

BROOK HOUSE INQUIRY

Sixth Witness Statement of Anna Marie Pincus

I, Anna Marie Pincus, Director of Gatwick Detainee Welfare Group (GDWG), The Orchard, 1-2 Gleneagles Court, Brighton Road, Crawley, RH10 6AD, will say as follows:

1. I make this my sixth statement to respond to requests made by Counsel to the Inquiry (CTI) during the course of my oral evidence on 9 December 2021¹.
2. I was asked about the case summaries² referred to in my first witness statement. Case summary number 1 was about a detained person who reported to GDWG that he had been assaulted by a detention officer that morning. The summary explained that GDWG had sent a complaint to the Home Office, the Independent Monitoring Board (IMB) and referred the detained person to a public law solicitor. CTI asked me if the complaint letters GDWG sent to the Home Office and the IMB led to an investigation. I replied that I would need to look at GDWG's records³.
3. I have checked our records for this detained person and, as indicated in the case summary, GDWG referred him to public law solicitors. GDWG's records do not include any responses from the Home Office or the IMB or indicate what happened following the referral to solicitors. GDWG would have expected the solicitors to advise the client on how to take his complaint further.

¹ Anna Pincus 9 December 2021

² GDW000010

³ Anna Pincus 9 December 2021 67/1-5

4. CTI also asked me whether in writing to the Home Office and the IMB we were raising this as a complaint or as a safeguarding referral and I replied that it was a complaint because the detained person was not suggesting that the officers posed a continuing threat⁴. CTI asked if any safeguarding referral was completed and I replied that it didn't appear so from the summary⁵. I have checked our records since I gave my oral evidence and confirm that the records show a safeguarding referral was not made because it was not considered that a safeguarding issue arose.
5. I was also asked about case summary number 4 which concerned a detained person who presented as mentally very unwell. This did raise safeguarding concerns. The case summary explained: that GDWG sent an email to Brook House healthcare outlining our concerns for the person's mental health and requesting an urgent clinical review; that we did not get a reply; that a few days later in a phone call the detained person told GDWG that he had been hit on the left side of his head by a staff member but he was not fully coherent and did not provide clear information about the incident and that a few days after that when GDWG spoke with him it seemed he was self-harming by banging his head against the wall and presented as having delusions and paranoia; his solicitor raised concerns with Brook House staff but by a week later neither GDWG nor his solicitor had received a response from Brook House and GDWG sent "another email" to the Safer Community Team⁶.
6. CTI asked if GDWG reported the specific allegation that he had been hit in the head by a member of detention staff and I replied that we had and that GDWG had in fact sent two emails to the Safer Community Team about this person⁷. CTI asked if GDWG had considered reporting the allegation to the Home Office

⁴ Anna Pincus 9 December 2021 66/24-25

⁵ Anna Pincus 9 December 2021 67/6-9

⁶ GDW000010_001-002

⁷ Anna Pincus 9 December 2021 68/3-21

and I replied that I wasn't the safeguarding lead at that time and didn't know whether James had considered this (James Wilson was then the Director of GDWG and the safeguarding lead). CTI indicated that it might be useful if I had further email evidence that it be disclosed in due course so that the Inquiry can consider it⁸.

7. I have tried but am unable to access the emails James Wilson sent about this client but the pages from the GDWG case notes for this client contain the wording of the first email James sent to the Safer Communities Team and the second email was simply a repeat of the first email. Copies of the relevant case notes are exhibited to this statement as 'AMP4'. From these notes it appears there is a mistake in our case summary which incorrectly stated that the first email was sent to healthcare whereas it seems it was in fact sent to the Safer Communities Team. And there was a mistake in my oral evidence in that it seems neither email referred to the allegation that the detained person had been hit in the head by a member of detention staff. However, the first email did raise explicit safeguarding concerns that the detained person had significant problems with his understanding and communication; high levels of emotional distress and anxiety which was increasing and he had been self-harming by banging his head. From the records it appears we had no responses from the Safer Communities Team to either email.
8. It appears James did not contact the Home Office about this client. I imagine this was because we had raised safeguarding concerns with G4S.
9. CTI asked me whether GDWG made any referral about the incident referred to in case summary number 6 which concerned a person who reported he had been injured by escort staff (from Tascor) two days previously during an attempt to transfer him to another IRC and that G4S staff had recommended he report the

⁸ Anna Pincus 9 December 2021 70/7-19

matter. I replied to CTI that I did not know if GDWG had made a referral⁹. I have checked GDWG's records and it appears GDWG did not report this complaint to Tascor or the Home Office. The case notes do not give a reason for this but it is likely to have been because the detained person did not want us to make a complaint. Unlike case summary 4 above, it did not appear to raise safeguarding concerns such that we would have made a safeguarding referral in the absence of consent.

10. Likewise, CTI asked whether GDWG reported to anyone the incident mentioned in case summary 7 which involved a detained person being injured to the head by G4S and/or escort staff when he resisted removal to another detention centre. I replied that I did not know what action GDWG took in response¹⁰. I have checked the GDWG records for this person and it appears that we did not report the matter. Again, this is likely to be because the detained person did not want us to make a complaint and from the notes it did not appear to raise such a level of concern that we would have made a safeguarding referral in the absence of consent. Our records show that we were told he left Brook House 4 days later.
11. CTI also referred to paragraph 73 of my first statement to the Inquiry which mentioned that one of the detained people who appeared in Panorama reported to GDWG something of the incident he was involved in. CTI asked if I was able to tell what steps GDWG took in response to that. I replied that I did not know but would report to the Inquiry after checking GDWG's database¹¹. Having checked our records I can confirm that what the detained person reported to us did not raise a safeguarding concern. He reported that he was held in segregation under Rule 40 and he asked GDWG to find out why he was held under Rule 40. However, he was removed from the UK shortly after and it appears GDWG had not written to G4S before he was removed.

⁹ Anna Pincus 9 December 2021 74/8-19

¹⁰ Anna Pincus 9 December 2021 74/20-25 to 75/1-13

¹¹ Anna Pincus 9 December 2021 93/19-25 to 94/1-5

12. Finally, CTI also asked me to comment on any changes GDWG has made to policies and procedures in order to get a better understanding of what was shown in Panorama. I replied that there had been many changes and that it was a difficult question to answer¹².
13. I understand the CTI's question might be addressing whether GDWG has made changes to policies and procedures which reduce the chances of mistreatment of the type shown in Panorama occurring.
14. Since Panorama we have recruited a new trustee with a social work background who worked with us to develop a safeguarding strategy. As set out in my first statement¹³, we had a robust policy on safeguarding during the relevant period, which included safeguarding training of volunteers and staff. Since the relevant period, we have developed our safeguarding strategy to include online training as well as the in-person training we hold for volunteers. We hold safeguarding training twice a year and safeguarding is a standing item on the agendas for local volunteer support group meetings, staff team meetings and trustee meetings.
15. As mentioned in my fifth statement, we were invited by Serco to attend their monthly Safer Communities Meetings where issues and trends relating to vulnerable detained people are discussed. Our Senior Advocacy Co-ordinator, Karris Hamilton, attended these meetings held in January, February and March 2022. The meetings have helped us to learn more about how these issues are managed in the Centres and we have used the meetings to gain clarification and to discuss concerns about the welfare of detained persons based on what we have learnt from our clients. However, during the negotiations over the content of a Memorandum of Understanding about our access to Brook House, the Home Office have declined to give us permission to attend these meetings. I exhibit to

¹² Anna Pincus 9 December 2021 121/19-25 to 122/1-9

¹³ DPG000002_00015 para 34

this statement as ‘AMP5’ my recent email exchanges with Mr Haughton of Serco, and Simon Murrell of the Home Office, on this issue. Mr Haughton in his email to me of 28 April 2022 commented “*I did find it helpful to have Karris in the meetings, she made a number of useful comments, suggestions and had positive inputs*”. I continue to believe that our attendance at these meetings would be assist in reducing the risk of abuse occurring in Brook House.

16. As I mentioned in my third witness statement it would also be helpful if we could attend the Vulnerable Residents Meetings where the needs and circumstances of individual vulnerable detained people are discussed. At present we report concerns about clients to Serco, but if in addition to immediate reports, we were able to discuss individuals at the Vulnerable Residents Meetings, we would have the opportunity for dynamic discussions about our individual clients’ welfare.
17. We now have regular quarterly meetings with the Brook House IMB whereas we did not do so during the relevant period. These meetings are undoubtedly helpful in sharing between the two organisations information about the experience of detained people at Brook House.
18. It is the experience of GDWG that detained people remain reticent to make official complaints about their treatment in detention. However, whilst our clients usually do not want to make a complaint, we are now logging on our database more detail of the treatment they complain of. We now record information in the knowledge that it could be used later whereas in the relevant period our entries were simply to share information with other caseworkers, and to remind ourselves, what a client had reported and steps we had taken. Recording the additional detail will enable us to identify trends and to quantify prevalence of issues and we can use this information when we are consulted by other organisations, such as prior to an HMIP inspection, and when we report issues to Serco, the IMB, the Home Office, HMIP and the CQC.

19. We held training about complaints for our volunteers early in 2022 in response to the evidence disclosed during the Inquiry. We think our volunteers can play a key role in informing detained people about their options to make formal complaints if they wish to do so.
20. Having, during the Inquiry, heard the evidence of the severity of abuse and mistreatment of detained people, we have reflected on whether the psychological support we provide for our staff members is sufficient. We have discussed this with the psychologist who supports our staff team, and we are now developing a greater focus on the well-being of our staff.

<u>Statement of Truth</u>	
<p>I believe that the facts stated in this witness statement are true. I understand that proceedings for contempt of court may be brought against anyone who makes, or causes to be made, a false statement in a document verified by a statement of truth without an honest belief in its truth.</p> <p>I am content for this witness statement to form part of the evidence before the Brook House Inquiry and to be published on the Inquiry's website.</p>	
Name	Anna Pincus
Signature	<div style="border: 1px dashed black; padding: 2px; display: inline-block;"> Signature </div> <small>Anna Pincus (Jun 10, 2022 02:17 GMT+1)</small>
Date	9 June 2022

Witness Name: Anna Marie Pincus
 Statement No: 6
 Exhibits: 2

BROOK HOUSE INQUIRY

Sixth Witness Statement of Ms Anna Marie Pincus

EXHIBIT “AMP4”

This is the Exhibit marked “**AMP4**” to the Sixth Witness Statement of Anna Marie Pincus.

Witness Name: Anna Marie Pincus
Statement No: 6
Exhibits: 2

GDWG Case Study 4 – case notes

Added by	Wilson, James
With Contact	[REDACTED]
Assigned to	
Subject	Further Steps from today
Location	
Date	[REDACTED] 2017 12:00 AM
Duration	
Activity Status	Completed
Details	<p>Following Anna's conversations with X and Theresa at MJ, I emailed Theresa some more details about our concerns re X. Theresa asked for more information on our reasons for thinking X was particularly unwell and vulnerable rather than just very angry. [REDACTED] spoke with Theresa by phone, and we [REDACTED] and I) agreed to write a letter summarising our concerns, and send to both the Safer Community team at Brook, and to MJ. Text of letter below. Enclosed authority form. Theresa emailed back shortly after to say that she didn't think there was anything MJ could add at this point. Brook House IRC Healthcare By email only to: [REDACTED] DPA [REDACTED]</p> <p>2017 Dear Sir/Madam X Dob: [REDACTED] I am writing to express concern about Mr X and to request an urgent clinical review of his current condition. I have concerns about Mr X's understanding of his current situation and am therefore disclosing information about him to you in the absence of his consent. In summary Mr X has been in contact with Gatwick Detainee's Welfare Group since [REDACTED] 2017. During our initial face to face meeting with him and numerous telephone calls since that date we have observed the following issues of concern: ♣ Significant problems with his understanding including: incoherent, pressured and monotone speech, being unable to answer simple questions and an inability within a short conversation to respond in a way that suggested an understanding of the content of our discussions or a reciprocity of conversation; ♣ Difficulties with social communication which do not appear to be associated with a language barrier: including a marked lack of eye contact and repeatedly returning to a repetitive and set narrative concerning his personal history when speaking to us; ♣ High levels of emotional distress and anxiety at all times when we have been in contact with him. We have also been highly concerned that Mr X has been self-harming by banging his head during his most recent telephone calls to us. His levels of distress appear to be escalating within the 9 days in which we have had contact with him. Mr X has expressed a wish to be moved to a different, quieter room where he has access to a television. It sounds as though he is finding it very difficult to cope with the pressures of being on E wing. I enclose a copy of Mr X's authority form. I would be grateful if you would confirm receipt of this letter and update me with your conclusions</p>

	upon reviewing Mr X. Yours faithfully James Wilson Director Gatwick Detainees Welfare Group
Added by	Pincus, Anna
With Contact	[REDACTED]
Assigned to	Pincus, Anna
Subject	AP spoke to Theresa at MJ
Location	
Date	[REDACTED] 2017 12:00 AM
Duration	
Activity Status	Completed
Details	Asked us to write with our concerns about how he is presenting. She will write to Healthcare and ask them to urgently reassess in light of this. Described concerning observations. Asked James to write to Theresa. She said the way he is means he may not be fit to fly (he clearly isn't). Described his crazed banging and shouting.
Added by	[REDACTED]
With Contact	[REDACTED]
Assigned to	
Subject	email from theresa
Location	
Date	[REDACTED] 2017 12:00 AM
Duration	
Activity Status	Completed
Details	Dear [REDACTED], I thought the letter that was sent to Brook House healthcare on Thursday was very good. Given we haven't seen him, I don't think there was anything we could add to that. Did you receive a response? If not, you may consider whether to also alert the Home Office. That's quite a big decision to make since he has not given you consent to do so. (I don't know how he reacts when you raise issues like this with him). I hope that we can assess him, but we don't have anyone available immediately. Are you also considering what the options are on his immigration case? It would be good to have an idea of what the plan would be once there is a medical assessment and also while we are waiting for one. It looks like he could be removable (I think the removal rate for [REDACTED] is fairly high). Thanks Theresa

Priority	Normal
Added by	
With Contact	
Assigned to	
Subject	James repeat letter to safer community team
Location	
Date	2017 12:00 AM
Duration	
Activity Status	Completed
Details	
Priority	Normal

BROOK HOUSE INQUIRY

Sixth Witness Statement of Ms Anna Marie Pincus

EXHIBIT “AMP5”

This is the Exhibit marked “**AMP5**” to the Sixth Witness Statement of Anna Marie Pincus.

Witness Name: Anna Marie Pincus
Statement No: 6
Exhibits: 2

From: Haughton, Daniel <[redacted] DPA >
Sent: 26 April 2022 08:50
To: Anna Pincus <[redacted] DPA >
Subject: RE: GDWG update

Serco Business

Hi Anna,

Attached is the final, having checked my emails I cannot see if I sent this to you to approve.
Can you let me know if you are ok with this please

Kind Regards

Dan Haughton
Gatwick IRC
Assistant Director Safeguarding
Justice & Immigration
Serco UK and Europe

DPA

<https://www.serco.com/gatwickirc>



Disclaimer

This e-mail and any attachments are for the intended addressee(s) only and may contain confidential and/or privileged material. If you are not a named addressee, do not use, retain or disclose such information. This email is not guaranteed to be free from viruses and does not bind Serco in any contract or obligation. Serco Limited. Registered in England and Wales. No: 242246. Registered Office: Serco House, 16 Bartley Wood Business Park, Hook, Hampshire RG27 9UY United Kingdom.

From: Anna Pincus <[redacted] DPA >
Sent: 23 April 2022 00:21
To: Haughton, Daniel <[redacted] DPA >
Subject: [EXTERNAL] GDWG update

ATTENTION EXTERNAL

Hi Dan,

How are you? Well, I hope.

I'm just writing to ask whether you have heard back on the MOU? We are keen to start our drop-in sessions in the Welfare room as you know.

Will it be possible for Karris to attend the next Safer Community meeting?

Thanks so much for an update and all good wishes,

Anna

Anna Pincus (she/her)

Director GDWG

www.gdwg.org.uk

Charity No. 1124328

This message is intended for the use of only the intended recipient to whom it is addressed. It may contain information that is privileged and confidential. Accordingly, any dissemination, distribution, copying or other use of this message or any of its content by any person other than the intended recipient may constitute a breach of civil or criminal law and is strictly prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender as soon as possible. Although it is believed that this email and any attachments are virus free, GDWG accept no liability for any damage sustained as a result of software viruses and therefore recommend that virus checks are performed to confirm this.

From: Haughton, Daniel <[REDACTED]>
Sent: 28 April 2022 14:01
To: Anna Pincus <[REDACTED]>
Subject: RE: GDWG update

Serco Business

Hi Anna

I did find it helpful to have Karris in the meetings, she made a number of useful comments, suggestions and had positive inputs

Kind Regards

Dan Haughton
Gatwick IRC
Assistant Director Safeguarding
Justice & Immigration
Serco UK and Europe

[REDACTED]

<https://www.serco.com/gatwickirc>



Disclaimer

This e-mail and any attachments are for the intended addressee(s) only and may contain confidential and/or privileged material. If you are not a named addressee, do not use, retain or disclose such information. This email is not guaranteed to be free from viruses and does not bind Serco in any contract or obligation. Serco Limited. Registered in England and Wales. No: 242246. Registered Office: Serco House, 16 Bartley Wood Business Park, Hook, Hampshire RG27 9UY United Kingdom.

From: Anna Pincus <[REDACTED]>
Sent: 28 April 2022 13:33
To: Haughton, Daniel <[REDACTED]>
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Re: GDWG update

ATTENTION EXTERNAL

Hi Dan,

Thanks so much. When I write to Simon, would it be true to say Serco found it helpful to have Karris attending? Would that be overstating? I don't wish to misrepresent you, but if there was a positive form of words I could share about how it was having GDWG in the

meetings, that might be helpful.

Many thanks for your advice,

Anna

Anna Pincus (she/her)
Director GDWG
Refugee Tales
www.gdwg.org.uk
www.refugeetales.org
www.28for28.org

“Human beings have to be more ingenious than this, and more generous. We’ve got to come up with a better answer.” - Ali Smith in *‘Winter’*

Please contribute to our Walking Inquiry into immigration detention - [Walking Inquiry — Refugee Tales](#)

Please become a [Friend](#) of GDWG

Logos



Charity No. 1124328

This message is intended for the use of only the intended recipient to whom it is addressed. It may contain information that is privileged and confidential. Accordingly, any dissemination, distribution, copying or other use of this message or any of its content by any person other than the intended recipient may constitute a breach of civil or criminal law and is strictly prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender as soon as possible. Although it is believed that this email and any attachments are virus free, GDWG accept no liability for any damage sustained as a result of software viruses and therefore recommend that virus checks are performed to confirm this.

From: Haughton, Daniel <[redacted] DPA >
Sent: 28 April 2022 12:19
To: Anna Pincus <[redacted] DPA >
Subject: RE: GDWG update

Serco Business

Hi Anna

Thanks for acknowledging. The safer community meetings are disappointing. It was Simon Murrell that informed me about the safer community meetings but not sure if he made the decision.

Kind Regards

Dan Haughton
Gatwick IRC
Assistant Director Safeguarding
Justice & Immigration
Serco UK and Europe

DPA

<https://www.serco.com/gatwickirc>



Disclaimer

This e-mail and any attachments are for the intended addressee(s) only and may contain confidential and/or privileged material. If you are not a named addressee, do not use, retain or disclose such information. This email is not guaranteed to be free from viruses and does not bind Serco in any contract or obligation. Serco Limited, Registered in England and Wales. No: 242246. Registered Office: Serco House, 16 Bartley Wood Business Park, Hook, Hampshire RG27 9UY United Kingdom.

From: Anna Pincus <DPA>
Sent: 28 April 2022 11:24
To: Haughton, Daniel <DPA>
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Re: GDWG update

ATTENTION EXTERNAL

Hi Dan,

Just to confirm safe receipt of the MOU latest draft. I'll review today and get back to you, just wanted to acknowledge. Thanks for sending over, I hadn't seen it before. Sorry to see the Safer Communities meetings aren't on there. Do you know who in the Home Office refused that so I can write to them directly?

Many thanks,

Anna

Anna Pincus (she/her)
Director GDWG

www.gdwg.org.uk

From: [Anna Pincus](#)
To: [Simon Murrell](#)
Subject: GDWG and MOU Ref Deighton Pierce Glynn:MA:4247/001
Date: 28 April 2022 14:08:44

CAUTION: This email originated from outside your organization. Exercise caution when opening attachments or clicking links, especially from unknown senders.

Dear Simon,

I hope you are well.

GDWG is currently working on a MOU with Serco and I understand from Dan Haughton you have been sighted on this. We have had positive communications with Dan over the MOU and our first draft with Serco included that GDWG would attend Safer Community meetings. After the Home Office saw this draft, attendance at Safer Community meetings was removed from the MOU at the request of the Home Office. I'm writing to request consideration of this being re-introduced before we sign off on the current MOU draft.

When meetings were removed from the MOU, whoever authorised may not have been aware that GDWG had attended three Safer Community meetings this year. This came about after the IMB suggested we request to attend in our regular catch-up sessions with them. I wrote to Dan Haughton to ask how he found it including Karris, our senior staff member, in the meetings and he replied '**I did find it helpful to have Karris in the meetings, she made a number of useful comments, suggestions and had positive inputs**'. I hope that knowing this is the case will enable you to authorise inclusion of the meetings in the MOU.

From our point of view, attending them is consistent with the MOU directive that GDWG should share safeguarding information since in addition to reporting urgent matters and sending emails about all issues as they arise, we realise safeguarding is very dynamic. It is also the case that sometimes someone we have visited may spiral down in their well-being and this is where the pastoral support of our visitors can be a meaningful intervention that is helpful in its impact when cases come to our attention in the meetings.

Hoping this assists you reinstate in the MOU that GDWG may attend the meetings.

All good wishes,

Anna

Anna Pincus (she/her)
Director GDWG

www.gdwg.org.uk

From: Simon Murrell <[REDACTED] DPA>
Sent: 29 April 2022 11:50
To: Anna Pincus <[REDACTED] DPA>
Subject: RE: GDWG and MOU

Good morning Anna,

I am well thank you, I hope you are too.

Thank you for your email, I understand your reasons for wishing to attend the Safer Community meetings. This was taken out of the MOU by my policy colleagues and I do not have the level of authority to reinstate this.

As we are keen to move at pace on the MOU I have asked Dan to return an amend version to me next week. The final version requires sign of by Phil Riley, when it goes to him I will attach your email for his consideration on the Safer Community meetings.

Regards
Simon



**Immigration
Enforcement**

Simon Murrell
Service Delivery Manager - Gatwick IRCs & PDA
Assistant Director - Detention & Escorting Services

Home Office Immigration Enforcement
Brook House IRC, Perimeter Road South, Gatwick, RH6 0PQ
[REDACTED] DPA