

A 1999. On 15 December 1999 Mr Alan Berg, a stipendiary magistrate, made anti-social behaviour orders against each of them, which they then appealed. Their appeal was heard in the form of a rehearing by the Crown Court.

B 48 The stipendiary magistrate held that the defendants had acted in a manner which caused or was likely to cause harassment, alarm or distress to one or more persons not of the same household as themselves by offensive, abusive, insulting, threatening and intimidating words and behaviour as well as violent behaviour towards people in the local authority area of Manchester. He also held that an anti-social behaviour order was necessary to protect persons in that area and he made prohibitions against each of them. Dismissing their appeals, the Crown Court made identical orders to those made by the magistrate which prohibited each of them: (1) from entering the Beswick area as defined, edged in red on the map attached;

C (2) from using or engaging in any abusive, insulting, offensive, threatening or intimidating language or behaviour in any public place in the City of Manchester; (3) from threatening or engaging in violence or damage against any person or property within the City of Manchester; (4) from encouraging any other person to engage in any of the acts described in paragraphs 2 and 3 within the City of Manchester.

D 49 The evidence against the defendants consisted in part of direct evidence and in part of hearsay evidence. Four members of the public gave evidence of various acts of anti-social behaviour. One said that he had been abused on one occasion by two of the defendants and that he had been threatened and assaulted on another occasion by the third. The second said that he had been abused on one occasion by one of the defendants, who on the same occasion also assaulted an unknown youth. The third was an employee of a local supermarket who said that on a number of occasions between April and November 1999 she had been abused, threatened, harassed and alarmed by all three defendants. The fourth said that he and his customers had been abused by all three defendants between April and September 1999 and that the defendants had sought to intimidate them. Three police officers also gave evidence. One said that on one occasion the oldest defendant caused alarm and physical danger to others by driving a vehicle recklessly. Another said that on another occasion the same defendant was party to the theft of a bag from a car. A third gave direct evidence of threats and abuse by two of the defendants of a householder by banging on the door and interfering with the electrics of the property. This incident was also the subject of anonymous hearsay evidence. Anonymous hearsay evidence was also given by the police of four other incidents.

E One was burglary of domestic premises by two of the defendants. The second was damage to a motor vehicle by the same two defendants. The third was the throwing of items into the street from scaffolding which they had climbed. The fourth was the abuse by one of them of market stall holders. There was also a hearsay witness statement of the abuse by two of the defendants of firefighters.

H 50 The overall picture which was painted by the evidence was of a prolonged course of behaviour which caused or was likely to cause harassment, alarm or distress to many people in the local government area during this six-month period. The contribution which was made to the picture by the hearsay evidence, while not perhaps crucial, was certainly significant.