARMER	01/04/1939	British	Newton Abbot
16.	George ARMSTRONG	03/03/1936	British	Wallsend
17.	Martyn ASHCROFT	30/04/1936	British	Stoke-on-Trent
18.	Adeline ASHWOOD	05/07/1935	British	Beith
19.	George ASKHAM	20/03/1938	British	Sheffield
20.	Stanley ASPINALL	17/07/1936	British	Bradford-upon-Avon
21.	Bernard ATKIN	03/03/1939	British	Hull
22.	Warren ATKINS	27/04/1937	New Zealand	Auckland
23.	Kathleen Doreen ATKINSON	08/10/1932	British	Plymouth
24.	Raymond ATKINSON	21/07/1938	British	Portsmouth
25.	Garry ATTWOOD	18/01/1938	British	Rotherham
26.	Sheila AUSTEN	01/12/1937	British	Westgate-on-sea
27.	Stephen AUSTEN	01/12/1937	British	Poole
28.	Lorraine AVERY	24/12/1938	New Zealand	Rotorua
29.	Anne AYRES	26/12/1932	British	Barry
30.	Edwina Mary AYRES	26/12/1932	British	South Molton
31.	Filipe Vaka BABENISALA	11/12/1937	Fidjien	Suva
32.	James BADLEY	09/03/1936	British	Sleaford
33.	Elaine BAILEY	23/12/1937	British	Gloucester
34.	Marie BAILEY	27/01/1939	British	Newport City
35.	Llimotama BAKA	18/01/1937	Fidjien	Lautoka
36.	Anare BAKELE	17/08/1938	Fidjien	Tailevu

Number	Name	Date of Birth	Nationality	Place of Residence
37.	Gordon BAKER	19/03/1922	British	Canterbury
38.	Isaia BALEITAVUKI	04/05/1930	Fidjien	Suva
39.	Frederick BALL	25/02/1937	British	Mitcham
40.	Kenneth BALLOCH	04/12/1937	New Zealand	Atawhai Nelson
41.	Terence BAMBRIDGE	04/11/1935	British	Hertford
42.	John BANNISTER	23/09/1935	British	Salisbury
43.	Tevita BARIKACIWA	14/10/1938	Fidjien	Nausori
44.	Michael BARKER	22/12/1938	British	Leyland
45.	Lesley BARLOW	11/08/1921	British	Bury St Edmunds
46.	Peter BARNARD	23/02/1939	British	Scunthorpe
47.	Isaia BARO	24/08/1937	Fidjien	Wainivula
48.	Harold BARWELL	06/04/1938	British	Braunstone
49.	Keler BATAI	02/07/1926	Fidjien	Nausori
50.	Josefa BATIMOKO	30/09/1938	Fidjien	Suva
51.	Wendy BEAR	16/02/1939	British	Sudbury
52.	Marion BEASLEY	11/08/1935	British	Charlton
53.	Molly BECKETT	25/02/1932	British	Barnsley
54.	Kevin BEDDOW	07/05/1935	British	Durham
55.	Deborah BEGG	24/06/1940	British	Dundee
56.	Andrew BELL	21/06/1928	New Zealand	Auckland
57.	Ruth BENSON	07/03/1938	British	Dorchester
58.	Wilfred BESSANT	02/11/1938	British	Clevedon
59.	Morgan BEYNON	05/03/1936	Australian	Trafalgar
60.	Donald BICKERTON	10/07/1933	British	Poole
61.	Donald BICKERTON	01/07/1940	New Zealand	Auckland
62.	Mary BISHOP	16/04/1942	British	Chapel Hall
63.	Richard BISHOP	31/12/1939	New Zealand	Christchurch
64.	Angela BLACK	30/08/1918	British	Norwich
65.	Marion BLACKBURN	08/02/1929	British	Manchester
66.	Patricia BLACKBURN	28/05/1937	British	London
67.	Phyllis BODIE	28/03/1939	British	Wrexham
68.	Maraia BOILA	11/07/1925	Fidjien	Nabua
69.	Ian BOLD	29/08/1938	Canadian	Ontario
70.	Richard BONAS	24/03/1938	British	Glastonbury
71.	Jean BOND	13/04/1933	British	St Leonard's On Sea
72.	Kieran BOOMER	14/12/1935	British	Chorley
73.	Janet Lesley BOOTH	10/05/1937	New Zealand	Auckland
74.	Denise BORTHWICK	13/05/1934	Canadian	New Westminster
75.	Suzy BOWEN	19/08/1930	British	Market Rasen
76.	David BOYFIELD	21/04/1938	British	Worksop

Number	Name	Date of Birth	Nationality	Place of Residence
77.	William BRADLEY	18/08/1931	British	Géraldine
78.	Ronald BRADSHAW	09/07/1938	British	Wigan
79.	Stanley BRADSHAW	06/09/1937	British	Wigston
80.	Terence BRADY	05/06/1932	British	Newcastle-upon-Tyne
81.	Joan BRAIN	17/08/1939	British	Wingate
82.	Malcolm BRAIN	02/07/1937	American	Newport Richey
83.	Kenneth BRAMWELL	22/02/1937	British	Runcorn
84.	Thomas BRANDON	28/03/1938	British	Beith
85.	Gillian BRAY	25/12/1934	British	Plymouth
86.	George BRENNAN	19/04/1938	British	Rhyl
87.	Edward BRIERLEY	18/05/1939	British	Ayr
88.	Harold BROCKEN	05/03/1937	British	Liverpool
89.	Karen BROGAN	03/10/1927	British	Crosby
90.	Peter BROOK	19/12/1936	British	Huddersfield
91.	Dennis BROOKS	05/09/1934	British	Blackpool
92.	Wendy BROTHERS	20/05/1933	British	Sleaford
93.	Allan BROWN	20/05/1938	British	Penmaenmawr
94.	Robert BROWN	09/02/1938	British	Fraserburgh
95.	Betty BRUCE	30/04/1936	British	Thornaby
96.	Charles BRUCE	12/11/1938	British	Crieff
97.	Bill BRYCE	05/04/1937	British	Aberdeen
98.	Gregory BRYDEN	10/05/1937	British	Girvan
99.	Gregory BRYDON	26/08/1931	New Zealand	Auckland
100.	Dorothy Joan BUCKLE	26/08/1928	British	Daventry
101.	Eta BULIMAITOGA	03/07/1932	Fidjien	Suva
102.	Peter BULLEN	08/04/1938	British	Gwynedd
103.	Ronald BURGESS	12/01/1938	British	Ellesmere Port
104.	Sylvia BURNETT	03/02/1935	British	Worthing
105.	Josephine BURNS	06/03/1933	British	Corby
106.	Patrick BURNS	28/10/1937	British	Coventry
107.	Rusiate BUSA	17/02/1941	Fidjien	Lautoka
108.	Brian BUTLER	04/07/1937	British	Hebburn
109.	Trevor BUTLER	07/03/1938	British	Hull
110.	Michael BUTTERS	07/01/1935	British	Greenwich
111.	Viliame CAGILABA	07/12/1934	Fidjien	Ba
112.	Roy CAIN	24/04/1939	British	Isle of Man
113.	William CALDWELL	10/09/1938	British	Glasgow
114.	Maureen CALLENDER	23/03/1938	British	Gwynedd
115.	Maxwell CAMERON	09/04/1934	Australian	Mackay
116.	Nanette CAMPBELL	25/12/1934	British	Stafford

Number	Name	Date of Birth	Nationality	Place of Residence
117.	Robert CARBERY	27/06/1937	British	Isle of Man
118.	Neil CAREY	04/08/1939	New Zealand	Dargaville
119.	Ada CARMAN	28/06/1925	British	Helensburgh
120.	Alvin CARMICHAEL	02/10/1938	British	Hull
121.	Ann Elizabeth CARMICHAEL	29/09/1937	British	Maidstone
122.	Alan CARR	04/10/1934	British	Northants
123.	James CARR	04/10/1934	British	Newcastle
124.	Daphne CARTWRIGHT	30/06/1938	Australian	Tuncurry
125.	Maureen CAW	23/02/1938	British	Wolverhampton
126.	Lynn CAWSE	12/03/1928	British	Plymouth
127.	Setoki CEINATURAGA	25/12/1929	Fidjien	Ovalau
128.	Carol CHAMBERLAIN	05/10/1937	British	New Duston
129.	Mary CHAMBERLAIN	30/10/1936	British	Birmingham
130.	Gil CHAPMAN	02/07/1935	British	Derby
131.	Derek CHAPPELL	30/11/1936	British	Norfolk
132.	June CHARNEY	28/02/1920	British	Eastbourne
133.	Diana CHENEY	24/09/1926	New Zealand	Wellington
134.	John CHESHER	20/07/1935	British	Ripon
135.	Ann CHEW	01/09/1938	British	Birmingham
136.	Raymond CHIMES	04/07/1937	British	Southampton
137.	Alice CLARK	04/04/1938	British	Romford
138.	Ronald CLARK	15/07/1938	British	Cheltenham
139.	Thomas CLARK	21/03/1938	British	Saltash
140.	Keith CLARKE	21/07/1937	British	Stevenage
141.	Richard CLIFFORD	09/10/1938	British	Southwold
142.	William COCKBURN	07/12/1938	British	Berwick on Tweed
143.	Ann COCKCROFT	26/09/1934	British	Gosport
144.	Ernest COCKER	20/02/1936	British	Wirral
145.	Beryl COLE	14/06/1935	British	Colchester
146.	Ronald COLEBY	03/10/1934	British	Brighton
147.	Philip COLEMAN	08/09/1936	British	Birmingham
148.	Charles COLLINS	21/07/1930	British	Dawlish
149.	Gerald COLLINS	27/12/1935	British	Birmingham
150.	Maureen COLLINS	29/08/1935	British	Accrington
151.	Bruce COLLYER	03/12/1937	British	Kent
152.	Katherine CONNERY	17/04/1936	Irish	Limerick
153.	John CONQUEST	20/03/1915	British	Bedford
154.	Roy CONSTABLE	13/04/1935	British	Kettering
155.	Brian COOK	19/08/1938	British	Bridport

Number	Name	Date of Birth	Nationality	Place of Residence
156.	John COOKE	02/10/1937	British	Ammanford
157.	David COOMBER	21/12/1938	British	Maidstone
158.	Patricia COOMBES	10/11/1934	British	Yate
159.	Graham COOPER	30/06/1938	Australian	Kallangur
160.	John COOPER	06/11/1934	British	London
161.	Molly COOPER	19/02/1938	New Zealand	Te Kuiti
162.	Ronald COOPER	29/04/1930	New Zealand	Rotorua
163.	Jean Marion COPELAND	09/05/1937	British	Romford
164.	Carole CORNWELL	25/01/1934	British	Cambridgeshire
165.	Diana COSTIN	21/11/1938	British	St Austell
166.	George COWAN	24/11/1938	New Zealand	Timaru
167.	Naima COWEN	09/05/1933	New Zealand	Paeroa
168.	Brian COWIE	12/05/1937	British	Aberdeen
169.	Jane COWLING	18/09/1938	British	Cheltenham
170.	Allan COX	10/11/1938	British	Burton-on-Trent
171.	Stanley CRAIG	17/08/1933	British	Caernarfon
172.	John CRAWFORD	15/04/1936	New Zealand	Auckland
173.	Margaret Elizabeth CRISP	21/05/1922	British	Hornsea
174.	Rose CROMPTON	25/07/1939	British	Leyland
175.	Terence CRUNDWELL	16/08/1938	British	Hull
176.	Thomas CUNNANE	20/02/1937	British	Wakefield
177.	Jona CURUVAKARUA	30/11/1936	Fidjien	Nausoh
178.	Robyn Maree CUTFIELD	14/08/1934	New Zealand	Whangarei
179.	Wini CUVATOKA	10/08/1938	Fidjien	Suva
180.	Kathleen DADD	06/03/1927	British	Weston-Super-Mare
181.	Margaret DAINES	25/11/1934	American	Alpharetta
182.	David DAVENPORT	02/06/1932	British	Taunton
183.	Allan DAVEY	30/05/1940	Australian	Ipswich
184.	George DAVIES	20/04/1936	British	Sunderland
185.	Sidney DAVIES	01/05/1933	British	Gwent
186.	John DAVIS	27/07/1938	British	Selkirk
187.	Edward DAWES	25/05/1935	British	Darlington
188.	Joan DAY	23/05/1925	British	Cardiff
189.	Paul DE ROSA	20/05/1936	British	Glasgow
190.	Ralph DE ROSA	20/05/1936	British	Glasgow
191.	Geoffrey DEAN	13/09/1937	British	Knaresborough
192.	Esita DEBALEVU	13/04/1933	Fidjien	Nadi Airport
193.	Shirley DENSON	06/04/1932	British	Morden
194.	Fred DENT	26/06/1935	British	Crook
195.	Freda Nellie DENT	05/12/1936	British	Brigg

Number	Name	Date of Birth	Nationality	Place of Residence
196.	Geoffrey DENYER	22/09/1930	Australian	Leabrook
197.	Evelyn DICKINSON	08/06/1938	British	Wakefield
198.	Norman DICKINSON	27/01/1938	British	Earl Shilton
199.	Michael DILWORTH	21/09/1938	British	Buxton
200.	Anthony DIXON	14/02/1940	British	Plymouth
201.	Edith DOBSON	03/10/1938	New Zealand	Cambridge
202.	Elizabeth DONNELLY	02/08/1938	British	Cheshire
203.	Sheila DONNO	17/07/1917	British	Cambridge
204.	Terence DORRALL	24/12/1936	British	Plymouth
205.	Gordon DOWNEY	02/02/1937	British	Hastings
206.	Dree Beryl DOWNIE	28/08/1916	British	Surrey
207.	Kathleen DOWNING	20/11/1936	British	Atherstone
208.	Alan DOWSON	10/05/1938	British	Peterborough
209.	Margaret Catherine Ellen DRAKE	27/01/1934	British	King's Lynn
210.	Charles DUDLEY	21/03/1937	British	Exeter
211.	Neil DUNKERLEY	29/07/1938	British	Oldham
212.	Mary DYTOR	28/06/1938	British	Braunton
213.	Christopher EASTGATE	29/12/1938	British	Woodford Green
214.	Kevin EINON	14/09/1924	British	Abingdon
215.	Helen ELKIN	07/10/1938	British	Nelson
216.	Graham ELLIOTT	05/02/1946	British	Littlehampton
217.	Ronald ELLIOTT	09/01/1938	British	County Durham
218.	Coral ELLIS	28/10/1936	New Zealand	Auckland
219.	Edna ELLIS	05/05/1926	British	Hook
220.	Hilary ELLIS	04/08/1938	British	Hereford
221.	Trevor ELLIS	01/09/1931	British	St. Helens
222.	Terence ELLISON	28/09/1939	British	Leeds
223.	Clifford EMERY	27/10/1936	British	Ayr
224.	Leslie EMERY	22/11/1934	British	Solihull
225.	Murray ENGBRETSSEN	06/01/1940	New Zealand	Bullo
226.	Joan ETHERINGTON	02/08/1932	British	Tuffley
227.	Avril EVANS	04/09/1936	British	Ammanford
228.	Michael EVANS	01/12/1935	British	Gwynedd
229.	Michael EVELEIGH	12/12/1933	British	Exeter
230.	William FAIR	30/01/1937	Australian	Tasmania
231.	Carole FAIRS	01/05/1938	Portuguese	Algarve
232.	Frank FALCONER	01/01/1954	British	Arbroath
233.	Lynda FARR	20/09/1938	British	Bromsgrove
234.	Derek FIDDAMAN	14/12/1936	British	Horsham

Number	Name	Date of Birth	Nationality	Place of Residence
235.	Rosemary FINDLAY	01/06/1937	British	Cowdenbeath
236.	Brian FITZGERALD	21/06/1939	British	Branksome
237.	Enid FITZSIMMONS	04/03/1927	British	Liverpool
238.	Leon FLAVELL	06/05/1934	New Zealand	Dargaville
239.	Reginald FLETCHER	04/11/1938	British	Blidworth
240.	Thomas FOOT	14/10/1934	Australian	Sydney
241.	Agnes FORBES	25/12/1936	British	Cumbernauld
242.	David FORBES	19/03/1930	British	Carlisle
243.	Doreen FORD	31/03/1938	British	Killingbeck
244.	Raymond FORD	08/05/1938	Australian	Queensland
245.	Raymond FORWARD	11/08/1938	British	Sittingbourne
246.	John FRANKLIN	25/09/1935	British	Gravesend
247.	David FREEMAN	21/11/1938	British	Norwich
248.	Erina FREEMAN	06/08/1935	New Zealand	Blenheim
249.	Dennis FURR	04/03/1939	British	Carlton
250.	Temalesi GALALA	08/06/1933	Fidjien	Nadi Airport
251.	David GAMBLE	11/02/1933	New Zealand	Auckland
252.	Lusiana GANILAU	28/07/1919	Fidjien	Suva
253.	Kenith GARDNER	03/04/1923	British	Leicestershire
254.	Pauline GARNHAM	12/05/1938	British	Torquay
255.	Harold GARRETT	03/10/1938	New Zealand	Tauranga
256.	Jean GATWARD	14/05/1937	British	Manchester
257.	Alice GAUL	18/02/1938	British	Llanelli
258.	Brian GAY	22/08/1937	British	Leeds
259.	Michael GAYWOOD	24/11/1936	British	Exeter
260.	Christine GELLENDER-MILLS	13/02/1939	British	Warlingham
261.	Peter GILBODY	13/05/1939	British	Manchester
262.	John GILCHRIST	01/10/1935	British	Dundee
263.	Margaret GILLESPIE	13/06/1937	British	Leeds
264.	Callum GILMOUR	09/02/1939	British	Swansea
265.	William GIRDWOOD	03/04/1940	British	Larkhall
266.	Christine GODBEHERE	25/03/1936	British	Sheffield
267.	George GOLDS	12/10/1928	New Zealand	Auckland
268.	James GOLDSMITH	27/02/1934	New Zealand	Auckland
269.	Mabel GOLDSMITH	29/05/1938	British	Newport
270.	Gerald GOODRIDGE	31/08/1935	British	Crewe
271.	Catherine GORDON	19/06/1928	British	Paisley
272.	Janette GRAFTON	01/06/1937	British	Christchurch
273.	Alistair GRANT	05/07/1939	British	St Albans

Number	Name	Date of Birth	Nationality	Place of Residence
274.	Elizabeth GRAY	09/08/1936	British	Blackpool
275.	Helen GRAY	11/11/1932	British	Gourock
276.	Ismail GRIFFITHS	21/03/1936	British	Cannock
277.	Lindsay GRIFFITHS	21/10/1938	British	Chorley
278.	Ida GRIMES	02/08/1937	New Zealand	Tauranga
279.	Steven GRIMMOND	26/04/1936	British	Dundee
280.	Senimelia GUGUQALI	05/01/1934	Fidjien	Nakasi
281.	Patricia GUIGNET	15/04/1939	British	Liverpool
282.	Peter GUY	18/06/1938	British	Crosby
283.	Rosemary HABERMAN	15/01/1933	British	Hemel Hempstead
284.	Isabel HALL	24/10/1933	British	Berwick-on-Tweed
285.	Ivan HALL	27/07/1939	British	Wareham
286.	Joy HALL	24/01/1933	British	Leicester
287.	Marilyn HALL	19/06/1938	British	Leicester
288.	Stephen HALL	01/04/1938	British	York
289.	Peter HALLEWELL	27/06/1937	British	Tadley
290.	Denzil HANCOCK	21/08/1937	British	Abertillery
291.	Rex HANDCOCK	14/05/1939	New Zealand	Murchison
292.	Joyce HANSEN	25/10/1929	New Zealand	Milford
293.	Lianne Marie HANSON	27/11/1937	British	Manchester
294.	Bernard HARGREAVES	22/06/1939	British	Thondda CynonTaff
295.	Pauline HARGREAVES	20/11/1938	British	Swansea
296.	David HARMAN	11/12/1936	British	Hemel Hempstead
297.	David HARMS	28/06/1935	British	Bolton
298.	Brian HARNOR	11/02/1938	New Zealand	Tauranga
299.	Carol HARRIS	27/08/1938	British	Pontypridd
300.	Malcolm HARRIS	07/11/1938	New Zealand	Masterton
301.	Mary HARRIS	11/05/1932	New Zealand	Auckland
302.	Miriam HARRIS	06/03/1939	British	Hertfordshire
303.	Raymond HARRIS	24/09/1939	American	Edgewater
304.	George HARRISON	09/10/1935	British	Preston
305.	Arthur HART	08/06/1937	British	Warrington
306.	Pauline HART	04/01/1939	British	Southport
307.	Gordon HARVEY	20/09/1937	British	Rugby
308.	Arthur HASELDEN	30/11/1936	Portuguese	Algarve
309.	William HASLOCK	11/03/1937	British	Redcar
310.	William HATFIELD	18/04/1935	British	Middlesbrough
311.	Ahitana HAWEA	29/07/1939	New Zealand	Waipukurau
312.	Colin HAWKER	10/03/1938	British	Stockport
313.	David HAWLEY	21/02/1935	British	Cobham

Number	Name	Date of Birth	Nationality	Place of Residence
314.	Dennis HAYDEN	16/03/1944	British	Lydney
315.	Christina HAYMAN	16/08/1933	New Zealand	Bluff
316.	Carole Anne HAYNES	23/08/1936	British	Exeter
317.	Dawn HAYNES	16/08/1935	British	Hertford
318.	Alister HAYWOOD	22/06/1938	British	Isle of Man
319.	Maurice HEADINGS	31/03/1929	British	London
320.	Derek HEAPS	06/07/1933	British	Castle Donington
321.	Douglas HERN	11/09/1936	British	Spalding
322.	Ann HESS	14/06/1936	British	Skelmersdale
323.	Kenneth HEWITT	14/11/1937	British	Weybridge
324.	Alison HILL	27/12/1938	British	Halesowen
325.	Ronald HILL	02/08/1936	British	Coventry
326.	John HINDMARCH	04/04/1935	British	Hitchin
327.	Mavice HINE	14/04/1919	British	London
328.	John HIRD	23/07/1937	New Zealand	Auckland
329.	Michael HOBSON	30/05/1935	British	Redcar
330.	Geraldine HOLFORD	16/05/1937	British	Stoke-on-Trent
331.	Shaun HOLLINGER	04/05/1929	New Zealand	Auckland
332.	Gwyneth HOLLOWAY	28/05/1937	British	Todmorden
333.	Ronald HOOPER	13/07/1937	British	Fakenham
334.	David HOWARD	28/05/1929	British	Southport
335.	Queenie HOWARD	19/05/1938	British	Bury St.Edmond
336.	Sean HOWARD	20/11/1935	British	Bicester
337.	Peter HUDDLESTONE	29/05/1941	New Zealand	Oamaru
338.	Ernest HUGHES	08/03/1935	British	Bognor Regis
339.	Ann HUME	04/05/1934	British	Newtownards
340.	Ronald HUME	17/11/1938	British	Thornton-Cleveleys
341.	Brian HUNT	14/08/1932	New Zealand	New South Wales
342.	Merle INGRAM	07/02/1937	British	Nuneaton
343.	Ian IRVING	24/11/1938	New Zealand	Warkworth
344.	Stanley JACOBS	10/09/1931	British	Camberley
345.	Allan JAGGARD	30/06/1937	British	Auckland
346.	Donald JAMES	11/06/1938	British	London
347.	Raymond JAMES	11/09/1933	British	Newton Abbot
348.	Colin JEFFERS	23/09/1934	British	Pinner
349.	Dennis JENKINS	18/04/1936	British	Pontypridd
350.	Geoffrey JENKINSON	28/02/1940	British	Norwich
351.	Stanley JENKINSON	12/07/1937	British	Llanfairfechan
352.	Vonivate JIOJI	08/01/1934	Fidjien	Navua
353.	Arlene JOHNSON	13/01/1935	British	Lincoln

Number	Name	Date of Birth	Nationality	Place of Residence
354.	Josephine JOHNSON	11/05/1934	British	Manchester
355.	Raeburn JOHNSON	19/07/1937	British	Oxford
356.	Alice JOHNSTON	24/10/1927	New Zealand	Ohope
357.	Kenneth JOHNSTONE	11/10/1937	British	Salford
358.	Peter JOHNSTONE	22/05/1933	New Zealand	Gisborne
359.	Malcolm JONES	07/04/1920	British	Malvern
360.	Michael JONES	19/05/1938	British	Caldicot
361.	Ralph JONES	16/12/1933	British	Pontypridd
362.	Ani KAIKAIVONU	30/01/1938	Fidjien	Nausori
363.	Kini KAMARUSI	18/01/1933	Fidjien	Nausori
364.	Elesio KANASALUSALU	07/02/1926	Fidjien	Suva
365.	Viniasi KARIKARITU	31/01/1933	Fidjien	Nabalili
366.	James KEAVENY	17/05/1933	British	Bradford
367.	Vorray KEEGAN	27/04/1935	New Zealand	Auckland
368.	Vernon KEEN	28/12/1937	British	Truro
369.	Rex KEEPING	10/01/1935	British	Bicester
370.	Patricia KELLY	23/02/1939	British	Isle of Man
371.	William KELSEY	11/12/1934	Australian	Queensland
372.	Raymond KENNEDY	28/10/1937	British	Northumberland
373.	Lynn KENT	28/02/1934	British	Halstead
374.	June KILBY	19/10/1932	British	Slough
375.	Basil KING	21/07/1935	New Zealand	Christchurch
376.	Colin KING	02/05/1938	British	Norfolk
377.	Raymond KING	12/08/1938	British	Rochester
378.	Thomas KITCHING	11/09/1933	British	Hull
379.	Monica KNOX	04/03/1939	British	Abergavenny
380.	Rupeni KOCOLEVU	04/10/1934	Fidjien	Nausori
381.	Eseroma KURUWALE	19/06/1934	Fidjien	Suva
382.	Geoffrey LAMBIE	23/09/1940	New Zealand	Auckland
383.	Terence LARKIN	10/05/1934	British	Watford
384.	Marieta LASAGAVIGAU	06/04/1931	Fidjien	Suva
385.	Agnes LAW	27/04/1934	British	Mold
386.	Eileen LAWRENCE	26/01/1921	British	Rickmansworth
387.	Thelma LAWRENCE	20/05/1927	New Zealand	Auckland
388.	Andrew LAWSON	27/11/1939	British	Slough
389.	David LE PREVOST	01/12/1935	New Zealand	Auckland
390.	Inoke LEDUA	15/07/1940	Fidjien	Suva
391.	Mereoni LEDUA	26/03/1905	Fidjien	Nabua
392.	Anthony LEE	25/03/1939	British	Mildenhall
393.	Joan LEE	11/12/1935	British	Manchester

Number	Name	Date of Birth	Nationality	Place of Residence
394.	William LENNON	07/07/1937	British	Motherwell
395.	Paul LEVENE	06/05/1937	British	Edgware
396.	Cagimudre LEWENILOVO	27/07/1934	Fidjien	Ba
397.	Elsbeth LEWIS	03/02/1942	British	Swansea
398.	Kate LEWIS	23/07/1933	New Zealand	Wellington
399.	Teresa LEWIS	26/03/1937	British	Swindon
400.	Jeffrey LIDDIATT	28/11/1940	British	Bristol
401.	Kelera LIGAIRI	14/03/1936	Fidjien	Cakaudrove
402.	Emori LIGICA	23/09/1935	Fidjien	Nausori
403.	Anthony LISTER	22/05/1925	New Zealand	Auckland
404.	John LOCKWOOD	19/04/1938	British	Leicestershire
405.	Jeffrey LOFTHOUSE	15/06/1934	British	Todmorden
406.	Catherine LOVATT	08/08/1935	British	Nottingham
407.	Frederick LOVELOCK	13/02/1937	British	Letchworth Garden City
408.	Douglas LOW	13/01/1938	New Zealand	Timaru
409.	Gordon LOWE	02/12/1933	British	Brierley Hill
410.	Leslie LUND	23/07/1935	British	Telford
411.	Muriel MACCROSSEN	16/08/1928	British	Crawley
412.	Mary MACKENZIE	03/12/1931	British	Portree
413.	Christine MADDISON	07/08/1940	British	Oldham
414.	Audrey MAILER	07/01/1939	British	Beverley
415.	Robert MALCOMSON	10/11/1937	Spanish	Alicante
416.	Thomas MALONE	10/01/1938	British	Dundee
417.	Richard MANDLEY	18/09/1938	British	Chatteris
418.	Brian MARCHANT	26/07/1938	British	Brighton
419.	Alan MARKS	05/07/1938	British	Biggin Hill
420.	John MARR	15/09/1938	British	Liverpool
421.	Christopher MARSHALL	06/04/1937	British	St Columb
422.	David MARSHALL	13/12/1936	British	Dereham
423.	William MASSON JNR	06/06/1936	British	Bacup
424.	Samuel MAUCLINE	22/07/1939	Australian	Queensland
425.	Linda MAUGER	19/03/1935	British	Utttoxeter
426.	Dennis MCCANN	23/01/1940	British	Christchurch
427.	Dorothy MCCANN	17/09/1917	New Zealand	Auckland
428.	Margaret MCCANN	15/12/1937	British	Glasgow
429.	Alastair MCCUE	30/04/1936	British	Galashiels
430.	Malcolm MCDONNELL	06/05/1931	British	Rugby
431.	Ken MCGINLEY	18/09/1938	British	Johnstone

Number	Name	Date of Birth	Nationality	Place of Residence
432.	Bede MCGURK	24/02/1937	British	Jarrow
433.	David MCINTYRE	04/07/1939	British	Gainsborough
434.	George MCKECHNIE	11/12/1936	British	Aberdeen
435.	Ruth MCKENZIE	08/10/1916	New Zealand	Waiheke Island
436.	Joan MCLACHLAN	21/12/1918	New Zealand	Auckland
437.	Anne MCLELLAN	18/05/1936	British	Falmouth
438.	Pauline MCLEOD	17/03/1936	Australian	Victoria
439.	Joan MCNAMEE	10/08/1936	British	St Helens
440.	Harry MELIA	13/04/1938	British	Holmesfield
441.	Philipp MERCER	18/04/1938	New Zealand	Porirua
442.	William MIDDLEMASS	04/08/1936	British	Lincoln
443.	Derek MILLERSHIP	02/07/1939	British	Sancton
444.	Susie Hokimate MILLYNN	24/07/1935	New Zealand	Kaikohe
445.	Brian MONK	08/04/1938	British	Plymouth
446.	Lionel MOORE	16/09/1934	British	Norwich
447.	Archibald MORRIS	15/10/1937	British	Johnstone
448.	Ethel MORRIS	08/03/1934	British	Southport
449.	John MORRIS	17/08/1937	British	Bury
450.	Francis MORRISEY	11/04/1930	British	Podsmead
451.	Sheila MOULTON	03/07/1930	British	Hove
452.	Reapi MUALAULAU	30/12/1922	Fidjien	Nadawa
453.	Adi MUALEVU	15/04/1934	Fidjien	Nausori
454.	Keith MULLEN	10/08/1941	British	Dorchester
455.	Margaret MULLEN	01/12/1928	British	Manchester
456.	Jessie MUNN	01/12/1933	British	Glasgow
457.	Dianne MUNRO	22/02/1938	Australian	Wingham
458.	Russell MUNRO	09/08/1934	British	Renfrew
459.	Reginald MURRAY	15/06/1937	New Zealand	Maketu
460.	Asikinasa NABUKAVOU	08/01/1930	Fidjien	Nabua
461.	Milika V NADUVA	17/02/1935	Fidjien	Nausori
462.	Silivakadua NAIKAWAKAWAVESI	05/05/1938	Fidjien	Tailevu
463.	Epeli NAILATIKAU	21/12/1908	Fidjien	Suva
464.	Vereniki NAILOLO	27/08/1915	Fidjien	Narere
465.	Salaciel NAISEVU	14/09/1937	Fidjien	Tailevu
466.	Margaret NAISMITH MORGAN	23/04/1939	British	Lanark
467.	Raijieli NAIVIQA	27/03/1927	Fidjien	Tailevu
468.	Virisila NAIVOWAI	13/08/1936	Fidjien	Tailevu
469.	Bette NATHAN	08/09/1937	British	Nottingham

Number	Name	Date of Birth	Nationality	Place of Residence
470.	Mere NAULU	19/12/1931	Fidjien	Macuata
471.	Silina NAVITI	17/04/1926	Fidjien	Suva
472.	Levani NAWAQA	27/01/1936	Fidjien	Rewa
473.	James NEARY	23/03/1939	British	Mearnskirik
474.	Catherine NETLEY	07/03/1929	British	Troon
475.	Kenneth NEWMAN	12/10/1934	British	Saltburn-by-the-Sea
476.	Christopher NOONE	15/06/1938	British	Brighton
477.	Virginia NORRIS	21/12/1923	British	Stoke-on-Trent
478.	Virginia NORRIS	23/09/1939	British	Stoke-on-Trent
479.	Maureen Francis NORTH	16/10/1936	British	Bedfordshire
480.	John NUTTAL	18/09/1935	British	Bolton
481.	Peter O'DONNELL	03/05/1939	Australian	East Maitland
482.	Margaret ORMROD	20/01/1937	British	St. Helens
483.	Duncan Raymond OSBORNE	27/07/1939	Fidjien	Taveuni
484.	Ronald OWEN	26/04/1936	New Zealand	Auckland
485.	Tina PAINE	15/03/1936	British	Hastings
486.	Barbara PARKINSON	01/08/1935	British	Preston
487.	Alec PARRY	28/02/1930	British	Ross-on-Wye
488.	Roy PARRY	04/11/1930	British	Sittingbourne
489.	Ian PATON	18/03/1937	British	Perth
490.	David PAUL	28/01/1935	British	Swindon
491.	Andrew PAYNE	03/02/1937	British	Mexborough
492.	Brian PAYNE	24/01/1934	British	Spalding
493.	David PEACEY	06/07/1937	British	Cheltenham
494.	Ann PEACOCK	20/03/1935	American	League City
495.	Ronald PEDGE	10/08/1934	British	Lincoln
496.	William PENGELLY	21/04/1934	British	Okehampton
497.	Morlais PHILLIPS	22/02/1936	British	Llantwit Major
498.	David PICKFORD	21/07/1938	British	Torquay
499.	Malcolm PIKE	02/03/1935	British	Bexhill-on-Sea
500.	Edwards PITHERS	18/09/1936	British	Nottingham
501.	Barry PITT	16/11/1937	British	Norfolk
502.	Sheila PLANK	18/09/1933	British	Hawkhurst
503.	Amy POLLARD	06/01/1930	New Zealand	Dannevirke
504.	Stella PRATLEY	25/04/1932	British	Barking
505.	James PRATT	24/04/1937	British	Kingswinford
506.	Sheila PREECE	21/09/1937	British	Stockport
507.	Janet PRICE	07/09/1929	New Zealand	Nelson
508.	Barbara PRIESTLEY	05/06/1935	British	Helston

Number	Name	Date of Birth	Nationality	Place of Residence
509.	Margaret PRING	21/12/1934	British	Kidlington
510.	Isireli QALO	20/05/1937	Fidjien	Nadi Airport
511.	Kelerayani QASEVAKATINI	23/08/1924	Fidjien	Navua
512.	Llisapeci QOLI	25/05/1940	Fidjien	Tacirua
513.	Elden QUALILAWA	28/01/1927	Fidjien	Nausori
514.	Joseph QUINN	06/01/1939	British	Sheffield
515.	Siteri RANOKO	27/05/1928	Fidjien	Rewa
516.	Salamieto RATULECA	18/09/1927	Fidjien	Nausori
517.	Kelera RAVUSUVUSU	30/06/1934	Fidjien	Tailevu
518.	Alan RAYFIELD	04/07/1938	British	Gravesend
519.	Helen REDDY	31/05/1939	British	Wirral
520.	Robert REDMAN	29/08/1935	British	Hebburn
521.	Albert REED	12/02/1937	British	St Andrews
522.	Barry REED	20/11/1936	British	Middlesbrough
523.	Aeron REES	21/09/1937	British	Bridgend
524.	Ann Marie REYNOLDS	27/12/1935	British	King's Lynn
525.	Colin REYNOLDS	08/02/1937	British	Bexhill-on-Sea
526.	Lorraine RHIND	10/02/1937	Australian	Queensland
527.	Lawrence RICHARDS	11/11/1931	British	Haywards Heath
528.	Peter RICHARDSON	30/08/1938	British	Sheffield
529.	Henry RIPLEY	01/10/1929	British	Burnley
530.	Elisabeth RITCHIE	11/04/1940	New Zealand	North Shore City
531.	Dennis ROBBINS	04/07/1937	Australian	Ridgewood
532.	Anthony T ROBERTS	10/06/1928	British	Ardrossan
533.	Gordon ROBERTS	26/02/1939	New Zealand	Omokoroa
534.	Trevor ROBERTS	02/04/1934	British	Coatbridge
535.	Henry ROBERTSON	03/03/1938	British	London
536.	Frances ROBINSON	29/10/1925	New Zealand	Auckland
537.	Randall ROBSON	05/05/1937	British	Houghton-Le-Spring
538.	Michael ROGERSON	02/11/1936	British	Edinburgh
539.	Kelera ROKOBIAU	18/10/1932	Fidjien	Nausori
540.	Seruwaia ROKOLEWASAU	07/06/1931	Fidjien	Lautoka
541.	George ROLTON	27/08/1932	New Zealand	Dunedin
542.	Tekoti ROTAN	25/09/1934	Fidjien	Laucala Beach Estate
543.	Evelyn RUGGLES	10/08/1931	British	Braintree
544.	John RYDER	18/05/1938	British	Lichfield
545.	Michael SAFFERY	18/02/1934	American	Stamford
546.	Joan SANGER	01/11/1935	British	Doncaster

Number	Name	Date of Birth	Nationality	Place of Residence
547.	Ethel SARGEANT	05/07/1943	British	Oldham
548.	Timoci SAUMAKI	16/06/1938	Fidjien	Lami
549.	John SCANLIN	01/08/1940	Australian	Victoria
550.	Catherine SCOTT	18/02/1938	British	Haddington
551.	Elizabeth SCOTT	07/03/1940	British	Dunfermline
552.	James SCOTT	24/08/1936	British	Edinburgh
553.	Robert SCOWCROFT	19/11/1937	British	Bury St Edmunds
554.	Brian SCRUNTON	24/08/1939	Australian	Queensland
555.	Robert SEENEY	24/07/1938	British	Oldbury
556.	Nacanieli SERU	07/05/1936	Fidjien	Lami
557.	John SHARP	26/03/1934	British	Bristol
558.	Denis SHAW	17/04/1937	British	Whitby
559.	James SHAW	16/07/1939	British	Skelmersdale
560.	Raymond SHAW	01/10/1937	British	Dinas Powys
561.	Ronald SHEELEY	31/10/1934	British	Manchester
562.	Martin SHERGOLD	28/01/1938	Australian	Queensland
563.	Anthony SHERIDAN	07/06/1937	British	Westbury Wilts
564.	Gareth SHORT	26/07/1939	British	Abertillery
565.	Peniame SILATOLU	21/05/1937	Fidjien	Rewa Provincial Office
566.	John SIMPSON	05/08/1935	British	Leven
567.	Susan SIMPSON	11/12/1938	British	Cambridge
568.	Joan SKILKY	07/10/1938	British	Widnes
569.	Neil SLINGER	21/08/1939	British	Barton-On-Sea
570.	Alan SMITH	26/02/1936	British	Liverpool
571.	David SMITH	09/12/1936	British	Leicester
572.	David SMITH	18/10/1937	British	Blackpool
573.	John SMITH	28/08/1934	British	Sheffield
574.	John M SMITH	06/06/1933	British	Eaglescliffe
575.	Margaret SMITH	13/03/1936	British	Blackburn
576.	Maurice SMITH	12/02/1938	British	Castle Douglas
577.	Robert SMITH	19/03/1911	British	Wimborne
578.	Robert SMITH	16/07/1938	British	Glasgow
579.	Stewart SMITH	07/07/1938	British	Nottingham
580.	Mereti SOBU	25/05/1929	Fidjien	Tailevu
581.	Noel SORRENSON	03/07/1936	New Zealand	Te Awamutu
582.	Ronald SOUTHARD	30/08/1937	British	Bath
583.	Carolyn SPENCER	20/04/1938	British	Aberdeen
584.	Tony SPOSITO	20/07/1936	British	Plymouth
585.	Harold STEAD	25/03/1938	British	Malton

Number	Name	Date of Birth	Nationality	Place of Residence
586.	Meryl STEVENS	15/08/1939	British	Colne
587.	Leonard STRETTON-ROSE	18/12/1933	British	Chippenham
588.	Clive STRICKETT	13/04/1935	New Zealand	Pirongia
589.	Brian STROUD	27/11/1938	British	Westcliff-on-Sea
590.	Maciu SUGUTURAGA	20/02/1931	Fidjien	Nausori
591.	Laisa SUKA	08/01/1934	Fidjien	Suva
592.	Tulia TABUA	26/03/1932	Fidjien	Nausori
593.	Loata TABUAKARAWA	18/12/1936	Fidjien	Naitasiri
594.	Tere TAHI	07/06/1938	New Zealand	Bulls
595.	Raijieli TAKAYAWA	27/12/1927	Fidjien	Tailevu
596.	Cagi TALICA	25/09/1938	Fidjien	Suva
597.	Samuel TAMS	21/03/1939	British	Crewe
598.	Ronald TANSEY	21/07/1935	New Zealand	Northland
599.	Frederick TASKER	29/05/1939	British	North Allerton
600.	William TASKER	05/09/1936	British	Peterlee
601.	Katherine TATE	12/03/1938	British	Northampton
602.	Cagica TAWAKE	06/08/1935	Fidjien	Nausori
603.	John TAYLOR	24/03/1937	British	South Shields
604.	Maureen TAYLOR	16/02/1929	British	Gloucester
605.	Pamela TAYLOR	01/03/1936	British	London
606.	John TEMPLETON	10/09/1929	British	Plymouth
607.	Paul THACKRAY	04/01/1936	British	Halifax
608.	George THEAKER	04/07/1935	British	Barton-on-Sea
609.	Clifford THOMAS	12/10/1937	Australian	Queensland
610.	William THOMAS	30/04/1938	British	Hereford
611.	Florence THOMPSON	29/03/1939	British	Paignton
612.	James THOMPSON	03/05/1939	British	Stocksfield
613.	Karen THOMPSON	02/01/1939	British	Stockton-on-Tees
614.	Barry THORNTON	09/08/1934	British	Thornton-Cleveleys
615.	Miriama TIKOENALIWALAIA	27/09/1936	Fidjien	Suva
616.	Alena TINAI	31/03/1928	Fidjien	Savusavu
617.	Anasaini TINAIRUVE	31/07/1932	Fidjien	Nasinu
618.	Doris TITMUS	08/05/1925	British	Emsworth
619.	Joeli TOKABOBO	02/04/1931	Fidjien	Nausori
620.	Gillian TOMPKINS	17/09/1929	British	Melksham
621.	Michael TOOMATH	29/06/1938	British	Ohaupo
622.	Brian TORODE	16/10/1937	British	Colchester
623.	Glenys TRIANA	07/03/1934	New Zealand	Rotorua

Number	Name	Date of Birth	Nationality	Place of Residence
624.	Raymond TRING	27/11/1935	British	High Barnet
625.	Apisalome TUILAWAKI	27/05/1928	Fidjien	Suva
626.	Benedito TUIMALABE	08/05/1938	Fidjien	Suva
627.	George TUMMEY	10/06/1937	British	Kidderminster
628.	Patrick TUNNICLIFF	10/02/1929	British	Nelson
629.	Sandra TUNNICLIFFE-JENNER	06/11/1934	British	Plymouth
630.	Wame TURAGA	22/11/1935	Fidjien	Suva
631.	Dereck TURVEY	28/08/1928	New Zealand	Palmerston North
632.	Barry UNDERDOWN	15/02/1938	British	London
633.	Katarina VAKATALE	24/09/1938	Fidjien	Suva
634.	Jone VARIVAL		Fidjien	Lami
635.	Jone VARIVAL	27/12/1935	Fidjien	Lami
636.	Terence VAUGHAN	21/08/1938	British	Leeds
637.	William VAUGHAN	21/06/1938	British	Merseyside
638.	Angela VESSEY	14/02/1939	British	London
639.	Howard VINCENT	29/01/1939	British	Leicester
640.	Brian VOSPER	30/10/1938	British	Dunoon
641.	Josefa VUETI	06/08/1938	Fidjien	Nausori
642.	Kinisimere VULAVOU	20/06/1939	Fidjien	Nabua
643.	Jone VUNIVALU	23/10/1922	Fidjien	Nausori
644.	John WADE	06/12/1938	American	Bradenton
645.	Keith WADSWORTH	29/07/1937	British	Tadcaster
646.	Sylvia WAIGH	08/04/1922	British	Ambleside
647.	Nathaniel WAKEFIELD	02/05/1937	British	Pontefract
648.	Pauline WALKER	13/04/1939	British	Eston
649.	Robert WALLACE	27/09/1930	British	Auckland
650.	Harold WALMSLEY	17/06/1938	British	Holywell
651.	Norman WALSH	28/03/1928	New Zealand	Ashburton
652.	Usaia WAQATAIREWA	27/08/1938	Fidjien	Suva
653.	Thomas WARD	11/05/1929	New Zealand	Auckland
654.	Jennifer WARE	21/08/1938	British	Okehampton
655.	Maria WARNER	09/02/1936	New Zealand	Waitakere
656.	Terence WASHINGTON	04/12/1934	British	Macclesfield
657.	John WATERS	26/09/1935	British	Swansea
658.	Paul WATKIN	12/01/1940	British	Plymouth
659.	David WATKINS	14/12/1938	British	Merthyr Tydfil
660.	Peter WATSON	17/04/1940	Australian	Hillarys
661.	John WATT	28/03/1936	British	North Shore City
662.	Michael WATTS	15/08/1939	Turkish	Antalya

Number	Name	Date of Birth	Nationality	Place of Residence
663.	Arthur WEBB	13/06/1934	British	Winsford
664.	June WELSH	06/01/1929	British	Stirling
665.	Harry WEST	05/09/1931	Canadian	Surrey
666.	Leonard WHISKER	09/11/1940	British	London
667.	Lily Ann WHITE	31/05/1931	British	Alton
668.	Roy WHITE	12/01/1938	British	Spalding
669.	Raymond WHITEHEAD	08/05/1939	Canadian	Ontario
670.	Joan WHITTAKER	09/12/1936	British	Edinburgh
671.	John WHITTON	04/07/1937	Australian	Walleroo
672.	Patrick WICKER	13/03/1938	British	Chatham
673.	Rita WIGG	26/08/1936	British	Luton
674.	James WIGHTMAN	05/09/1937	British	Newcastle upon Tyne
675.	Leslie WILKINS	01/02/1938	British	Watchet
676.	Ronald WILKINS	09/02/1938	British	Longlevens
677.	Shirley WILKINSON	24/06/1932	British	North Shields
678.	Avis WILLARD	02/02/1938	British	St. Leonards-on-Sea
679.	Brian WILLIAMS	13/09/1936	British	Cardiff
680.	Malcolm WILLIAMS	02/06/1938	British	Newport
681.	Peter WILLIAMS	09/12/1939	British	Lincoln
682.	Raymond WILLIAMS	11/07/1939	Australian	Mandurah
683.	Ernest WILLIAMSON	14/11/1937	British	Kilmarnock
684.	Hazel WILLIAMSON	25/04/1937	British	Stoke-on-Trent
685.	Janet WILLIS	16/04/1924	British	Liverpool
686.	Elizabeth WILSON	19/10/1933	British	Heckmondwike
687.	Gail WILSON	27/02/1935	British	Scarborough
688.	James WILSON	29/12/1935	British	Telford
689.	Thomas WILSON	10/08/1932	British	Newcastle upon Tyne
690.	Thomas WILSON	21/06/1935	British	Nottingham
691.	David WOOD	11/12/1937	British	London
692.	Frances WOOD	17/06/1931	British	Swindon
693.	Sandra WOOD	15/06/1932	New Zealand	Auckland
694.	Jack WOODGER	18/04/1935	British	Swindon
695.	Peter WOODHAM	26/03/1928	British	Eastbourne
696.	Patricia WOODMAN	23/05/1938	British	Gosport
697.	Margaret WOODWARD	04/05/1936	British	Jarrow
698.	John WOOLDRIDGE	16/05/1939	British	Fareham
699.	Christopher WORSWICK	21/05/1935	British	Runcorn
700.	David WRIGHT	13/10/1939	British	Bournemouth
701.	James WRIGHT	21/01/1939	British	Victoria
702.	Roy WRIGHT	14/07/1931	British	Cambridge

Number	Name	Date of Birth	Nationality	Place of Residence
703.	Ropate YAGOMATE	21/07/1939	Fidjien	Lautoka
704.	Laurence YEO	30/12/1938	British	Crewe
705.	George YOUNG	31/12/1937	British	Newcastle upon Tyne
706.	George YOUNG	14/12/1938	New Zealand	Helensville
707.	Mark ZEALEY	10/05/1930	British	Canterbury