1	Friday, 10 December 2021	1	in your statement so that the transcriber can put them
2	(9.30 am)	2	in, but in paragraph 25 [sic] of your 2018 statement,
3	MR LIVINGSTON: Good morning, chair. We will now be hearing	3	you say that, in July 2016, just after taking up your
4	from James Wilson, if he can be sworn, please.	4	post, you met with Dan Haughton of G4S, Paul Gasson from
5	MR JAMES WILSON (affirmed)	5	the Home Office and Neil Davies, who I think was G4S
6	Examination by MR LIVINGSTON	6	head of visits at the time?
7	MR LIVINGSTON: Mr Wilson, you gave a statement to the	7	A. Yes, that's correct.
8	inquiry on 15 November 2021. Chair, that's at	8	Q. You say that you were told at that point that G4S were
9	<dpg000003> and I ask for that to be adduced in full,</dpg000003>	9	keen that your work centred on social visits; is that
10	please.	10	right?
11	Mr Wilson, that's the one at tab 1 of your bundle.	11	A. Yes, that's correct.
12	Then, Mr Wilson, you also gave a statement in other	12	Q. Throughout your time as director of GDWG, was that
13	proceedings as part of a judicial review claim	13	a common theme?
14	in September 2018. That's at reference <gdw000001>.</gdw000001>	14	A. Very common theme, very much, yes.
15	I ask for that to be adduced in full as well, please,	15	Q. Is it fair to say that there was some dispute between
16	chair. Mr Wilson, I will refer to this as your 2018	16	you and your organisation and G4S and the Home Office as
17	statement. Hopefully it will be clear, as I'm asking	17	to the limits of GDWG's role?
18	questions, which statement I'm referring to, but if	18	A. Yes, very much so.
19	I have ever not made that clear, then just ask, please.	19	Q. You say that you then met Ben Saunders, who was the
20	A. Thank you.	20	director of Brook House of Gatwick IRCs, actually,
21	Q. Because those two statements are adduced into evidence,	21	in August 2016. You refer to this at paragraph 26 of
22	I won't be going through every paragraph in each of your	22	your 2018 statement. Do you remember what was discussed
23	statements in full, but I will just be asking you to	23	then with Mr Saunders?
24	focus on some issues.	24	A. Yes. I'm not certain on this point, but I think the
25	Is it correct, Mr Wilson, that your current role is	25	previous meeting, that first meeting, I had with
	Page 1		Page 3
	1 45€ 1		1 age 5
1	as deputy director of Detention Action?	1	Paul Gasson and Dan Haughton and Neil Davies was
2	A. Yes, that's correct.	2	prompted by me. I had just come into post.
3	Q. But from June 2016 to December 2018, you were the	3	I understood from my predecessor that the
4	director of Gatwick Detainees Welfare Group?	4	relationship that there could be work done on the
5	A. Yes, that's right.	5	relationship. I reached out to them for that meeting.
6	Q. GDWG. In that role, in summary, you were responsible	6	I think Ben Saunders then subsequently contacted me
7	for the charity's day-to-day operations, strategic	7	directly and asked for a meeting, but I'm not certain on
8	activities, line managing other staff members, working	8	that point. I remember the meeting being fairly
9	with volunteers and front-line work, including visits to	9	amenable, but he did very much emphasise that he saw our
10	detained people?	10	role as being there to do social visits, as they would
11	A. Yes, that's correct.	11	repeatedly put that, only, and he would refer to this
12	Q. We heard evidence from Ms Pincus yesterday she was	12	was also a common theme of meetings, three particular
13	the senior advocacy coordinator at the time. Were you	13	instances from the past where he felt we had stepped
14	her manager at the time?	14	over certain lines.
15	A. Yes, that's correct.	15	Q. When you had taken up your role in the summer of 2016,
16	Q. But did you also do the type of drop-in sessions that	16	when you were given your handover I assume there was
17	she talked about doing?	17	some sort of handover. How was the relationship with
1.0	A V., I J.J	18	G4S and the Home Office described to you at that point?
18	A. Yes, I did.	1	
18	Q. Firstly, I want to ask you, for contextual purposes,	19	A. In my handover with my predecessor, I think his phrase
		19 20	A. In my handover with my predecessor, I think his phrase was that we didn't really have a relationship with
19	Q. Firstly, I want to ask you, for contextual purposes,		
19 20	Q. Firstly, I want to ask you, for contextual purposes, about the relationship between your organisation and G4S	20	was that we didn't really have a relationship with
19 20 21	Q. Firstly, I want to ask you, for contextual purposes, about the relationship between your organisation and G4S and the Home Office prior to the relevant period. You	20 21	was that we didn't really have a relationship with management. I subsequently learnt about the draft MoU
19 20 21 22	Q. Firstly, I want to ask you, for contextual purposes, about the relationship between your organisation and G4S and the Home Office prior to the relevant period. You will know that the relevant period is April 2017	20 21 22	was that we didn't really have a relationship with management. I subsequently learnt about the draft MoU that had happened in the previous month before
19 20 21 22 23	Q. Firstly, I want to ask you, for contextual purposes, about the relationship between your organisation and G4S and the Home Office prior to the relevant period. You will know that the relevant period is April 2017 to August 2017.	20 21 22 23	was that we didn't really have a relationship with management. I subsequently learnt about the draft MoU that had happened in the previous month before I started, but my predecessor phrased it as there wasn't
19 20 21 22 23 24	Q. Firstly, I want to ask you, for contextual purposes, about the relationship between your organisation and G4S and the Home Office prior to the relevant period. You will know that the relevant period is April 2017 to August 2017.  Looking, first, and you don't need to turn to it	20 21 22 23 24	was that we didn't really have a relationship with management. I subsequently learnt about the draft MoU that had happened in the previous month before I started, but my predecessor phrased it as there wasn't really a relationship and he said it would be very good

1	Q. So you saw, upon taking up the role, that there was an	1	we were in frequent contact with. We usually had a very
2	importance of building up a relationship with both G4S	2	good relationship with the welfare individual welfare
3	and the Home Office?	3	officers and had very positive impressions of them, and
4	A. Yeah. Just for sort of context, my previous role to	4	our impressions of them were always that they
5	that had been as a service manager at the Red Cross	5	invariably, I think, that they were doing a very good
6	Family Tracing Service in London. We were going into	6	job but were very stretched, very short staffed. They
7	detention at the Heathrow centres and my team, that	7	were very positive about this idea. But the proposal
8	team, had had some success in increasing access to the	8	was then escalated and it was then declined by
9	centre there for family tracing purposes. So I guess	9	management.
10	I had some, perhaps naive, perhaps slightly arrogant,	10	Q. Did they ever give you a reason for why it was declined?
11	optimism, but I thought that I could help us build	11	A. No. I think I said in the statement I checked back and
12		12	I couldn't find wasn't able to find, even while at
13	a more cordial relationship.  Q. Thanks, Mr Wilson. Just one thing. You will know that	13	, and the second se
		14	GDWG, a sort of written list of reasons, but it was
14	the transcribers are taking a note of everything you		Dan Haughton and Michelle Brown, I understand, that
15	say. If you try and slow down just a little bit.	15	turned that down. I think the only reasons we were
16	A. Oh, of course.	16	given was that there was no need, and that the welfare
17	Q. It is obviously very normal, and I would do the same,	17	officers wouldn't have capacity to support us then
18	but if you can try to do that, I think that would be	18	coming in and doing that role.
19	appreciated.	19	Q. So they were suggesting that you being there alongside
20	In your 2018 statement, you say that, after that	20	the welfare office might increase the amount of work
21	meeting with Ben Saunders so that was summer 2016.	21	that the welfare office had to do, whereas your point,
22	Then coming on to 2017, in February 2017, you tried to	22	presumably, was that it might actually decrease the
23	secure the use of a desk in Brook House alongside	23	amount of work that the welfare office had to do?
24	welfare officers. Was that in the welfare office?	24	A. We felt confident it would decrease that work and,
25	A. Yes.	25	indeed, that was the impression we were getting from the
	Page 5		Page 7
	1 age 3		r age /
1	Q. What was the reception to that proposal at that time; do	1	welfare officers themselves.
1 2	Q. What was the reception to that proposal at that time; do you remember?	1 2	welfare officers themselves.  Q. Did you consider that that response from G4S was
2	you remember?	2	Q. Did you consider that that response from G4S was
2 3	you remember?  A. So this — it was not — there was precedent for that	2 3	Q. Did you consider that that response from G4S was a genuine one? Do you think that they genuinely thought
2 3 4	you remember?  A. So this – it was not – there was precedent for that happening, we knew, from other organisations. Actually,	2 3 4	Q. Did you consider that that response from G4S was a genuine one? Do you think that they genuinely thought that it would increase the work and thought that there
2 3 4 5	you remember?  A. So this — it was not — there was precedent for that happening, we knew, from other organisations. Actually, again, in my Red Cross role, we'd managed to do that, to	2 3 4 5	Q. Did you consider that that response from G4S was a genuine one? Do you think that they genuinely thought that it would increase the work and thought that there was no need, or did you see that as an excuse or a fig leaf?
2 3 4 5 6	you remember?  A. So this — it was not — there was precedent for that happening, we knew, from other organisations. Actually, again, in my Red Cross role, we'd managed to do that, to start having some access in the welfare area at	2 3 4 5 6	<ul><li>Q. Did you consider that that response from G4S was a genuine one? Do you think that they genuinely thought that it would increase the work and thought that there was no need, or did you see that as an excuse or a fig leaf?</li><li>A. It's hard to speculate.</li></ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7	you remember?  A. So this — it was not — there was precedent for that happening, we knew, from other organisations. Actually, again, in my Red Cross role, we'd managed to do that, to start having some access in the welfare area at Heathrow, and I know there were other charities,	2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>Q. Did you consider that that response from G4S was a genuine one? Do you think that they genuinely thought that it would increase the work and thought that there was no need, or did you see that as an excuse or a fig leaf?</li> <li>A. It's hard to speculate.</li> <li>Q. Sorry, Mr Wilson, I don't really want you to speculate</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	you remember?  A. So this — it was not — there was precedent for that happening, we knew, from other organisations. Actually, again, in my Red Cross role, we'd managed to do that, to start having some access in the welfare area at Heathrow, and I know there were other charities, including my current employers, Detention Action, at Heathrow, who have a similar arrangement where they have	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>Q. Did you consider that that response from G4S was a genuine one? Do you think that they genuinely thought that it would increase the work and thought that there was no need, or did you see that as an excuse or a fig leaf?</li> <li>A. It's hard to speculate.</li> <li>Q. Sorry, Mr Wilson, I don't really want you to speculate now. It's more, you know, at the time, that was the</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	you remember?  A. So this — it was not — there was precedent for that happening, we knew, from other organisations. Actually, again, in my Red Cross role, we'd managed to do that, to start having some access in the welfare area at Heathrow, and I know there were other charities, including my current employers, Detention Action, at Heathrow, who have a similar arrangement where they have times to go into the welfare space.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>Q. Did you consider that that response from G4S was a genuine one? Do you think that they genuinely thought that it would increase the work and thought that there was no need, or did you see that as an excuse or a fig leaf?</li> <li>A. It's hard to speculate.</li> <li>Q. Sorry, Mr Wilson, I don't really want you to speculate now. It's more, you know, at the time, that was the response. What was your thinking when you got that</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	you remember?  A. So this — it was not — there was precedent for that happening, we knew, from other organisations. Actually, again, in my Red Cross role, we'd managed to do that, to start having some access in the welfare area at Heathrow, and I know there were other charities, including my current employers, Detention Action, at Heathrow, who have a similar arrangement where they have times to go into the welfare space.  Q. Just to clarify, you were aware that other NGOs —	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	<ul> <li>Q. Did you consider that that response from G4S was a genuine one? Do you think that they genuinely thought that it would increase the work and thought that there was no need, or did you see that as an excuse or a fig leaf?</li> <li>A. It's hard to speculate.</li> <li>Q. Sorry, Mr Wilson, I don't really want you to speculate now. It's more, you know, at the time, that was the response. What was your thinking when you got that response?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	you remember?  A. So this — it was not — there was precedent for that happening, we knew, from other organisations. Actually, again, in my Red Cross role, we'd managed to do that, to start having some access in the welfare area at Heathrow, and I know there were other charities, including my current employers, Detention Action, at Heathrow, who have a similar arrangement where they have times to go into the welfare space.  Q. Just to clarify, you were aware that other NGOs —  A. In other centres.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>Q. Did you consider that that response from G4S was a genuine one? Do you think that they genuinely thought that it would increase the work and thought that there was no need, or did you see that as an excuse or a fig leaf?</li> <li>A. It's hard to speculate.</li> <li>Q. Sorry, Mr Wilson, I don't really want you to speculate now. It's more, you know, at the time, that was the response. What was your thinking when you got that response?</li> <li>A. I didn't think I didn't know exactly what was behind</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	you remember?  A. So this — it was not — there was precedent for that happening, we knew, from other organisations. Actually, again, in my Red Cross role, we'd managed to do that, to start having some access in the welfare area at Heathrow, and I know there were other charities, including my current employers, Detention Action, at Heathrow, who have a similar arrangement where they have times to go into the welfare space.  Q. Just to clarify, you were aware that other NGOs —  A. In other centres.  Q. — in other centres had a desk or some sort of presence	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>Q. Did you consider that that response from G4S was a genuine one? Do you think that they genuinely thought that it would increase the work and thought that there was no need, or did you see that as an excuse or a fig leaf?</li> <li>A. It's hard to speculate.</li> <li>Q. Sorry, Mr Wilson, I don't really want you to speculate now. It's more, you know, at the time, that was the response. What was your thinking when you got that response?</li> <li>A. I didn't think I didn't know exactly what was behind it. I don't think it surprised us in the context of</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	you remember?  A. So this — it was not — there was precedent for that happening, we knew, from other organisations. Actually, again, in my Red Cross role, we'd managed to do that, to start having some access in the welfare area at Heathrow, and I know there were other charities, including my current employers, Detention Action, at Heathrow, who have a similar arrangement where they have times to go into the welfare space.  Q. Just to clarify, you were aware that other NGOs —  A. In other centres.  Q. — in other centres had a desk or some sort of presence in the welfare office, which means inside the actual	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>Q. Did you consider that that response from G4S was a genuine one? Do you think that they genuinely thought that it would increase the work and thought that there was no need, or did you see that as an excuse or a fig leaf?</li> <li>A. It's hard to speculate.</li> <li>Q. Sorry, Mr Wilson, I don't really want you to speculate now. It's more, you know, at the time, that was the response. What was your thinking when you got that response?</li> <li>A. I didn't think I didn't know exactly what was behind it. I don't think it surprised us in the context of other messages we had around sort of suspicions or lack</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	you remember?  A. So this — it was not — there was precedent for that happening, we knew, from other organisations. Actually, again, in my Red Cross role, we'd managed to do that, to start having some access in the welfare area at Heathrow, and I know there were other charities, including my current employers, Detention Action, at Heathrow, who have a similar arrangement where they have times to go into the welfare space.  Q. Just to clarify, you were aware that other NGOs —  A. In other centres.  Q. — in other centres had a desk or some sort of presence in the welfare office, which means inside the actual centre; yes?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>Q. Did you consider that that response from G4S was a genuine one? Do you think that they genuinely thought that it would increase the work and thought that there was no need, or did you see that as an excuse or a fig leaf?</li> <li>A. It's hard to speculate.</li> <li>Q. Sorry, Mr Wilson, I don't really want you to speculate now. It's more, you know, at the time, that was the response. What was your thinking when you got that response?</li> <li>A. I didn't think I didn't know exactly what was behind it. I don't think it surprised us in the context of other messages we had around sort of suspicions or lack of clarity around our work.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	you remember?  A. So this — it was not — there was precedent for that happening, we knew, from other organisations. Actually, again, in my Red Cross role, we'd managed to do that, to start having some access in the welfare area at Heathrow, and I know there were other charities, including my current employers, Detention Action, at Heathrow, who have a similar arrangement where they have times to go into the welfare space.  Q. Just to clarify, you were aware that other NGOs —  A. In other centres.  Q. — in other centres had a desk or some sort of presence in the welfare office, which means inside the actual centre; yes?  A. Yes, which has numerous advantages, not least — you	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>Q. Did you consider that that response from G4S was a genuine one? Do you think that they genuinely thought that it would increase the work and thought that there was no need, or did you see that as an excuse or a fig leaf?</li> <li>A. It's hard to speculate.</li> <li>Q. Sorry, Mr Wilson, I don't really want you to speculate now. It's more, you know, at the time, that was the response. What was your thinking when you got that response?</li> <li>A. I didn't think I didn't know exactly what was behind it. I don't think it surprised us in the context of other messages we had around sort of suspicions or lack of clarity around our work.</li> <li>I didn't the reasons didn't make sense because</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	you remember?  A. So this — it was not — there was precedent for that happening, we knew, from other organisations. Actually, again, in my Red Cross role, we'd managed to do that, to start having some access in the welfare area at Heathrow, and I know there were other charities, including my current employers, Detention Action, at Heathrow, who have a similar arrangement where they have times to go into the welfare space.  Q. Just to clarify, you were aware that other NGOs —  A. In other centres.  Q. — in other centres had a desk or some sort of presence in the welfare office, which means inside the actual centre; yes?  A. Yes, which has numerous advantages, not least — you know, we always referred to — I'm sure we will talk	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>Q. Did you consider that that response from G4S was a genuine one? Do you think that they genuinely thought that it would increase the work and thought that there was no need, or did you see that as an excuse or a fig leaf?</li> <li>A. It's hard to speculate.</li> <li>Q. Sorry, Mr Wilson, I don't really want you to speculate now. It's more, you know, at the time, that was the response. What was your thinking when you got that response?</li> <li>A. I didn't think I didn't know exactly what was behind it. I don't think it surprised us in the context of other messages we had around sort of suspicions or lack of clarity around our work.  I didn't the reasons didn't make sense because our impressions were the welfare area was very busy,</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	you remember?  A. So this — it was not — there was precedent for that happening, we knew, from other organisations. Actually, again, in my Red Cross role, we'd managed to do that, to start having some access in the welfare area at Heathrow, and I know there were other charities, including my current employers, Detention Action, at Heathrow, who have a similar arrangement where they have times to go into the welfare space.  Q. Just to clarify, you were aware that other NGOs —  A. In other centres.  Q. — in other centres had a desk or some sort of presence in the welfare office, which means inside the actual centre; yes?  A. Yes, which has numerous advantages, not least — you know, we always referred to — I'm sure we will talk about our drop-in surgery arrangements. They were	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>Q. Did you consider that that response from G4S was a genuine one? Do you think that they genuinely thought that it would increase the work and thought that there was no need, or did you see that as an excuse or a fig leaf?</li> <li>A. It's hard to speculate.</li> <li>Q. Sorry, Mr Wilson, I don't really want you to speculate now. It's more, you know, at the time, that was the response. What was your thinking when you got that response?</li> <li>A. I didn't think I didn't know exactly what was behind it. I don't think it surprised us in the context of other messages we had around sort of suspicions or lack of clarity around our work. <ol> <li>I didn't the reasons didn't make sense because our impressions were the welfare area was very busy, there were large numbers of vulnerable people, we were</li> </ol> </li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	you remember?  A. So this — it was not — there was precedent for that happening, we knew, from other organisations. Actually, again, in my Red Cross role, we'd managed to do that, to start having some access in the welfare area at Heathrow, and I know there were other charities, including my current employers, Detention Action, at Heathrow, who have a similar arrangement where they have times to go into the welfare space.  Q. Just to clarify, you were aware that other NGOs —  A. In other centres.  Q. — in other centres had a desk or some sort of presence in the welfare office, which means inside the actual centre; yes?  A. Yes, which has numerous advantages, not least — you know, we always referred to — I'm sure we will talk about our drop-in surgery arrangements. They were never, in my time, truly drop-in because people had to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>Q. Did you consider that that response from G4S was a genuine one? Do you think that they genuinely thought that it would increase the work and thought that there was no need, or did you see that as an excuse or a fig leaf?</li> <li>A. It's hard to speculate.</li> <li>Q. Sorry, Mr Wilson, I don't really want you to speculate now. It's more, you know, at the time, that was the response. What was your thinking when you got that response?</li> <li>A. I didn't think — I didn't know exactly what was behind it. I don't think it surprised us in the context of other messages we had around sort of suspicions or lack of clarity around our work.</li> <li>I didn't — the reasons didn't make sense because our impressions were the welfare area was very busy, there were large numbers of vulnerable people, we were seeing lots of clients, so there was a need, and, again,</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	you remember?  A. So this — it was not — there was precedent for that happening, we knew, from other organisations. Actually, again, in my Red Cross role, we'd managed to do that, to start having some access in the welfare area at Heathrow, and I know there were other charities, including my current employers, Detention Action, at Heathrow, who have a similar arrangement where they have times to go into the welfare space.  Q. Just to clarify, you were aware that other NGOs —  A. In other centres.  Q. — in other centres had a desk or some sort of presence in the welfare office, which means inside the actual centre; yes?  A. Yes, which has numerous advantages, not least — you know, we always referred to — I'm sure we will talk about our drop—in surgery arrangements. They were never, in my time, truly drop—in because people had to prebook appointments. A desk in the welfare area	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>Q. Did you consider that that response from G4S was a genuine one? Do you think that they genuinely thought that it would increase the work and thought that there was no need, or did you see that as an excuse or a fig leaf?</li> <li>A. It's hard to speculate.</li> <li>Q. Sorry, Mr Wilson, I don't really want you to speculate now. It's more, you know, at the time, that was the response. What was your thinking when you got that response?</li> <li>A. I didn't think I didn't know exactly what was behind it. I don't think it surprised us in the context of other messages we had around sort of suspicions or lack of clarity around our work. <ol> <li>I didn't the reasons didn't make sense because our impressions were the welfare area was very busy, there were large numbers of vulnerable people, we were seeing lots of clients, so there was a need, and, again, it wasn't again, if they'd spoken to the welfare</li> </ol> </li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	you remember?  A. So this — it was not — there was precedent for that happening, we knew, from other organisations. Actually, again, in my Red Cross role, we'd managed to do that, to start having some access in the welfare area at Heathrow, and I know there were other charities, including my current employers, Detention Action, at Heathrow, who have a similar arrangement where they have times to go into the welfare space.  Q. Just to clarify, you were aware that other NGOs —  A. In other centres.  Q. — in other centres had a desk or some sort of presence in the welfare office, which means inside the actual centre; yes?  A. Yes, which has numerous advantages, not least — you know, we always referred to — I'm sure we will talk about our drop-in surgery arrangements. They were never, in my time, truly drop-in because people had to prebook appointments. A desk in the welfare area further into the centre could be a genuine drop-in where	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>Q. Did you consider that that response from G4S was a genuine one? Do you think that they genuinely thought that it would increase the work and thought that there was no need, or did you see that as an excuse or a fig leaf?</li> <li>A. It's hard to speculate.</li> <li>Q. Sorry, Mr Wilson, I don't really want you to speculate now. It's more, you know, at the time, that was the response. What was your thinking when you got that response?</li> <li>A. I didn't think I didn't know exactly what was behind it. I don't think it surprised us in the context of other messages we had around sort of suspicions or lack of clarity around our work. <ul> <li>I didn't the reasons didn't make sense because our impressions were the welfare area was very busy, there were large numbers of vulnerable people, we were seeing lots of clients, so there was a need, and, again, it wasn't again, if they'd spoken to the welfare officers, I don't think they would have said, "We don't</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	you remember?  A. So this — it was not — there was precedent for that happening, we knew, from other organisations. Actually, again, in my Red Cross role, we'd managed to do that, to start having some access in the welfare area at Heathrow, and I know there were other charities, including my current employers, Detention Action, at Heathrow, who have a similar arrangement where they have times to go into the welfare space.  Q. Just to clarify, you were aware that other NGOs —  A. In other centres.  Q. — in other centres had a desk or some sort of presence in the welfare office, which means inside the actual centre; yes?  A. Yes, which has numerous advantages, not least — you know, we always referred to — I'm sure we will talk about our drop—in surgery arrangements. They were never, in my time, truly drop—in because people had to prebook appointments. A desk in the welfare area further into the centre could be a genuine drop—in where people could come, so much more accessible, particularly	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>Q. Did you consider that that response from G4S was a genuine one? Do you think that they genuinely thought that it would increase the work and thought that there was no need, or did you see that as an excuse or a fig leaf?</li> <li>A. It's hard to speculate.</li> <li>Q. Sorry, Mr Wilson, I don't really want you to speculate now. It's more, you know, at the time, that was the response. What was your thinking when you got that response?</li> <li>A. I didn't think I didn't know exactly what was behind it. I don't think it surprised us in the context of other messages we had around sort of suspicions or lack of clarity around our work.</li> <li>I didn't the reasons didn't make sense because our impressions were the welfare area was very busy, there were large numbers of vulnerable people, we were seeing lots of clients, so there was a need, and, again, it wasn't again, if they'd spoken to the welfare officers, I don't think they would have said, "We don't have capacity to support this charity being there". So</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	you remember?  A. So this — it was not — there was precedent for that happening, we knew, from other organisations. Actually, again, in my Red Cross role, we'd managed to do that, to start having some access in the welfare area at Heathrow, and I know there were other charities, including my current employers, Detention Action, at Heathrow, who have a similar arrangement where they have times to go into the welfare space.  Q. Just to clarify, you were aware that other NGOs —  A. In other centres.  Q. — in other centres had a desk or some sort of presence in the welfare office, which means inside the actual centre; yes?  A. Yes, which has numerous advantages, not least — you know, we always referred to — I'm sure we will talk about our drop—in surgery arrangements. They were never, in my time, truly drop—in because people had to prebook appointments. A desk in the welfare area further into the centre could be a genuine drop—in where people could come, so much more accessible, particularly to vulnerable clients.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>Q. Did you consider that that response from G4S was a genuine one? Do you think that they genuinely thought that it would increase the work and thought that there was no need, or did you see that as an excuse or a fig leaf?</li> <li>A. It's hard to speculate.</li> <li>Q. Sorry, Mr Wilson, I don't really want you to speculate now. It's more, you know, at the time, that was the response. What was your thinking when you got that response?</li> <li>A. I didn't think — I didn't know exactly what was behind it. I don't think it surprised us in the context of other messages we had around sort of suspicions or lack of clarity around our work.</li> <li>I didn't — the reasons didn't make sense because our impressions were the welfare area was very busy, there were large numbers of vulnerable people, we were seeing lots of clients, so there was a need, and, again, it wasn't — again, if they'd spoken to the welfare officers, I don't think they would have said, "We don't have capacity to support this charity being there". So those didn't make sense, those reasons.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	you remember?  A. So this — it was not — there was precedent for that happening, we knew, from other organisations. Actually, again, in my Red Cross role, we'd managed to do that, to start having some access in the welfare area at Heathrow, and I know there were other charities, including my current employers, Detention Action, at Heathrow, who have a similar arrangement where they have times to go into the welfare space.  Q. Just to clarify, you were aware that other NGOs —  A. In other centres.  Q. — in other centres had a desk or some sort of presence in the welfare office, which means inside the actual centre; yes?  A. Yes, which has numerous advantages, not least — you know, we always referred to — I'm sure we will talk about our drop—in surgery arrangements. They were never, in my time, truly drop—in because people had to prebook appointments. A desk in the welfare area further into the centre could be a genuine drop—in where people could come, so much more accessible, particularly to vulnerable clients.  But, sorry, to answer your question, the response	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>Q. Did you consider that that response from G4S was a genuine one? Do you think that they genuinely thought that it would increase the work and thought that there was no need, or did you see that as an excuse or a fig leaf?</li> <li>A. It's hard to speculate.</li> <li>Q. Sorry, Mr Wilson, I don't really want you to speculate now. It's more, you know, at the time, that was the response. What was your thinking when you got that response?</li> <li>A. I didn't think I didn't know exactly what was behind it. I don't think it surprised us in the context of other messages we had around sort of suspicions or lack of clarity around our work. <ol> <li>I didn't the reasons didn't make sense because our impressions were the welfare area was very busy, there were large numbers of vulnerable people, we were seeing lots of clients, so there was a need, and, again, it wasn't again, if they'd spoken to the welfare officers, I don't think they would have said, "We don't have capacity to support this charity being there". So those didn't make sense, those reasons.</li> <li>Q. Coming on to a meeting that you had in March 2017, so</li> </ol></li></ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	you remember?  A. So this — it was not — there was precedent for that happening, we knew, from other organisations. Actually, again, in my Red Cross role, we'd managed to do that, to start having some access in the welfare area at Heathrow, and I know there were other charities, including my current employers, Detention Action, at Heathrow, who have a similar arrangement where they have times to go into the welfare space.  Q. Just to clarify, you were aware that other NGOs —  A. In other centres.  Q. — in other centres had a desk or some sort of presence in the welfare office, which means inside the actual centre; yes?  A. Yes, which has numerous advantages, not least — you know, we always referred to — I'm sure we will talk about our drop—in surgery arrangements. They were never, in my time, truly drop—in because people had to prebook appointments. A desk in the welfare area further into the centre could be a genuine drop—in where people could come, so much more accessible, particularly to vulnerable clients.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>Q. Did you consider that that response from G4S was a genuine one? Do you think that they genuinely thought that it would increase the work and thought that there was no need, or did you see that as an excuse or a fig leaf?</li> <li>A. It's hard to speculate.</li> <li>Q. Sorry, Mr Wilson, I don't really want you to speculate now. It's more, you know, at the time, that was the response. What was your thinking when you got that response?</li> <li>A. I didn't think — I didn't know exactly what was behind it. I don't think it surprised us in the context of other messages we had around sort of suspicions or lack of clarity around our work.</li> <li>I didn't — the reasons didn't make sense because our impressions were the welfare area was very busy, there were large numbers of vulnerable people, we were seeing lots of clients, so there was a need, and, again, it wasn't — again, if they'd spoken to the welfare officers, I don't think they would have said, "We don't have capacity to support this charity being there". So those didn't make sense, those reasons.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	you remember?  A. So this — it was not — there was precedent for that happening, we knew, from other organisations. Actually, again, in my Red Cross role, we'd managed to do that, to start having some access in the welfare area at Heathrow, and I know there were other charities, including my current employers, Detention Action, at Heathrow, who have a similar arrangement where they have times to go into the welfare space.  Q. Just to clarify, you were aware that other NGOs —  A. In other centres.  Q. — in other centres had a desk or some sort of presence in the welfare office, which means inside the actual centre; yes?  A. Yes, which has numerous advantages, not least — you know, we always referred to — I'm sure we will talk about our drop—in surgery arrangements. They were never, in my time, truly drop—in because people had to prebook appointments. A desk in the welfare area further into the centre could be a genuine drop—in where people could come, so much more accessible, particularly to vulnerable clients.  But, sorry, to answer your question, the response	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>Q. Did you consider that that response from G4S was a genuine one? Do you think that they genuinely thought that it would increase the work and thought that there was no need, or did you see that as an excuse or a fig leaf?</li> <li>A. It's hard to speculate.</li> <li>Q. Sorry, Mr Wilson, I don't really want you to speculate now. It's more, you know, at the time, that was the response. What was your thinking when you got that response?</li> <li>A. I didn't think I didn't know exactly what was behind it. I don't think it surprised us in the context of other messages we had around sort of suspicions or lack of clarity around our work. <ol> <li>I didn't the reasons didn't make sense because our impressions were the welfare area was very busy, there were large numbers of vulnerable people, we were seeing lots of clients, so there was a need, and, again, it wasn't again, if they'd spoken to the welfare officers, I don't think they would have said, "We don't have capacity to support this charity being there". So those didn't make sense, those reasons.</li> <li>Q. Coming on to a meeting that you had in March 2017, so</li> </ol></li></ul>

1	were invited to this meeting by Mr Gasson of	1	A. It felt very joint. It didn't, in terms of it felt
2	the Home Office, I think, and he said that he had some	2	like, in this case, three people from the same
3	concerns about some staff and volunteers within GDWG and	3	organisation very much on the same page.
4	he wanted to meet to clarify the role that GDWG carry	4	Q. Building on that, what was your impression at this
5	out in the centre and if that needed to be revisited.	5	stage so we are talking just before the relevant
6	You address this a little in your statement at	6	period about the relationship between, if not G4S and
7	paragraph 29, but, in summary, is it right that	7	the Home Office as a whole, at least between these
8	Mr Gasson, Mr Haughton and Mr Skitt were all there?	8	people who were employees of G4S and the Home Office?
9	Mr Gasson of the Home Office and Mr Haughton and	9	A. I don't think I had a sense, at that sort of management
10	Mr Skitt of G4S?	10	level, of there being as I say, there was very much
11	A. Yes, that's correct.	11	a sense certainly we got at these meetings, which was my
12	Q. They referred, as you said in your statement, to some of	12	main contact with management, they were very much, yeah,
13	the historical complaints that were raised about GDWG,	13	on the same page. So there wasn't a sense of I mean,
14	so about someone giving a witness statement in support,	14	for example, one could be in that situation and get the
15	someone standing surety for a detainee and that you were	15	sense of G4S that there being a tension between the
16	sometimes not obtaining consent about repeat drop-ins,	16	parties or all coming from slightly different angles.
17	and an accusation that your organisation had been giving	17	I didn't get that sense.
18	legal advice. Is that right?	18	Q. In your experience prior to taking up this role and sort
19	A. Yes, that's correct.	19	of up until this point, what would you have expected
20	Q. How did you feel about that meeting at the time; do you	20	so we know that Brook House was run by G4S, but the
21	recall?	21	Home Office have overall responsibility for it. Did you
22	A. I remember I mean, I note from the emails and this	22	have any expectation about how you would encounter those
23	was a trend that happened at later meetings that	23	two organisations?
24	I was trying to ask when these requests came from the	24	A. No. Possibly I think I was a little surprised from
25	IRC management for these meetings, I would try to ask	25	the first meeting. I mean, Paul Gasson was a very
			, ,
	Page 9		Page 11
1	C	1	Table I was a law or of the control of the control of
1	for more information about what had prompted it and they	1	I think more or less constant figure at the meetings
2	were reluctant to share things ahead of the meeting,	2	that I had during my time at GDWG. I think I was
2	were reluctant to share things ahead of the meeting, which made it difficult, because I couldn't you know,	2 3	that I had during my time at GDWG. I think I was initially surprised that there was necessarily
2 3 4	were reluctant to share things ahead of the meeting, which made it difficult, because I couldn't you know, I couldn't look into any concerns they might have had.	2 3 4	that I had during my time at GDWG. I think I was initially surprised that there was necessarily a Home Office manager there because G4S had the contract
2 3 4 5	were reluctant to share things ahead of the meeting, which made it difficult, because I couldn't you know, I couldn't look into any concerns they might have had. I felt concerned about that meeting. It was quite	2 3 4 5	that I had during my time at GDWG. I think I was initially surprised that there was necessarily a Home Office manager there because G4S had the contract to run the centre. That was the operational
2 3 4 5 6	were reluctant to share things ahead of the meeting, which made it difficult, because I couldn't you know, I couldn't look into any concerns they might have had.  I felt concerned about that meeting. It was quite a negative meeting. I was I think I was surprised	2 3 4 5 6	that I had during my time at GDWG. I think I was initially surprised that there was necessarily a Home Office manager there because G4S had the contract to run the centre. That was the operational responsibility. That's who I imagined, coming into
2 3 4 5 6 7	were reluctant to share things ahead of the meeting, which made it difficult, because I couldn't you know, I couldn't look into any concerns they might have had.  I felt concerned about that meeting. It was quite a negative meeting. I was I think I was surprised already by that point they were still referring back to	2 3 4 5 6 7	that I had during my time at GDWG. I think I was initially surprised that there was necessarily a Home Office manager there because G4S had the contract to run the centre. That was the operational responsibility. That's who I imagined, coming into post, our main relationship point would be.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	were reluctant to share things ahead of the meeting, which made it difficult, because I couldn't you know, I couldn't look into any concerns they might have had.  I felt concerned about that meeting. It was quite a negative meeting. I was I think I was surprised already by that point they were still referring back to increasingly historical things where, you know, from our	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	that I had during my time at GDWG. I think I was initially surprised that there was necessarily a Home Office manager there because G4S had the contract to run the centre. That was the operational responsibility. That's who I imagined, coming into post, our main relationship point would be.  Q. Was it ever explained to you why the Home Office had
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	were reluctant to share things ahead of the meeting, which made it difficult, because I couldn't you know, I couldn't look into any concerns they might have had.  I felt concerned about that meeting. It was quite a negative meeting. I was I think I was surprised already by that point they were still referring back to increasingly historical things where, you know, from our point of view, we hadn't stepped over any line any	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	that I had during my time at GDWG. I think I was initially surprised that there was necessarily a Home Office manager there because G4S had the contract to run the centre. That was the operational responsibility. That's who I imagined, coming into post, our main relationship point would be.  Q. Was it ever explained to you why the Home Office had a presence there?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	were reluctant to share things ahead of the meeting, which made it difficult, because I couldn't you know, I couldn't look into any concerns they might have had.  I felt concerned about that meeting. It was quite a negative meeting. I was I think I was surprised already by that point they were still referring back to increasingly historical things where, you know, from our point of view, we hadn't stepped over any line any inappropriate line anyway, but they were increasingly in	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	that I had during my time at GDWG. I think I was initially surprised that there was necessarily a Home Office manager there because G4S had the contract to run the centre. That was the operational responsibility. That's who I imagined, coming into post, our main relationship point would be.  Q. Was it ever explained to you why the Home Office had a presence there?  A. No, I don't believe it was, no.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	were reluctant to share things ahead of the meeting, which made it difficult, because I couldn't you know, I couldn't look into any concerns they might have had.  I felt concerned about that meeting. It was quite a negative meeting. I was I think I was surprised already by that point they were still referring back to increasingly historical things where, you know, from our point of view, we hadn't stepped over any line any inappropriate line anyway, but they were increasingly in the past.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	that I had during my time at GDWG. I think I was initially surprised that there was necessarily a Home Office manager there because G4S had the contract to run the centre. That was the operational responsibility. That's who I imagined, coming into post, our main relationship point would be.  Q. Was it ever explained to you why the Home Office had a presence there?  A. No, I don't believe it was, no.  Q. If we could bring up on screen, please, <gdw000003> at</gdw000003>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	were reluctant to share things ahead of the meeting, which made it difficult, because I couldn't you know, I couldn't look into any concerns they might have had.  I felt concerned about that meeting. It was quite a negative meeting. I was I think I was surprised already by that point they were still referring back to increasingly historical things where, you know, from our point of view, we hadn't stepped over any line any inappropriate line anyway, but they were increasingly in the past.  Q. Just to anchor these in dates, I think I'm right in	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	that I had during my time at GDWG. I think I was initially surprised that there was necessarily a Home Office manager there because G4S had the contract to run the centre. That was the operational responsibility. That's who I imagined, coming into post, our main relationship point would be.  Q. Was it ever explained to you why the Home Office had a presence there?  A. No, I don't believe it was, no.  Q. If we could bring up on screen, please, <gdw000003> at page 11. Chair, that's tab 4 of your bundle.</gdw000003>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	were reluctant to share things ahead of the meeting, which made it difficult, because I couldn't you know, I couldn't look into any concerns they might have had.  I felt concerned about that meeting. It was quite a negative meeting. I was I think I was surprised already by that point they were still referring back to increasingly historical things where, you know, from our point of view, we hadn't stepped over any line any inappropriate line anyway, but they were increasingly in the past.  Q. Just to anchor these in dates, I think I'm right in thinking that the issue about the Twitter post was in	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	that I had during my time at GDWG. I think I was initially surprised that there was necessarily a Home Office manager there because G4S had the contract to run the centre. That was the operational responsibility. That's who I imagined, coming into post, our main relationship point would be.  Q. Was it ever explained to you why the Home Office had a presence there?  A. No, I don't believe it was, no.  Q. If we could bring up on screen, please, <gdw000003> at page 11. Chair, that's tab 4 of your bundle.  If we could zoom in on the bottom half of that page,</gdw000003>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	were reluctant to share things ahead of the meeting, which made it difficult, because I couldn't you know, I couldn't look into any concerns they might have had.  I felt concerned about that meeting. It was quite a negative meeting. I was I think I was surprised already by that point they were still referring back to increasingly historical things where, you know, from our point of view, we hadn't stepped over any line any inappropriate line anyway, but they were increasingly in the past.  Q. Just to anchor these in dates, I think I'm right in thinking that the issue about the Twitter post was in 2013. The issue about the witness statement in support	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	that I had during my time at GDWG. I think I was initially surprised that there was necessarily a Home Office manager there because G4S had the contract to run the centre. That was the operational responsibility. That's who I imagined, coming into post, our main relationship point would be.  Q. Was it ever explained to you why the Home Office had a presence there?  A. No, I don't believe it was, no.  Q. If we could bring up on screen, please, <gdw000003> at page 11. Chair, that's tab 4 of your bundle.  If we could zoom in on the bottom half of that page, please. Mr Wilson, this is an email you sent four days</gdw000003>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	were reluctant to share things ahead of the meeting, which made it difficult, because I couldn't you know, I couldn't look into any concerns they might have had.  I felt concerned about that meeting. It was quite a negative meeting. I was I think I was surprised already by that point they were still referring back to increasingly historical things where, you know, from our point of view, we hadn't stepped over any line any inappropriate line anyway, but they were increasingly in the past.  Q. Just to anchor these in dates, I think I'm right in thinking that the issue about the Twitter post was in 2013. The issue about the witness statement in support of a claim was in 2015. And then the standing surety	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	that I had during my time at GDWG. I think I was initially surprised that there was necessarily a Home Office manager there because G4S had the contract to run the centre. That was the operational responsibility. That's who I imagined, coming into post, our main relationship point would be.  Q. Was it ever explained to you why the Home Office had a presence there?  A. No, I don't believe it was, no.  Q. If we could bring up on screen, please, <gdw000003> at page 11. Chair, that's tab 4 of your bundle.  If we could zoom in on the bottom half of that page, please. Mr Wilson, this is an email you sent four days after that meeting, on 13 March 2017. It says:</gdw000003>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	were reluctant to share things ahead of the meeting, which made it difficult, because I couldn't you know, I couldn't look into any concerns they might have had.  I felt concerned about that meeting. It was quite a negative meeting. I was I think I was surprised already by that point they were still referring back to increasingly historical things where, you know, from our point of view, we hadn't stepped over any line any inappropriate line anyway, but they were increasingly in the past.  Q. Just to anchor these in dates, I think I'm right in thinking that the issue about the Twitter post was in 2013. The issue about the witness statement in support of a claim was in 2015. And then the standing surety was around then as well; is that right?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	that I had during my time at GDWG. I think I was initially surprised that there was necessarily a Home Office manager there because G4S had the contract to run the centre. That was the operational responsibility. That's who I imagined, coming into post, our main relationship point would be.  Q. Was it ever explained to you why the Home Office had a presence there?  A. No, I don't believe it was, no.  Q. If we could bring up on screen, please, <gdw000003> at page 11. Chair, that's tab 4 of your bundle.  If we could zoom in on the bottom half of that page, please. Mr Wilson, this is an email you sent four days after that meeting, on 13 March 2017. It says:  "Dear Paul, I hope you had a good weekend.</gdw000003>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	were reluctant to share things ahead of the meeting, which made it difficult, because I couldn't you know, I couldn't look into any concerns they might have had.  I felt concerned about that meeting. It was quite a negative meeting. I was I think I was surprised already by that point they were still referring back to increasingly historical things where, you know, from our point of view, we hadn't stepped over any line any inappropriate line anyway, but they were increasingly in the past.  Q. Just to anchor these in dates, I think I'm right in thinking that the issue about the Twitter post was in 2013. The issue about the witness statement in support of a claim was in 2015. And then the standing surety was around then as well; is that right?  A. That's correct, absolutely.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	that I had during my time at GDWG. I think I was initially surprised that there was necessarily a Home Office manager there because G4S had the contract to run the centre. That was the operational responsibility. That's who I imagined, coming into post, our main relationship point would be.  Q. Was it ever explained to you why the Home Office had a presence there?  A. No, I don't believe it was, no.  Q. If we could bring up on screen, please, <gdw000003> at page 11. Chair, that's tab 4 of your bundle.  If we could zoom in on the bottom half of that page, please. Mr Wilson, this is an email you sent four days after that meeting, on 13 March 2017. It says:  "Dear Paul, I hope you had a good weekend. "Thank you very much for the meeting last week.</gdw000003>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	were reluctant to share things ahead of the meeting, which made it difficult, because I couldn't you know, I couldn't look into any concerns they might have had.  I felt concerned about that meeting. It was quite a negative meeting. I was I think I was surprised already by that point they were still referring back to increasingly historical things where, you know, from our point of view, we hadn't stepped over any line any inappropriate line anyway, but they were increasingly in the past.  Q. Just to anchor these in dates, I think I'm right in thinking that the issue about the Twitter post was in 2013. The issue about the witness statement in support of a claim was in 2015. And then the standing surety was around then as well; is that right?  A. That's correct, absolutely.  Q. So this was all at least a year, and sometimes a few	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	that I had during my time at GDWG. I think I was initially surprised that there was necessarily a Home Office manager there because G4S had the contract to run the centre. That was the operational responsibility. That's who I imagined, coming into post, our main relationship point would be.  Q. Was it ever explained to you why the Home Office had a presence there?  A. No, I don't believe it was, no.  Q. If we could bring up on screen, please, <gdw000003> at page 11. Chair, that's tab 4 of your bundle.  If we could zoom in on the bottom half of that page, please. Mr Wilson, this is an email you sent four days after that meeting, on 13 March 2017. It says:  "Dear Paul, I hope you had a good weekend.  "Thank you very much for the meeting last week. I really appreciated your, Dan and Steve's time, the</gdw000003>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	were reluctant to share things ahead of the meeting, which made it difficult, because I couldn't you know, I couldn't look into any concerns they might have had.  I felt concerned about that meeting. It was quite a negative meeting. I was I think I was surprised already by that point they were still referring back to increasingly historical things where, you know, from our point of view, we hadn't stepped over any line any inappropriate line anyway, but they were increasingly in the past.  Q. Just to anchor these in dates, I think I'm right in thinking that the issue about the Twitter post was in 2013. The issue about the witness statement in support of a claim was in 2015. And then the standing surety was around then as well; is that right?  A. That's correct, absolutely.  Q. So this was all at least a year, and sometimes a few years, before you even came into post?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	that I had during my time at GDWG. I think I was initially surprised that there was necessarily a Home Office manager there because G4S had the contract to run the centre. That was the operational responsibility. That's who I imagined, coming into post, our main relationship point would be.  Q. Was it ever explained to you why the Home Office had a presence there?  A. No, I don't believe it was, no.  Q. If we could bring up on screen, please, <gdw000003> at page 11. Chair, that's tab 4 of your bundle.  If we could zoom in on the bottom half of that page, please. Mr Wilson, this is an email you sent four days after that meeting, on 13 March 2017. It says:  "Dear Paul, I hope you had a good weekend.  "Thank you very much for the meeting last week. I really appreciated your, Dan and Steve's time, the chance to catch up and the opportunity to address some</gdw000003>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	were reluctant to share things ahead of the meeting, which made it difficult, because I couldn't you know, I couldn't look into any concerns they might have had.  I felt concerned about that meeting. It was quite a negative meeting. I was I think I was surprised already by that point they were still referring back to increasingly historical things where, you know, from our point of view, we hadn't stepped over any line any inappropriate line anyway, but they were increasingly in the past.  Q. Just to anchor these in dates, I think I'm right in thinking that the issue about the Twitter post was in 2013. The issue about the witness statement in support of a claim was in 2015. And then the standing surety was around then as well; is that right?  A. That's correct, absolutely.  Q. So this was all at least a year, and sometimes a few years, before you even came into post?  A. That's correct, yes.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	that I had during my time at GDWG. I think I was initially surprised that there was necessarily a Home Office manager there because G4S had the contract to run the centre. That was the operational responsibility. That's who I imagined, coming into post, our main relationship point would be.  Q. Was it ever explained to you why the Home Office had a presence there?  A. No, I don't believe it was, no.  Q. If we could bring up on screen, please, <gdw000003> at page 11. Chair, that's tab 4 of your bundle.  If we could zoom in on the bottom half of that page, please. Mr Wilson, this is an email you sent four days after that meeting, on 13 March 2017. It says:  "Dear Paul, I hope you had a good weekend.  "Thank you very much for the meeting last week. I really appreciated your, Dan and Steve's time, the chance to catch up and the opportunity to address some current concerns. I particularly appreciated the honest</gdw000003>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	were reluctant to share things ahead of the meeting, which made it difficult, because I couldn't you know, I couldn't look into any concerns they might have had.  I felt concerned about that meeting. It was quite a negative meeting. I was I think I was surprised already by that point they were still referring back to increasingly historical things where, you know, from our point of view, we hadn't stepped over any line any inappropriate line anyway, but they were increasingly in the past.  Q. Just to anchor these in dates, I think I'm right in thinking that the issue about the Twitter post was in 2013. The issue about the witness statement in support of a claim was in 2015. And then the standing surety was around then as well; is that right?  A. That's correct, absolutely.  Q. So this was all at least a year, and sometimes a few years, before you even came into post?  A. That's correct, yes.  Q. You have already explained that, at this meeting, you	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	that I had during my time at GDWG. I think I was initially surprised that there was necessarily a Home Office manager there because G4S had the contract to run the centre. That was the operational responsibility. That's who I imagined, coming into post, our main relationship point would be.  Q. Was it ever explained to you why the Home Office had a presence there?  A. No, I don't believe it was, no.  Q. If we could bring up on screen, please, <gdw000003> at page 11. Chair, that's tab 4 of your bundle.  If we could zoom in on the bottom half of that page, please. Mr Wilson, this is an email you sent four days after that meeting, on 13 March 2017. It says:  "Dear Paul, I hope you had a good weekend.  "Thank you very much for the meeting last week. I really appreciated your, Dan and Steve's time, the chance to catch up and the opportunity to address some current concerns. I particularly appreciated the honest and positive conversation we were able to have; we</gdw000003>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	were reluctant to share things ahead of the meeting, which made it difficult, because I couldn't you know, I couldn't look into any concerns they might have had.  I felt concerned about that meeting. It was quite a negative meeting. I was I think I was surprised already by that point they were still referring back to increasingly historical things where, you know, from our point of view, we hadn't stepped over any line any inappropriate line anyway, but they were increasingly in the past.  Q. Just to anchor these in dates, I think I'm right in thinking that the issue about the Twitter post was in 2013. The issue about the witness statement in support of a claim was in 2015. And then the standing surety was around then as well; is that right?  A. That's correct, absolutely.  Q. So this was all at least a year, and sometimes a few years, before you even came into post?  A. That's correct, yes.  Q. You have already explained that, at this meeting, you had two people from the G4S and somebody from the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	that I had during my time at GDWG. I think I was initially surprised that there was necessarily a Home Office manager there because G4S had the contract to run the centre. That was the operational responsibility. That's who I imagined, coming into post, our main relationship point would be.  Q. Was it ever explained to you why the Home Office had a presence there?  A. No, I don't believe it was, no.  Q. If we could bring up on screen, please, <gdw000003> at page 11. Chair, that's tab 4 of your bundle.  If we could zoom in on the bottom half of that page, please. Mr Wilson, this is an email you sent four days after that meeting, on 13 March 2017. It says:  "Dear Paul, I hope you had a good weekend.  "Thank you very much for the meeting last week. I really appreciated your, Dan and Steve's time, the chance to catch up and the opportunity to address some current concerns. I particularly appreciated the honest and positive conversation we were able to have; we continue to value highly our good working relationship</gdw000003>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	were reluctant to share things ahead of the meeting, which made it difficult, because I couldn't you know, I couldn't look into any concerns they might have had.  I felt concerned about that meeting. It was quite a negative meeting. I was I think I was surprised already by that point they were still referring back to increasingly historical things where, you know, from our point of view, we hadn't stepped over any line any inappropriate line anyway, but they were increasingly in the past.  Q. Just to anchor these in dates, I think I'm right in thinking that the issue about the Twitter post was in 2013. The issue about the witness statement in support of a claim was in 2015. And then the standing surety was around then as well; is that right?  A. That's correct, absolutely.  Q. So this was all at least a year, and sometimes a few years, before you even came into post?  A. That's correct, yes.  Q. You have already explained that, at this meeting, you had two people from the G4S and somebody from the Home Office. Did you feel like these were concerns	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	that I had during my time at GDWG. I think I was initially surprised that there was necessarily a Home Office manager there because G4S had the contract to run the centre. That was the operational responsibility. That's who I imagined, coming into post, our main relationship point would be.  Q. Was it ever explained to you why the Home Office had a presence there?  A. No, I don't believe it was, no.  Q. If we could bring up on screen, please, <gdw000003> at page 11. Chair, that's tab 4 of your bundle.  If we could zoom in on the bottom half of that page, please. Mr Wilson, this is an email you sent four days after that meeting, on 13 March 2017. It says:  "Dear Paul, I hope you had a good weekend.  "Thank you very much for the meeting last week. I really appreciated your, Dan and Steve's time, the chance to catch up and the opportunity to address some current concerns. I particularly appreciated the honest and positive conversation we were able to have; we continue to value highly our good working relationship with the Home Office and with G4S."</gdw000003>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	were reluctant to share things ahead of the meeting, which made it difficult, because I couldn't you know, I couldn't look into any concerns they might have had.  I felt concerned about that meeting. It was quite a negative meeting. I was I think I was surprised already by that point they were still referring back to increasingly historical things where, you know, from our point of view, we hadn't stepped over any line any inappropriate line anyway, but they were increasingly in the past.  Q. Just to anchor these in dates, I think I'm right in thinking that the issue about the Twitter post was in 2013. The issue about the witness statement in support of a claim was in 2015. And then the standing surety was around then as well; is that right?  A. That's correct, absolutely.  Q. So this was all at least a year, and sometimes a few years, before you even came into post?  A. That's correct, yes.  Q. You have already explained that, at this meeting, you had two people from the G4S and somebody from the Home Office. Did you feel like these were concerns being raised by G4S, by the Home Office or jointly by	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	that I had during my time at GDWG. I think I was initially surprised that there was necessarily a Home Office manager there because G4S had the contract to run the centre. That was the operational responsibility. That's who I imagined, coming into post, our main relationship point would be.  Q. Was it ever explained to you why the Home Office had a presence there?  A. No, I don't believe it was, no.  Q. If we could bring up on screen, please, <gdw000003> at page 11. Chair, that's tab 4 of your bundle.  If we could zoom in on the bottom half of that page, please. Mr Wilson, this is an email you sent four days after that meeting, on 13 March 2017. It says:  "Dear Paul, I hope you had a good weekend.  "Thank you very much for the meeting last week. I really appreciated your, Dan and Steve's time, the chance to catch up and the opportunity to address some current concerns. I particularly appreciated the honest and positive conversation we were able to have; we continue to value highly our good working relationship with the Home Office and with G4S."  Did you consider yourself to have a good working</gdw000003>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	were reluctant to share things ahead of the meeting, which made it difficult, because I couldn't you know, I couldn't look into any concerns they might have had.  I felt concerned about that meeting. It was quite a negative meeting. I was I think I was surprised already by that point they were still referring back to increasingly historical things where, you know, from our point of view, we hadn't stepped over any line any inappropriate line anyway, but they were increasingly in the past.  Q. Just to anchor these in dates, I think I'm right in thinking that the issue about the Twitter post was in 2013. The issue about the witness statement in support of a claim was in 2015. And then the standing surety was around then as well; is that right?  A. That's correct, absolutely.  Q. So this was all at least a year, and sometimes a few years, before you even came into post?  A. That's correct, yes.  Q. You have already explained that, at this meeting, you had two people from the G4S and somebody from the Home Office. Did you feel like these were concerns	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	that I had during my time at GDWG. I think I was initially surprised that there was necessarily a Home Office manager there because G4S had the contract to run the centre. That was the operational responsibility. That's who I imagined, coming into post, our main relationship point would be.  Q. Was it ever explained to you why the Home Office had a presence there?  A. No, I don't believe it was, no.  Q. If we could bring up on screen, please, <gdw000003> at page 11. Chair, that's tab 4 of your bundle.  If we could zoom in on the bottom half of that page, please. Mr Wilson, this is an email you sent four days after that meeting, on 13 March 2017. It says:  "Dear Paul, I hope you had a good weekend.  "Thank you very much for the meeting last week. I really appreciated your, Dan and Steve's time, the chance to catch up and the opportunity to address some current concerns. I particularly appreciated the honest and positive conversation we were able to have; we continue to value highly our good working relationship with the Home Office and with G4S."</gdw000003>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	were reluctant to share things ahead of the meeting, which made it difficult, because I couldn't you know, I couldn't look into any concerns they might have had.  I felt concerned about that meeting. It was quite a negative meeting. I was I think I was surprised already by that point they were still referring back to increasingly historical things where, you know, from our point of view, we hadn't stepped over any line any inappropriate line anyway, but they were increasingly in the past.  Q. Just to anchor these in dates, I think I'm right in thinking that the issue about the Twitter post was in 2013. The issue about the witness statement in support of a claim was in 2015. And then the standing surety was around then as well; is that right?  A. That's correct, absolutely.  Q. So this was all at least a year, and sometimes a few years, before you even came into post?  A. That's correct, yes.  Q. You have already explained that, at this meeting, you had two people from the G4S and somebody from the Home Office. Did you feel like these were concerns being raised by G4S, by the Home Office or jointly by	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	that I had during my time at GDWG. I think I was initially surprised that there was necessarily a Home Office manager there because G4S had the contract to run the centre. That was the operational responsibility. That's who I imagined, coming into post, our main relationship point would be.  Q. Was it ever explained to you why the Home Office had a presence there?  A. No, I don't believe it was, no.  Q. If we could bring up on screen, please, <gdw000003> at page 11. Chair, that's tab 4 of your bundle.  If we could zoom in on the bottom half of that page, please. Mr Wilson, this is an email you sent four days after that meeting, on 13 March 2017. It says:  "Dear Paul, I hope you had a good weekend.  "Thank you very much for the meeting last week. I really appreciated your, Dan and Steve's time, the chance to catch up and the opportunity to address some current concerns. I particularly appreciated the honest and positive conversation we were able to have; we continue to value highly our good working relationship with the Home Office and with G4S."  Did you consider yourself to have a good working</gdw000003>

	nly wouldn't have been able to honestly say that	1	a document that we ever signed, but it was something
	onths down the line, after subsequent meetings.	2	that increasingly came up as a request in meetings and
•	ossibly, at this point, I was still hopeful of	3	in correspondence, and it's something that, in practice,
ē	hat, but I think, to be candid, I was being	4	I had more or less agreed to follow.
	putting a very positive and diplomatic take on	5	Q. If we can go to that draft MoU, that's at <gdw000003> at</gdw000003>
6 it because	se I wanted to build that, I wanted to be as	6	page 1. If it helps for the evidence handler, I'm going
-	ve as I possibly could to the concerns.	7	to be going to this document and pages from it a fair
8 Q. Because	e, obviously, this that paragraph I just read	8	amount.
9 out reads	quite positively, other than the thing I said,	9	If we can zoom in on the bullet points, the first
10 you know	v, "Thank you very much really appreciated	10	few bullet points. I already asked Anna Pincus about
11 [the oppo	ortunity] honest and positive conversation".	11	this yesterday, but as you were the director during the
12 You have	e said that you were trying to put a sort of	12	relevant period, I need to ask you as well. So, as you
13 positive	spin on things. Is that what we can take from	13	have alluded to, this was a draft memorandum of
14 this para	•	14	understanding. When you came into your post, were you
15 A. I think	that would be that's what I would suggest	15	told there was a draft MoU that had never been agreed?
16 would be	e the main	16	A. I don't remember being told that immediately. I may be
17 Q. Okay.		17	misremembering. I don't think my predecessor
18 A. I mean	I would say that you may come on to this	18	highlighted that to me. So that's something that
19 in terms	of the specific concerns of that meeting, I did	19	emerged in the course of meetings with Brook House
20 then go	on to respond in writing. I did of course	20	management.
21 I would	rather they raised things to me rather than not,	21	Q. You will see here, obviously, it says at the second
22 as long a	s they were then open to discussion about them.	22	bullet point what the purpose of meetings was, and it
Q. One this	ng I wanted to check while we are on this is, the	23	says:
24 people th	at you met with on a fairly regular basis who	24	"On occasion it may be in the interest of a detainee
come up.	and we will come to them, which is Paul Gasson	25	to have a further follow-up meeting in private with GDWG
	Dage 12		Dags 15
	Page 13		Page 15
1 from the	Home Office, Dan Haughton and Steve Skitt, and	1	staff. These will be exceptional circumstances
2 there are	other people as well. Were you ever told that	2	requiring prior agreement"
3 you had	a specific liaison at G4S? Was there anyone who	3	Whether or not the memorandum of understanding was
4 was you	r sort of go-to person?	4	ever agreed, was it your position that that bullet point
5 A. I don't	think I was, no. I think increasingly I, in the	5	setting out that there would need to be exceptional
6 first ins	ance, would probably have gone to Steve Skitt.	6	circumstances requiring prior agreement, did that govern
7 He beca	me our de facto my de facto first point of	7	your relationship?
8 contact.	But I don't think that was ever formalised.	8	A. It was made increasingly clear to me by management that
9 Q. He was	the deputy director of Brook House at the	9	they expected that to be happening and, therefore,
10 relevant	time; is that right? To your understanding?	10	that's what we tried to follow.
11 A. I think	that's correct, yes.	11	Q. If we can go down to the penultimate paragraph of this
12 Q. I want	o come on now to the issue of restrictions on	12	page, I'm going to, again, come on to the issue of
13 visits an	d your work done with or for detained people.	13	reporting safeguarding in due course, but you will see
14 We ha	ive already heard evidence yesterday from	14	the top paragraph there sets out that:
15 Ms Pinc	us about the position regarding drop-ins, as they	15	"As part of the GDWG surgery meetings with
	d, although, as you say, I think they weren't	16	detainees, it is critical that where any staff
	drop-ins. In summary, am I right in saying	17	member has reasonable cause to believe that a detainee
	position as at this point, the beginning of	18	may be suffering or may be at risk of suffering
17 actually			, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,
17 actually 18 that the j		19	significant harm, a member of Brook House IRC staff is
17 actually 18 that the p 19 the relev	ant period, was agreed that you would make	19 20	significant harm, a member of Brook House IRC staff is notified immediately."
17 actually 18 that the p 19 the relev 20 a reques	ant period, was agreed that you would make on each occasion that you wanted to have		notified immediately."
17 actually 18 that the p 19 the relev 20 a reques 21 a repeat	ant period, was agreed that you would make on each occasion that you wanted to have drop-in, so a second drop-in visit with	20	notified immediately."  Would you say that that, even if the document wasn't
17 actually 18 that the p 19 the relev 20 a reques 21 a repeat 22 a detained	ant period, was agreed that you would make ton each occasion that you wanted to have drop-in, so a second drop-in visit with bed person; is that right?	20 21	notified immediately."  Would you say that that, even if the document wasn't agreed, set out your understanding of what the agreement
17 actually 18 that the p 19 the relev 20 a reques 21 a repeat 22 a detaine 23 A. In prace	ant period, was agreed that you would make on each occasion that you wanted to have drop-in, so a second drop-in visit with ed person; is that right?	20 21 22	notified immediately."  Would you say that that, even if the document wasn't agreed, set out your understanding of what the agreement was as to what you would do?
17 actually 18 that the p 19 the relev 20 a reques 21 a repeat 22 a detaine 23 A. In prac 24 request	ant period, was agreed that you would make ton each occasion that you wanted to have drop-in, so a second drop-in visit with bed person; is that right?	20 21 22 23	notified immediately."  Would you say that that, even if the document wasn't agreed, set out your understanding of what the agreement
17 actually 18 that the p 19 the relev 20 a reques 21 a repeat 22 a detaine 23 A. In prac 24 request	ant period, was agreed that you would make on each occasion that you wanted to have drop-in, so a second drop-in visit with ed person; is that right?  Etice, more or less. I mean, I think that that for you know, for us to seek explicit	20 21 22 23 24	notified immediately."  Would you say that that, even if the document wasn't agreed, set out your understanding of what the agreement was as to what you would do?  A. Yes, essentially. We had a number of concerns about the

		П	
1	we were going to sign it, we would have wanted to amend	1	I recall the standard was along the lines that I am
2	it substantially. We were concerned about I was	2	describing. So it was around immediate harm, active
3	concerned about this paragraph potentially tying us to	3	suicidal thoughts, feelings, plans, imminent risk of
4	a particular standard in terms of when we would report	4	self-harm where that wasn't known to the centre. We may
5	to management that may not have aligned with our	5	go on to talk about this. I feel clear that that was
6	safeguarding policy. But, essentially, this is this	6	that was clear to staff and volunteers across the
7	is correct.	7	organisation.
8	Q. Were you concerned that the standard here was too low,	8	Q. We will come back to the safeguarding issue in due
9	too high?	9	course. Sticking to visits, if we can turn to page 14
10	A. Potentially. Potentially too high.	10	of this document, please, this is an email which can be
11	Q. You thought that, in fact, you might want to notify	11	seen from the previous page is dated 22 March, and it is
12	Brook House staff even where they weren't suffering, or	12	sent to Dan Haughton from Naomi Blackwell, who was one
13	at risk of suffering, significant harm but there might	13	of your team. Yes?
14	be lower-level things?	14	A. Yes.
15	A. Oh, sorry, no, I think what I mean is, this may have	15	Q. It says, as you can see:
16	put set an imposition on us to report in cases where	16	"Apologies for eating into your time, but I just
17	we wouldn't have felt that threshold or the need, or the	17	wanted to clarify this so we are all clear. Are you
18	appropriateness was there.	18	happy for us to request repeat (drop-in) visits and
19	Q. So is it fair to say, and we can come on to some	19	attend, provided we have informed you prior to the
20	specific examples in due course, that there may have	20	visit, ie, we don't need to wait for your permission?"
21	been situations during the relevant period where you or	21	If we can go to the previous page, please, page 13,
22	your staff members thought that a detainee was	22	if we can expand the text a little bit, this is
23	suffering, or was at risk of suffering, significant harm	23	Dan Haughton's email in reply, copying in you, and it
24	but, for other reasons, you would have decided not to	24	says:
25	report that?	25	"Hi Naomi, it's not a problem.
	Page 17		Page 19
1	A. I mean, I'm happy to, you know, talk around maybe we	1	"We should keep to the current memorandum of
2	will come to this in terms of the context and the type	2	understanding which states"
3	of situations where we might have raised something	3	And there's two bullet points there:
4	immediately or not. But I guess there are certainly	4	"During our recent meeting with James, it was agreed
5	situations where I think, for us, the test would be	5	that should a follow-up surgery appointment be required
6	around immediate the key thing would be around	6	the purpose of this would be to identify another GDWG
7	immediate harm, particularly around active suicidal	7	visitor should the original matching not be appropriate.
8	thoughts and feelings and plans, and active risk of	8	"So moving forward any requests should be given
9	self-harm where we were clear, or where there was	9	prior permission before progressing."
10	a doubt, that the centre already knew, which in many	10	First of all, you will see there it says "we should
11	cases they would. Unfortunately, people in detention	11	keep to the current memorandum of understanding". Did
12	are often in very desperate situations, there are lots	12	you think that there was a current memorandum of
13	of things that come up, there are lots of things where,	13	understanding agreed?
14	for a variety of reasons, it wouldn't be appropriate or	14	A. No. It had never been finalised or signed.
15	wouldn't feel necessary to flag that immediately up with	15	Q. Where it says "during our recent meeting with James" and
16	the management or may not be appropriate.	16	it says what you'd agreed, ie, that the purpose of any
17	Q. Do you remember Ms Pincus said that she thought there	17	repeat drop-in would be to identify another visitor for
18	was a safeguarding policy in place at GDWG at the time?	18	an inappropriate matching, was that agreed?
19	Is that your recollection as well?	19	A. No. That was very much what they wanted from the
20	A. Yes, yes.	20	point of view of IRC management.
21	Q. Obviously, it is possible that you may be able to	21	(Fire alarm test)
22	disclose this in due course, if it hasn't been disclosed	22	MR LIVINGSTON: Sorry, I should have highlighted that at the
23	already, but do you remember whether that set a standard	23	beginning. I forgot.
24	as to when you had to notify G4S staff?	24	Just to get my place with what you just said, you
25	A. Yes. I don't recall the exact wording, but I think	25	have said that, in terms of them saying here that this
	<u> </u>		
	Page 18		Page 20

1	was agreed with you, that was what they wanted the	1	As you note in your statement, you note that the
2	position to be, but it's already your position was	2	reason it is actually at the bottom of this page
3	that wasn't the agreed position?	3	why Ms Blackwell was requesting a repeat drop-in was
4	A. If I can elaborate slightly, their repeat message on	4	that this detained person was unable to correspond
5	this was, what they wanted to be the case was that the	5	meaningfully via telephone or fax. GDWG had concerns
6	purpose of our we are calling it a drop-in the	6	about his mental health and wanted to be able to
7	drop-in appointment in the legal visit room was for us	7	maintain regular contact with him to support him.
8	to speak to a detainee and assign a social visitor and	8	Then, if we go up to the top half of the page,
9	from their point of view, therefore, the only reason you	9	please, as we can see, 6 April, from Dan Haughton,
10	need to see the same client again was if, for example,	10	copying in you, Steve Skitt and Paul Gasson. This says,
11	the first social visitor had had to was away and you	11	in the third paragraph:
12	needed to assign somebody else to step in for them. I'm	12	"From the shared understanding we have with James,
13	confident I was always diplomatic in how I responded to	13	drop-in clinics are not the place to maintain regular
14	that but, from our point of view, that wasn't the only	14	contacts with detainees. This should be taking place in
15	purpose of the surgery because we were also working with	15	the context of social visits."
16	clients on a range of other needs and, therefore, that	16	Do you think that was a shared understanding with
17	would be a possible reason, reassigning a different	17	you?
18	visitor for a second visit, but by no means the only one	18	A. No. No, in short.
19	and I think I was always clear on that.	19	Q. If we actually see the top bit of that, it says:
20	Q. Do you think that this was a misunderstanding of what	20	"Thank you for raising concerns about [this person]
21	had been agreed or do you think that this was trying to	21	have you raised these concerns with the officers at
22	suggest something had been agreed that hadn't been?	22	Brook House before?"
23	A. I think it's the latter. I think it's trying to insist	23	Do you know if those concerns had been raised
24	on something that had been, when what had happened at	24	before?
25	those meetings is I had been told that this should be	25	A. I'm sorry, I don't recall that.
	Page 21		Page 23
1	the case without then us mutually agreeing	1	O. It cave in the second paragraph:
1	the case rather than us mutually agreeing.	1 2	Q. It says in the second paragraph:  "I have passed your concerns about [this person's]
2	Q. If we can turn to page 10 of this document, please, and	2	"I have passed your concerns about [this person's]
2 3	Q. If we can turn to page 10 of this document, please, and if we can go to the first paragraph that has the bold in	2 3	"I have passed your concerns about [this person's] mental health to our healthcare team who will refer him
2 3 4	Q. If we can turn to page 10 of this document, please, and if we can go to the first paragraph that has the bold in it, and starts with "Firstly". This is your email in	2 3 4	"I have passed your concerns about [this person's] mental health to our healthcare team who will refer him to see our onsite registered mental health nurse if this
2 3 4 5	Q. If we can turn to page 10 of this document, please, and if we can go to the first paragraph that has the bold in it, and starts with "Firstly". This is your email in response, on 29 March, and you respond to various	2 3 4 5	"I have passed your concerns about [this person's] mental health to our healthcare team who will refer him to see our onsite registered mental health nurse if this is not already in place."
2 3 4 5 6	Q. If we can turn to page 10 of this document, please, and if we can go to the first paragraph that has the bold in it, and starts with "Firstly". This is your email in response, on 29 March, and you respond to various points, but on the issue we have just been talking about	2 3 4 5 6	"I have passed your concerns about [this person's] mental health to our healthcare team who will refer him to see our onsite registered mental health nurse if this is not already in place." What would you say about this reaction to it? So
2 3 4 5 6 7	Q. If we can turn to page 10 of this document, please, and if we can go to the first paragraph that has the bold in it, and starts with "Firstly". This is your email in response, on 29 March, and you respond to various points, but on the issue we have just been talking about here, you say, in summary, that you are happy to ask for	2 3 4 5 6 7	"I have passed your concerns about [this person's] mental health to our healthcare team who will refer him to see our onsite registered mental health nurse if this is not already in place."  What would you say about this reaction to it? So saying no to the second drop-in, but it is taking action
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Q. If we can turn to page 10 of this document, please, and if we can go to the first paragraph that has the bold in it, and starts with "Firstly". This is your email in response, on 29 March, and you respond to various points, but on the issue we have just been talking about here, you say, in summary, that you are happy to ask for approval for second drop-in visits, but you say "there	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	"I have passed your concerns about [this person's] mental health to our healthcare team who will refer him to see our onsite registered mental health nurse if this is not already in place."  What would you say about this reaction to it? So saying no to the second drop-in, but it is taking action in relation to concerns about mental health raised?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Q. If we can turn to page 10 of this document, please, and if we can go to the first paragraph that has the bold in it, and starts with "Firstly". This is your email in response, on 29 March, and you respond to various points, but on the issue we have just been talking about here, you say, in summary, that you are happy to ask for approval for second drop-in visits, but you say "there are a number of reasons why we may wish to see	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	"I have passed your concerns about [this person's] mental health to our healthcare team who will refer him to see our onsite registered mental health nurse if this is not already in place."  What would you say about this reaction to it? So saying no to the second drop-in, but it is taking action in relation to concerns about mental health raised?  A. I mean, it's welcome, if there's an indication of steps
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Q. If we can turn to page 10 of this document, please, and if we can go to the first paragraph that has the bold in it, and starts with "Firstly". This is your email in response, on 29 March, and you respond to various points, but on the issue we have just been talking about here, you say, in summary, that you are happy to ask for approval for second drop-in visits, but you say "there are a number of reasons why we may wish to see a detainee for a second time, and I am happy to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	"I have passed your concerns about [this person's] mental health to our healthcare team who will refer him to see our onsite registered mental health nurse if this is not already in place."  What would you say about this reaction to it? So saying no to the second drop-in, but it is taking action in relation to concerns about mental health raised?  A. I mean, it's welcome, if there's an indication of steps being taken to give you know, somebody who needs
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Q. If we can turn to page 10 of this document, please, and if we can go to the first paragraph that has the bold in it, and starts with "Firstly". This is your email in response, on 29 March, and you respond to various points, but on the issue we have just been talking about here, you say, in summary, that you are happy to ask for approval for second drop-in visits, but you say "there are a number of reasons why we may wish to see a detainee for a second time, and I am happy to elaborate if ever needed"?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	"I have passed your concerns about [this person's] mental health to our healthcare team who will refer him to see our onsite registered mental health nurse if this is not already in place."  What would you say about this reaction to it? So saying no to the second drop-in, but it is taking action in relation to concerns about mental health raised?  A. I mean, it's welcome, if there's an indication of steps being taken to give you know, somebody who needs extra support with their mental health. You know, we
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Q. If we can turn to page 10 of this document, please, and if we can go to the first paragraph that has the bold in it, and starts with "Firstly". This is your email in response, on 29 March, and you respond to various points, but on the issue we have just been talking about here, you say, in summary, that you are happy to ask for approval for second drop-in visits, but you say "there are a number of reasons why we may wish to see a detainee for a second time, and I am happy to elaborate if ever needed"?  A. (Witness nods).	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	"I have passed your concerns about [this person's] mental health to our healthcare team who will refer him to see our onsite registered mental health nurse if this is not already in place."  What would you say about this reaction to it? So saying no to the second drop-in, but it is taking action in relation to concerns about mental health raised?  A. I mean, it's welcome, if there's an indication of steps being taken to give you know, somebody who needs extra support with their mental health. You know, we saw very frequently in our work clients whose mental
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Q. If we can turn to page 10 of this document, please, and if we can go to the first paragraph that has the bold in it, and starts with "Firstly". This is your email in response, on 29 March, and you respond to various points, but on the issue we have just been talking about here, you say, in summary, that you are happy to ask for approval for second drop-in visits, but you say "there are a number of reasons why we may wish to see a detainee for a second time, and I am happy to elaborate if ever needed"?  A. (Witness nods).  Q. Am I right in thinking that you were content to agree to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	"I have passed your concerns about [this person's] mental health to our healthcare team who will refer him to see our onsite registered mental health nurse if this is not already in place."  What would you say about this reaction to it? So saying no to the second drop-in, but it is taking action in relation to concerns about mental health raised?  A. I mean, it's welcome, if there's an indication of steps being taken to give you know, somebody who needs extra support with their mental health. You know, we saw very frequently in our work clients whose mental health needs didn't seem to be being appropriately met.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Q. If we can turn to page 10 of this document, please, and if we can go to the first paragraph that has the bold in it, and starts with "Firstly". This is your email in response, on 29 March, and you respond to various points, but on the issue we have just been talking about here, you say, in summary, that you are happy to ask for approval for second drop-in visits, but you say "there are a number of reasons why we may wish to see a detainee for a second time, and I am happy to elaborate if ever needed"?  A. (Witness nods).  Q. Am I right in thinking that you were content to agree to the limit that you had to ask for approval for a repeat	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	"I have passed your concerns about [this person's] mental health to our healthcare team who will refer him to see our onsite registered mental health nurse if this is not already in place."  What would you say about this reaction to it? So saying no to the second drop-in, but it is taking action in relation to concerns about mental health raised?  A. I mean, it's welcome, if there's an indication of steps being taken to give you know, somebody who needs extra support with their mental health. You know, we saw very frequently in our work clients whose mental health needs didn't seem to be being appropriately met. We had generally, as I've mentioned, a very positive
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Q. If we can turn to page 10 of this document, please, and if we can go to the first paragraph that has the bold in it, and starts with "Firstly". This is your email in response, on 29 March, and you respond to various points, but on the issue we have just been talking about here, you say, in summary, that you are happy to ask for approval for second drop-in visits, but you say "there are a number of reasons why we may wish to see a detainee for a second time, and I am happy to elaborate if ever needed"?  A. (Witness nods).  Q. Am I right in thinking that you were content to agree to the limit that you had to ask for approval for a repeat drop-in, but you weren't content to agree that there was	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	"I have passed your concerns about [this person's] mental health to our healthcare team who will refer him to see our onsite registered mental health nurse if this is not already in place."  What would you say about this reaction to it? So saying no to the second drop-in, but it is taking action in relation to concerns about mental health raised?  A. I mean, it's welcome, if there's an indication of steps being taken to give you know, somebody who needs extra support with their mental health. You know, we saw very frequently in our work clients whose mental health needs didn't seem to be being appropriately met. We had generally, as I've mentioned, a very positive relationship with the welfare team, a more difficult
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Q. If we can turn to page 10 of this document, please, and if we can go to the first paragraph that has the bold in it, and starts with "Firstly". This is your email in response, on 29 March, and you respond to various points, but on the issue we have just been talking about here, you say, in summary, that you are happy to ask for approval for second drop-in visits, but you say "there are a number of reasons why we may wish to see a detainee for a second time, and I am happy to elaborate if ever needed"?  A. (Witness nods).  Q. Am I right in thinking that you were content to agree to the limit that you had to ask for approval for a repeat drop-in, but you weren't content to agree that there was only one purpose of a repeat drop-in?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	"I have passed your concerns about [this person's] mental health to our healthcare team who will refer him to see our onsite registered mental health nurse if this is not already in place."  What would you say about this reaction to it? So saying no to the second drop-in, but it is taking action in relation to concerns about mental health raised?  A. I mean, it's welcome, if there's an indication of steps being taken to give you know, somebody who needs extra support with their mental health. You know, we saw very frequently in our work clients whose mental health needs didn't seem to be being appropriately met. We had generally, as I've mentioned, a very positive relationship with the welfare team, a more difficult relationship with healthcare, and therefore we'd often
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Q. If we can turn to page 10 of this document, please, and if we can go to the first paragraph that has the bold in it, and starts with "Firstly". This is your email in response, on 29 March, and you respond to various points, but on the issue we have just been talking about here, you say, in summary, that you are happy to ask for approval for second drop-in visits, but you say "there are a number of reasons why we may wish to see a detainee for a second time, and I am happy to elaborate if ever needed"?  A. (Witness nods).  Q. Am I right in thinking that you were content to agree to the limit that you had to ask for approval for a repeat drop-in, but you weren't content to agree that there was only one purpose of a repeat drop-in?  A. Yes, absolutely.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	"I have passed your concerns about [this person's] mental health to our healthcare team who will refer him to see our onsite registered mental health nurse if this is not already in place."  What would you say about this reaction to it? So saying no to the second drop-in, but it is taking action in relation to concerns about mental health raised?  A. I mean, it's welcome, if there's an indication of steps being taken to give you know, somebody who needs extra support with their mental health. You know, we saw very frequently in our work clients whose mental health needs didn't seem to be being appropriately met. We had generally, as I've mentioned, a very positive relationship with the welfare team, a more difficult relationship with healthcare, and therefore we'd often be making enquiries ourselves and were often
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Q. If we can turn to page 10 of this document, please, and if we can go to the first paragraph that has the bold in it, and starts with "Firstly". This is your email in response, on 29 March, and you respond to various points, but on the issue we have just been talking about here, you say, in summary, that you are happy to ask for approval for second drop-in visits, but you say "there are a number of reasons why we may wish to see a detainee for a second time, and I am happy to elaborate if ever needed"?  A. (Witness nods).  Q. Am I right in thinking that you were content to agree to the limit that you had to ask for approval for a repeat drop-in, but you weren't content to agree that there was only one purpose of a repeat drop-in?  A. Yes, absolutely.  Q. Coming on to sort of chronologically, so this is the end	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	"I have passed your concerns about [this person's] mental health to our healthcare team who will refer him to see our onsite registered mental health nurse if this is not already in place."  What would you say about this reaction to it? So saying no to the second drop-in, but it is taking action in relation to concerns about mental health raised?  A. I mean, it's welcome, if there's an indication of steps being taken to give you know, somebody who needs extra support with their mental health. You know, we saw very frequently in our work clients whose mental health needs didn't seem to be being appropriately met. We had generally, as I've mentioned, a very positive relationship with the welfare team, a more difficult relationship with healthcare, and therefore we'd often be making enquiries ourselves and were often unsatisfied you know, it seemed to us the correct
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Q. If we can turn to page 10 of this document, please, and if we can go to the first paragraph that has the bold in it, and starts with "Firstly". This is your email in response, on 29 March, and you respond to various points, but on the issue we have just been talking about here, you say, in summary, that you are happy to ask for approval for second drop-in visits, but you say "there are a number of reasons why we may wish to see a detainee for a second time, and I am happy to elaborate if ever needed"?  A. (Witness nods).  Q. Am I right in thinking that you were content to agree to the limit that you had to ask for approval for a repeat drop-in, but you weren't content to agree that there was only one purpose of a repeat drop-in?  A. Yes, absolutely.  Q. Coming on to sort of chronologically, so this is the end of March, so a couple of days before the relevant	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	"I have passed your concerns about [this person's] mental health to our healthcare team who will refer him to see our onsite registered mental health nurse if this is not already in place."  What would you say about this reaction to it? So saying no to the second drop-in, but it is taking action in relation to concerns about mental health raised?  A. I mean, it's welcome, if there's an indication of steps being taken to give — you know, somebody who needs extra support with their mental health. You know, we saw very frequently in our work clients whose mental health needs didn't seem to be being appropriately met. We had generally, as I've mentioned, a very positive relationship with the welfare team, a more difficult relationship with healthcare, and therefore we'd often be making enquiries ourselves and were often unsatisfied — you know, it seemed to us the correct support wasn't in place. So it is a welcome, you know,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Q. If we can turn to page 10 of this document, please, and if we can go to the first paragraph that has the bold in it, and starts with "Firstly". This is your email in response, on 29 March, and you respond to various points, but on the issue we have just been talking about here, you say, in summary, that you are happy to ask for approval for second drop-in visits, but you say "there are a number of reasons why we may wish to see a detainee for a second time, and I am happy to elaborate if ever needed"?  A. (Witness nods).  Q. Am I right in thinking that you were content to agree to the limit that you had to ask for approval for a repeat drop-in, but you weren't content to agree that there was only one purpose of a repeat drop-in?  A. Yes, absolutely.  Q. Coming on to sort of chronologically, so this is the end of March, so a couple of days before the relevant period. At paragraph 30 of your 2018 statement	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	"I have passed your concerns about [this person's] mental health to our healthcare team who will refer him to see our onsite registered mental health nurse if this is not already in place."  What would you say about this reaction to it? So saying no to the second drop-in, but it is taking action in relation to concerns about mental health raised?  A. I mean, it's welcome, if there's an indication of steps being taken to give you know, somebody who needs extra support with their mental health. You know, we saw very frequently in our work clients whose mental health needs didn't seem to be being appropriately met. We had generally, as I've mentioned, a very positive relationship with the welfare team, a more difficult relationship with healthcare, and therefore we'd often be making enquiries ourselves and were often unsatisfied you know, it seemed to us the correct support wasn't in place. So it is a welcome, you know, action and update, but it would be unlikely, because of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Q. If we can turn to page 10 of this document, please, and if we can go to the first paragraph that has the bold in it, and starts with "Firstly". This is your email in response, on 29 March, and you respond to various points, but on the issue we have just been talking about here, you say, in summary, that you are happy to ask for approval for second drop-in visits, but you say "there are a number of reasons why we may wish to see a detainee for a second time, and I am happy to elaborate if ever needed"?  A. (Witness nods).  Q. Am I right in thinking that you were content to agree to the limit that you had to ask for approval for a repeat drop-in, but you weren't content to agree that there was only one purpose of a repeat drop-in?  A. Yes, absolutely.  Q. Coming on to sort of chronologically, so this is the end of March, so a couple of days before the relevant period. At paragraph 30 of your 2018 statement that's page 10, for the transcribers, of <gdw0000001>,</gdw0000001>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	"I have passed your concerns about [this person's] mental health to our healthcare team who will refer him to see our onsite registered mental health nurse if this is not already in place."  What would you say about this reaction to it? So saying no to the second drop-in, but it is taking action in relation to concerns about mental health raised?  A. I mean, it's welcome, if there's an indication of steps being taken to give you know, somebody who needs extra support with their mental health. You know, we saw very frequently in our work clients whose mental health needs didn't seem to be being appropriately met. We had generally, as I've mentioned, a very positive relationship with the welfare team, a more difficult relationship with healthcare, and therefore we'd often be making enquiries ourselves and were often unsatisfied you know, it seemed to us the correct support wasn't in place. So it is a welcome, you know, action and update, but it would be unlikely, because of our experience elsewhere, to have satisfied us. We
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Q. If we can turn to page 10 of this document, please, and if we can go to the first paragraph that has the bold in it, and starts with "Firstly". This is your email in response, on 29 March, and you respond to various points, but on the issue we have just been talking about here, you say, in summary, that you are happy to ask for approval for second drop-in visits, but you say "there are a number of reasons why we may wish to see a detainee for a second time, and I am happy to elaborate if ever needed"?  A. (Witness nods).  Q. Am I right in thinking that you were content to agree to the limit that you had to ask for approval for a repeat drop-in, but you weren't content to agree that there was only one purpose of a repeat drop-in?  A. Yes, absolutely.  Q. Coming on to sort of chronologically, so this is the end of March, so a couple of days before the relevant period. At paragraph 30 of your 2018 statement that's page 10, for the transcribers, of <gdw000001>, you discuss an incident in April 2017 where Dan Haughton</gdw000001>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	"I have passed your concerns about [this person's] mental health to our healthcare team who will refer him to see our onsite registered mental health nurse if this is not already in place."  What would you say about this reaction to it? So saying no to the second drop-in, but it is taking action in relation to concerns about mental health raised?  A. I mean, it's welcome, if there's an indication of steps being taken to give you know, somebody who needs extra support with their mental health. You know, we saw very frequently in our work clients whose mental health needs didn't seem to be being appropriately met. We had generally, as I've mentioned, a very positive relationship with the welfare team, a more difficult relationship with healthcare, and therefore we'd often be making enquiries ourselves and were often unsatisfied you know, it seemed to us the correct support wasn't in place. So it is a welcome, you know, action and update, but it would be unlikely, because of our experience elsewhere, to have satisfied us. We would have wanted at least to speak to the client more
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Q. If we can turn to page 10 of this document, please, and if we can go to the first paragraph that has the bold in it, and starts with "Firstly". This is your email in response, on 29 March, and you respond to various points, but on the issue we have just been talking about here, you say, in summary, that you are happy to ask for approval for second drop-in visits, but you say "there are a number of reasons why we may wish to see a detainee for a second time, and I am happy to elaborate if ever needed"?  A. (Witness nods).  Q. Am I right in thinking that you were content to agree to the limit that you had to ask for approval for a repeat drop-in, but you weren't content to agree that there was only one purpose of a repeat drop-in?  A. Yes, absolutely.  Q. Coming on to sort of chronologically, so this is the end of March, so a couple of days before the relevant period. At paragraph 30 of your 2018 statement that's page 10, for the transcribers, of <gdw000001>, you discuss an incident in April 2017 where Dan Haughton refused a request by your colleague Ms Blackwell to see</gdw000001>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	"I have passed your concerns about [this person's] mental health to our healthcare team who will refer him to see our onsite registered mental health nurse if this is not already in place."  What would you say about this reaction to it? So saying no to the second drop-in, but it is taking action in relation to concerns about mental health raised?  A. I mean, it's welcome, if there's an indication of steps being taken to give you know, somebody who needs extra support with their mental health. You know, we saw very frequently in our work clients whose mental health needs didn't seem to be being appropriately met. We had generally, as I've mentioned, a very positive relationship with the welfare team, a more difficult relationship with healthcare, and therefore we'd often be making enquiries ourselves and were often unsatisfied you know, it seemed to us the correct support wasn't in place. So it is a welcome, you know, action and update, but it would be unlikely, because of our experience elsewhere, to have satisfied us. We would have wanted at least to speak to the client more to see what had happened and what had changed.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Q. If we can turn to page 10 of this document, please, and if we can go to the first paragraph that has the bold in it, and starts with "Firstly". This is your email in response, on 29 March, and you respond to various points, but on the issue we have just been talking about here, you say, in summary, that you are happy to ask for approval for second drop-in visits, but you say "there are a number of reasons why we may wish to see a detainee for a second time, and I am happy to elaborate if ever needed"?  A. (Witness nods).  Q. Am I right in thinking that you were content to agree to the limit that you had to ask for approval for a repeat drop-in, but you weren't content to agree that there was only one purpose of a repeat drop-in?  A. Yes, absolutely.  Q. Coming on to sort of chronologically, so this is the end of March, so a couple of days before the relevant period. At paragraph 30 of your 2018 statement that's page 10, for the transcribers, of <gdw000001>, you discuss an incident in April 2017 where Dan Haughton refused a request by your colleague Ms Blackwell to see a detainee for a repeat drop-in session. If we can go</gdw000001>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	"I have passed your concerns about [this person's] mental health to our healthcare team who will refer him to see our onsite registered mental health nurse if this is not already in place."  What would you say about this reaction to it? So saying no to the second drop-in, but it is taking action in relation to concerns about mental health raised?  A. I mean, it's welcome, if there's an indication of steps being taken to give you know, somebody who needs extra support with their mental health. You know, we saw very frequently in our work clients whose mental health needs didn't seem to be being appropriately met. We had generally, as I've mentioned, a very positive relationship with the welfare team, a more difficult relationship with healthcare, and therefore we'd often be making enquiries ourselves and were often unsatisfied you know, it seemed to us the correct support wasn't in place. So it is a welcome, you know, action and update, but it would be unlikely, because of our experience elsewhere, to have satisfied us. We would have wanted at least to speak to the client more to see what had happened and what had changed.  Q. We see here, and we will see throughout, and we have
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Q. If we can turn to page 10 of this document, please, and if we can go to the first paragraph that has the bold in it, and starts with "Firstly". This is your email in response, on 29 March, and you respond to various points, but on the issue we have just been talking about here, you say, in summary, that you are happy to ask for approval for second drop-in visits, but you say "there are a number of reasons why we may wish to see a detainee for a second time, and I am happy to elaborate if ever needed"?  A. (Witness nods).  Q. Am I right in thinking that you were content to agree to the limit that you had to ask for approval for a repeat drop-in, but you weren't content to agree that there was only one purpose of a repeat drop-in?  A. Yes, absolutely.  Q. Coming on to sort of chronologically, so this is the end of March, so a couple of days before the relevant period. At paragraph 30 of your 2018 statement that's page 10, for the transcribers, of <gdw000001>, you discuss an incident in April 2017 where Dan Haughton refused a request by your colleague Ms Blackwell to see a detainee for a repeat drop-in session. If we can go to page 15 of this document, please.</gdw000001>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	"I have passed your concerns about [this person's] mental health to our healthcare team who will refer him to see our onsite registered mental health nurse if this is not already in place."  What would you say about this reaction to it? So saying no to the second drop-in, but it is taking action in relation to concerns about mental health raised?  A. I mean, it's welcome, if there's an indication of steps being taken to give — you know, somebody who needs extra support with their mental health. You know, we saw very frequently in our work clients whose mental health needs didn't seem to be being appropriately met. We had generally, as I've mentioned, a very positive relationship with the welfare team, a more difficult relationship with healthcare, and therefore we'd often be making enquiries ourselves and were often unsatisfied — you know, it seemed to us the correct support wasn't in place. So it is a welcome, you know, action and update, but it would be unlikely, because of our experience elsewhere, to have satisfied us. We would have wanted at least to speak to the client more to see what had happened and what had changed.  Q. We see here, and we will see throughout, and we have already discussed, this distinction being made, quite
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Q. If we can turn to page 10 of this document, please, and if we can go to the first paragraph that has the bold in it, and starts with "Firstly". This is your email in response, on 29 March, and you respond to various points, but on the issue we have just been talking about here, you say, in summary, that you are happy to ask for approval for second drop-in visits, but you say "there are a number of reasons why we may wish to see a detainee for a second time, and I am happy to elaborate if ever needed"?  A. (Witness nods).  Q. Am I right in thinking that you were content to agree to the limit that you had to ask for approval for a repeat drop-in, but you weren't content to agree that there was only one purpose of a repeat drop-in?  A. Yes, absolutely.  Q. Coming on to sort of chronologically, so this is the end of March, so a couple of days before the relevant period. At paragraph 30 of your 2018 statement that's page 10, for the transcribers, of <gdw000001>, you discuss an incident in April 2017 where Dan Haughton refused a request by your colleague Ms Blackwell to see a detainee for a repeat drop-in session. If we can go</gdw000001>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	"I have passed your concerns about [this person's] mental health to our healthcare team who will refer him to see our onsite registered mental health nurse if this is not already in place."  What would you say about this reaction to it? So saying no to the second drop-in, but it is taking action in relation to concerns about mental health raised?  A. I mean, it's welcome, if there's an indication of steps being taken to give you know, somebody who needs extra support with their mental health. You know, we saw very frequently in our work clients whose mental health needs didn't seem to be being appropriately met. We had generally, as I've mentioned, a very positive relationship with the welfare team, a more difficult relationship with healthcare, and therefore we'd often be making enquiries ourselves and were often unsatisfied you know, it seemed to us the correct support wasn't in place. So it is a welcome, you know, action and update, but it would be unlikely, because of our experience elsewhere, to have satisfied us. We would have wanted at least to speak to the client more to see what had happened and what had changed.  Q. We see here, and we will see throughout, and we have

1

2

3

4

5

6

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1	a sort of stark distinction between drop-in clinics
2	where staff can go and see someone in the legal visits
3	room, and social visits, which are a visitor,
4	a volunteer visitor, seeing someone. Here we have
5	Dan Haughton saying, "You can't maintain regular
6	contacts in the drop-ins, but that can happen in the
7	context of social visits". Did you have any
8	understanding as to why there was seen to be this stark
9	difference between the two types of contact?
10	A. I'm sorry, I'm not clear, in terms of from
11	management's point of view?
12	Q. Yes. Firstly, did you understand why they saw it as
13	essentially fine to keep contact with visitors but not
14	fine to keep contact with by GDWG staff?
15	A. I mean, the message they gave us was that they and on
16	reviewing the emails, this will be made more clearly
17	more directly to me perhaps in my notes from meetings
18	than perhaps I would necessarily recall. Their message
19	was, "We see you as a visitors organisation, not we
20	don't see the need for your wider work, your casework,
21	with clients. Therefore, why do you need to see
22	somebody in a private room more than this one time? You
23	can see them in the visits hall". Where, in fact, there
24	are clear limitations, I think yeah, there are
25	limitations on what can be covered, what support can be
	Page 25

# Q. You come on in your statement to discuss a further occasion in May 2017 -- this is, for the transcriber, at paragraphs 31 to 32 on the 2018 statement. You describe this further occasion where a request was made to have a second meeting with the detained person, and if we can bring that up at <GDW000003> page 27, please. This is an email from Ana Szopa to you, giving you an update on what was going on, and saying that this person met a vulnerable 14-year-old boy and that she wanted to have a repeat visit because she believed that he was very vulnerable and potentially under age and that he potentially wanted to disclose something but time had run out, and we can see here she quotes what Dan Haughton said to her in refusing that request for a repeat drop-in. It says: "To put it bluntly: no. There has been scrutiny from outside and concerns raised about your drop-ins. It has developed into a welfare surgery. This is not its intended purpose. From the HO's [Home Office's] point of view this is not the purpose of your drop-in. The detainee has been integrated into the general population and is doing well. We have built the support plan with him and he likes it."

What was your reaction to this email from Ms Szopa?

Page 26

given to somebody, in the visits hall environment.

```
Page 27
 1
          that referral could happen. So it seemed very clear.
 2
          So it seemed a very -- yes, a very unreasonable refusal.
 3
       Q. It refers to, here, "scrutiny from outside". What, if
 4
          anything, did you understand that to refer to?
 5
       A. I'm not sure that, at the time, I was clear what that
 6
          meant or where "outside" was.
 7
       Q. You flag in your statement, your 2018 statement, at
 8
          paragraphs 33 to 34, that this person was someone, who
 9
          the inquiry knows as D852, who was the person shown on
10
          Panorama as being suspected of being under age and
11
          having been forced to test spice, and obviously it says
12
          here that he was scared of sharing a room with adults,
13
          which is also something, I think, which was reflected on
14
          Panorama. What do you think or what do you say about
15
          the consequences of this refusal to have a repeat
16
          drop-in visit?
17
       A. Yes. I mean, it seems clear to me that they were
18
          serious. I mean, had we been able to have this visit,
19
          we would have completed that referral to the
20
          Refugee Council, who were the most expert, as I say, on
2.1
          cases in detention where somebody may be, or was
22
          believed to be, under 18. They would have responded
23
          very rapidly. And I'm as confident as I can be that
24
          their intervention, whether or not it led to a swift
25
          release from detention, they would have looked quickly
```

Page 28

A. I was very concerned. I mean, firstly, there remains

more meetings with a client. There might be, for

example, vulnerabilities, things that they only felt

a number of people, we couldn't see -- couldn't be

useful to do that. But particularly, I mean, the

covered. There's a variety of reasons why we wanted --

would have wanted to do that, why it would have been

particular aspect, it was concerning as a refusal anyway

and generally, but particularly here, we have a client

who is telling us that they are 14, so should not, if

they are under 18, be in detention. What Ana is

responsively, to look at arrangements for an age

to be looking at. So the main purpose of the next

meeting, as I understood, was to get a form signed so

referring to here is the Refugee Council Children's

Panel who, at the time, were the main NGO providing

support across the detention system where there were

age-dispute cases, who would come in very rapidly, very

assessment. This was a very appropriate pathway for us

able to disclose to us and wouldn't be disclosing to the centre in the first instance. There may be issues we wanted to explore more, which, in the limited time of that -- the drop-in meeting, where we're trying to see

the sort of general point, from our point of view, there

were a number of reasons why we might want a second or

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

g

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1	at issues like the room-sharing situation. So I'm	1	you consider it was just G4S who were doing so or
2	confident that the client was put in a was left in	2	whether you think the Home Office were also involved in
3	a vulnerable position that they probably otherwise	3	this?
4	wouldn't have been in.	4	A. I think I can go on, you know, in terms of my direct
5	Q. It refers here to the fact that Ms Szopa had referred	5	communication with management and the meetings that
6	him to the Safer Community Team. Ms Pincus told us	6	I had. Again, my impression was that this was that
7	a little bit about that yesterday. Do you know whether	7	management of G4S and the Home Office management
8	there was anything any quick response or any response	8	presence within the centre were very much working in
9	from the safer community team?	9	sync.
10	A. I don't recall, I'm afraid. I don't recall.	10	Q. I'm going to come on a bit later in time to some other
11	Q. Did you, at the time, have confidence in raising things	11	things. Also, going back in time a little bit, at
12	with the Safer Community Team that they would take	12	paragraph 18 of your witness statement, you say that G4S
13	action?	13	were highly critical of a member of GDWG staff,
14	A. We did we certainly did receive things from the Safer	14	Naomi Blackwell, having made a witness statement in
15	Community Team. My recollection is, I don't remember	15	support of a claim for judicial review. We have already
16	many detailed responses from the Safer Community Team.	16	briefly touched upon that.
17	I remember acknowledgements that they had received the	17	By way of background about that case, although we
18	concern and passed it on to someone else, but I don't	18	won't refer to the case by its name, to your knowledge,
19	remember much follow-up beyond that.	19	was it right that this was a judicial review claim
20	Q. In your statement, jumping a bit, you also give, just on	20	advanced on behalf of a detained person at Brook House
21	the issue of visits here, an example about a detention	21	who was severely mentally unwell, lacked mental capacity
22	officer, DCO Gayatri Mehraa, who would challenge staff	22	and could not advocate for himself in relation to
23	if she thought there was a repeat visit and even	23	unlawful detention at Brook House?
24	interrupted a meeting on one occasion. Ms Pincus told	24	A. Yes, that's correct.
25	us yesterday that she was in the meeting that DCO Mehraa	25	Q. Is it right that Ms Blackwell made a witness statement
	D 20		D 24
	Page 29		Page 31
1	interrupted. Was that the only occasion you heard of	1	as part of that claim setting out her dealings with that
2	her challenging GDWG volunteers or staff or were there	2	particular detained person?
3	others as well?	3	A. Yes, I believe that's correct.
4			
5	A. I don't recall meeting although I sometimes ran those	4	Q. This was before you were director; yes?
5	A. I don't recall meeting — although I sometimes ran those sessions, I don't think I met the officer myself, or met	5	
6	y y	1	Q. This was before you were director; yes?
	sessions, I don't think I met the officer myself, or met	5	<ul><li>Q. This was before you were director; yes?</li><li>A. Yes.</li></ul>
6	sessions, I don't think I met the officer myself, or met her very briefly and didn't have any particular	5 6	<ul><li>Q. This was before you were director; yes?</li><li>A. Yes.</li><li>Q. To your knowledge, what happened as a result of</li></ul>
6 7	sessions, I don't think I met the officer myself, or met her very briefly and didn't have any particular concerns. But I was made aware that she had been	5 6 7	<ul><li>Q. This was before you were director; yes?</li><li>A. Yes.</li><li>Q. To your knowledge, what happened as a result of Ms Blackwell making that witness statement in terms of</li></ul>
6 7 8	sessions, I don't think I met the officer myself, or met her very briefly and didn't have any particular concerns. But I was made aware that she had been difficult. I heard about the incident with Anna where	5 6 7 8	<ul><li>Q. This was before you were director; yes?</li><li>A. Yes.</li><li>Q. To your knowledge, what happened as a result of Ms Blackwell making that witness statement in terms of how GDWG were treated?</li></ul>
6 7 8 9	sessions, I don't think I met the officer myself, or met her very briefly and didn't have any particular concerns. But I was made aware that she had been difficult. I heard about the incident with Anna where she invaded the meeting and accused us of having	5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>Q. This was before you were director; yes?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. To your knowledge, what happened as a result of Ms Blackwell making that witness statement in terms of how GDWG were treated?</li> <li>A. I mean, my understanding was that it had firstly</li> </ul>
6 7 8 9 10	sessions, I don't think I met the officer myself, or met her very briefly and didn't have any particular concerns. But I was made aware that she had been difficult. I heard about the incident with Anna where she invaded the meeting and accused us of having a second meeting. And I think, if I recall correctly,	5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>Q. This was before you were director; yes?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. To your knowledge, what happened as a result of Ms Blackwell making that witness statement in terms of how GDWG were treated?</li> <li>A. I mean, my understanding was that it had firstly I think that was around October 2015, the statement.</li> </ul>
6 7 8 9 10 11	sessions, I don't think I met the officer myself, or met her very briefly and didn't have any particular concerns. But I was made aware that she had been difficult. I heard about the incident with Anna where she invaded the meeting and accused us of having a second meeting. And I think, if I recall correctly, that Ana Szopa also had a very similar experience.	5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>Q. This was before you were director; yes?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. To your knowledge, what happened as a result of Ms Blackwell making that witness statement in terms of how GDWG were treated?</li> <li>A. I mean, my understanding was that it had firstly I think that was around October 2015, the statement. I think that had I understood subsequently that had</li> </ul>
6 7 8 9 10 11 12	sessions, I don't think I met the officer myself, or met her very briefly and didn't have any particular concerns. But I was made aware that she had been difficult. I heard about the incident with Anna where she invaded the meeting and accused us of having a second meeting. And I think, if I recall correctly, that Ana Szopa also had a very similar experience.  Q. I'm asked on behalf of Duncan Lewis to ask you what you	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>Q. This was before you were director; yes?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. To your knowledge, what happened as a result of Ms Blackwell making that witness statement in terms of how GDWG were treated?</li> <li>A. I mean, my understanding was that it had firstly — I think that was around October 2015, the statement. I think that had — I understood subsequently that had prompted conversations that led to the draft memorandum</li> </ul>
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	sessions, I don't think I met the officer myself, or met her very briefly and didn't have any particular concerns. But I was made aware that she had been difficult. I heard about the incident with Anna where she invaded the meeting and accused us of having a second meeting. And I think, if I recall correctly, that Ana Szopa also had a very similar experience.  Q. I'm asked on behalf of Duncan Lewis to ask you what you think, if you do have a view on this, the reason for her	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>Q. This was before you were director; yes?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. To your knowledge, what happened as a result of Ms Blackwell making that witness statement in terms of how GDWG were treated?</li> <li>A. I mean, my understanding was that it had firstly I think that was around October 2015, the statement.</li> <li>I think that had I understood subsequently that had prompted conversations that led to the draft memorandum of understanding around February 2016. Otherwise, in</li> </ul>
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	sessions, I don't think I met the officer myself, or met her very briefly and didn't have any particular concerns. But I was made aware that she had been difficult. I heard about the incident with Anna where she invaded the meeting and accused us of having a second meeting. And I think, if I recall correctly, that Ana Szopa also had a very similar experience.  Q. I'm asked on behalf of Duncan Lewis to ask you what you think, if you do have a view on this, the reason for her attitude towards GDWG was?	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>Q. This was before you were director; yes?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. To your knowledge, what happened as a result of Ms Blackwell making that witness statement in terms of how GDWG were treated?</li> <li>A. I mean, my understanding was that it had firstly I think that was around October 2015, the statement. I think that had I understood subsequently that had prompted conversations that led to the draft memorandum of understanding around February 2016. Otherwise, in terms of how it's difficult to say, without obviously</li> </ul>
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	sessions, I don't think I met the officer myself, or met her very briefly and didn't have any particular concerns. But I was made aware that she had been difficult. I heard about the incident with Anna where she invaded the meeting and accused us of having a second meeting. And I think, if I recall correctly, that Ana Szopa also had a very similar experience.  Q. I'm asked on behalf of Duncan Lewis to ask you what you think, if you do have a view on this, the reason for her attitude towards GDWG was?  A. It's hard to answer that. My impression was there was	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>Q. This was before you were director; yes?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. To your knowledge, what happened as a result of Ms Blackwell making that witness statement in terms of how GDWG were treated?</li> <li>A. I mean, my understanding was that it had firstly I think that was around October 2015, the statement. I think that had I understood subsequently that had prompted conversations that led to the draft memorandum of understanding around February 2016. Otherwise, in terms of how it's difficult to say, without obviously being in meetings, you know, internally, what the impact</li> </ul>
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	sessions, I don't think I met the officer myself, or met her very briefly and didn't have any particular concerns. But I was made aware that she had been difficult. I heard about the incident with Anna where she invaded the meeting and accused us of having a second meeting. And I think, if I recall correctly, that Ana Szopa also had a very similar experience.  Q. I'm asked on behalf of Duncan Lewis to ask you what you think, if you do have a view on this, the reason for her attitude towards GDWG was?  A. It's hard to answer that. My impression was there was a strong hostility there towards us, our presence.	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>Q. This was before you were director; yes?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. To your knowledge, what happened as a result of Ms Blackwell making that witness statement in terms of how GDWG were treated?</li> <li>A. I mean, my understanding was that it had firstly I think that was around October 2015, the statement. I think that had I understood subsequently that had prompted conversations that led to the draft memorandum of understanding around February 2016. Otherwise, in terms of how it's difficult to say, without obviously being in meetings, you know, internally, what the impact was specifically, but I can only reasonably assume that</li> </ul>
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	sessions, I don't think I met the officer myself, or met her very briefly and didn't have any particular concerns. But I was made aware that she had been difficult. I heard about the incident with Anna where she invaded the meeting and accused us of having a second meeting. And I think, if I recall correctly, that Ana Szopa also had a very similar experience.  Q. I'm asked on behalf of Duncan Lewis to ask you what you think, if you do have a view on this, the reason for her attitude towards GDWG was?  A. It's hard to answer that. My impression was there was a strong hostility there towards us, our presence.  Q. Did you have any understanding or experience that there	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>Q. This was before you were director; yes?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. To your knowledge, what happened as a result of Ms Blackwell making that witness statement in terms of how GDWG were treated?</li> <li>A. I mean, my understanding was that it had firstly I think that was around October 2015, the statement. I think that had I understood subsequently that had prompted conversations that led to the draft memorandum of understanding around February 2016. Otherwise, in terms of how it's difficult to say, without obviously being in meetings, you know, internally, what the impact was specifically, but I can only reasonably assume that it was a very that it was a key part of either</li> </ul>
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	sessions, I don't think I met the officer myself, or met her very briefly and didn't have any particular concerns. But I was made aware that she had been difficult. I heard about the incident with Anna where she invaded the meeting and accused us of having a second meeting. And I think, if I recall correctly, that Ana Szopa also had a very similar experience.  Q. I'm asked on behalf of Duncan Lewis to ask you what you think, if you do have a view on this, the reason for her attitude towards GDWG was?  A. It's hard to answer that. My impression was there was a strong hostility there towards us, our presence.  Q. Did you have any understanding or experience that there was any sort of communication from management towards	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>Q. This was before you were director; yes?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. To your knowledge, what happened as a result of Ms Blackwell making that witness statement in terms of how GDWG were treated?</li> <li>A. I mean, my understanding was that it had firstly I think that was around October 2015, the statement. I think that had I understood subsequently that had prompted conversations that led to the draft memorandum of understanding around February 2016. Otherwise, in terms of how it's difficult to say, without obviously being in meetings, you know, internally, what the impact was specifically, but I can only reasonably assume that it was a very that it was a key part of either a cause of, or an excuse for, some suspicion and</li> </ul>
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	sessions, I don't think I met the officer myself, or met her very briefly and didn't have any particular concerns. But I was made aware that she had been difficult. I heard about the incident with Anna where she invaded the meeting and accused us of having a second meeting. And I think, if I recall correctly, that Ana Szopa also had a very similar experience.  Q. I'm asked on behalf of Duncan Lewis to ask you what you think, if you do have a view on this, the reason for her attitude towards GDWG was?  A. It's hard to answer that. My impression was there was a strong hostility there towards us, our presence.  Q. Did you have any understanding or experience that there was any sort of communication from management towards DCOs and DCMs about the approach that should or that	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>Q. This was before you were director; yes?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. To your knowledge, what happened as a result of Ms Blackwell making that witness statement in terms of how GDWG were treated?</li> <li>A. I mean, my understanding was that it had firstly — I think that was around October 2015, the statement. I think that had — I understood subsequently that had prompted conversations that led to the draft memorandum of understanding around February 2016. Otherwise, in terms of how — it's difficult to say, without obviously being in meetings, you know, internally, what the impact was specifically, but I can only reasonably assume that it was a very — that it was a key part of — either a cause of, or an excuse for, some suspicion and hostility we were receiving, because it was referred to</li> </ul>
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	sessions, I don't think I met the officer myself, or met her very briefly and didn't have any particular concerns. But I was made aware that she had been difficult. I heard about the incident with Anna where she invaded the meeting and accused us of having a second meeting. And I think, if I recall correctly, that Ana Szopa also had a very similar experience.  Q. I'm asked on behalf of Duncan Lewis to ask you what you think, if you do have a view on this, the reason for her attitude towards GDWG was?  A. It's hard to answer that. My impression was there was a strong hostility there towards us, our presence.  Q. Did you have any understanding or experience that there was any sort of communication from management towards DCOs and DCMs about the approach that should or that should be taken to GDWG?	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>Q. This was before you were director; yes?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. To your knowledge, what happened as a result of Ms Blackwell making that witness statement in terms of how GDWG were treated?</li> <li>A. I mean, my understanding was that it had firstly I think that was around October 2015, the statement. I think that had I understood subsequently that had prompted conversations that led to the draft memorandum of understanding around February 2016. Otherwise, in terms of how it's difficult to say, without obviously being in meetings, you know, internally, what the impact was specifically, but I can only reasonably assume that it was a very that it was a key part of either a cause of, or an excuse for, some suspicion and hostility we were receiving, because it was referred to in, I think, more or less every meeting I went on to</li> </ul>
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	sessions, I don't think I met the officer myself, or met her very briefly and didn't have any particular concerns. But I was made aware that she had been difficult. I heard about the incident with Anna where she invaded the meeting and accused us of having a second meeting. And I think, if I recall correctly, that Ana Szopa also had a very similar experience.  Q. I'm asked on behalf of Duncan Lewis to ask you what you think, if you do have a view on this, the reason for her attitude towards GDWG was?  A. It's hard to answer that. My impression was there was a strong hostility there towards us, our presence.  Q. Did you have any understanding or experience that there was any sort of communication from management towards DCOs and DCMs about the approach that should or that should be taken to GDWG?  A. I don't know that there was.	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>Q. This was before you were director; yes?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. To your knowledge, what happened as a result of Ms Blackwell making that witness statement in terms of how GDWG were treated?</li> <li>A. I mean, my understanding was that it had firstly I think that was around October 2015, the statement. I think that had I understood subsequently that had prompted conversations that led to the draft memorandum of understanding around February 2016. Otherwise, in terms of how it's difficult to say, without obviously being in meetings, you know, internally, what the impact was specifically, but I can only reasonably assume that it was a very that it was a key part of either a cause of, or an excuse for, some suspicion and hostility we were receiving, because it was referred to in, I think, more or less every meeting I went on to have with the management, even, yeah, meetings that</li> </ul>
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	sessions, I don't think I met the officer myself, or met her very briefly and didn't have any particular concerns. But I was made aware that she had been difficult. I heard about the incident with Anna where she invaded the meeting and accused us of having a second meeting. And I think, if I recall correctly, that Ana Szopa also had a very similar experience.  Q. I'm asked on behalf of Duncan Lewis to ask you what you think, if you do have a view on this, the reason for her attitude towards GDWG was?  A. It's hard to answer that. My impression was there was a strong hostility there towards us, our presence.  Q. Did you have any understanding or experience that there was any sort of communication from management towards DCOs and DCMs about the approach that should or that should be taken to GDWG?  A. I don't know that there was.  Q. Overall, did you consider that G4S were limiting your	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>Q. This was before you were director; yes?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. To your knowledge, what happened as a result of Ms Blackwell making that witness statement in terms of how GDWG were treated?</li> <li>A. I mean, my understanding was that it had firstly I think that was around October 2015, the statement. I think that had I understood subsequently that had prompted conversations that led to the draft memorandum of understanding around February 2016. Otherwise, in terms of how it's difficult to say, without obviously being in meetings, you know, internally, what the impact was specifically, but I can only reasonably assume that it was a very that it was a key part of either a cause of, or an excuse for, some suspicion and hostility we were receiving, because it was referred to in, I think, more or less every meeting I went on to have with the management, even, yeah, meetings that weren't so meetings towards the end of my time that</li> </ul>
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	sessions, I don't think I met the officer myself, or met her very briefly and didn't have any particular concerns. But I was made aware that she had been difficult. I heard about the incident with Anna where she invaded the meeting and accused us of having a second meeting. And I think, if I recall correctly, that Ana Szopa also had a very similar experience.  Q. I'm asked on behalf of Duncan Lewis to ask you what you think, if you do have a view on this, the reason for her attitude towards GDWG was?  A. It's hard to answer that. My impression was there was a strong hostility there towards us, our presence.  Q. Did you have any understanding or experience that there was any sort of communication from management towards DCOs and DCMs about the approach that should or that should be taken to GDWG?  A. I don't know that there was.  Q. Overall, did you consider that G4S were limiting your access to detained people?	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>Q. This was before you were director; yes?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. To your knowledge, what happened as a result of Ms Blackwell making that witness statement in terms of how GDWG were treated?</li> <li>A. I mean, my understanding was that it had firstly I think that was around October 2015, the statement. I think that had I understood subsequently that had prompted conversations that led to the draft memorandum of understanding around February 2016. Otherwise, in terms of how it's difficult to say, without obviously being in meetings, you know, internally, what the impact was specifically, but I can only reasonably assume that it was a very that it was a key part of either a cause of, or an excuse for, some suspicion and hostility we were receiving, because it was referred to in, I think, more or less every meeting I went on to have with the management, even, yeah, meetings that weren't so meetings towards the end of my time that were more amenable, it was still referred to as if this</li> </ul>
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	sessions, I don't think I met the officer myself, or met her very briefly and didn't have any particular concerns. But I was made aware that she had been difficult. I heard about the incident with Anna where she invaded the meeting and accused us of having a second meeting. And I think, if I recall correctly, that Ana Szopa also had a very similar experience.  Q. I'm asked on behalf of Duncan Lewis to ask you what you think, if you do have a view on this, the reason for her attitude towards GDWG was?  A. It's hard to answer that. My impression was there was a strong hostility there towards us, our presence.  Q. Did you have any understanding or experience that there was any sort of communication from management towards DCOs and DCMs about the approach that should or that should be taken to GDWG?  A. I don't know that there was.  Q. Overall, did you consider that G4S were limiting your access to detained people?  A. Yes, yes.  Q. I'm asked on behalf of Bhatt Murphy to ask you whether	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>Q. This was before you were director; yes?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. To your knowledge, what happened as a result of Ms Blackwell making that witness statement in terms of how GDWG were treated?</li> <li>A. I mean, my understanding was that it had firstly — I think that was around October 2015, the statement. I think that had — I understood subsequently that had prompted conversations that led to the draft memorandum of understanding around February 2016. Otherwise, in terms of how — it's difficult to say, without obviously being in meetings, you know, internally, what the impact was specifically, but I can only reasonably assume that it was a very — that it was a key part of — either a cause of, or an excuse for, some suspicion and hostility we were receiving, because it was referred to in, I think, more or less every meeting I went on to have with the management, even, yeah, meetings that weren't — so meetings towards the end of my time that were more amenable, it was still referred to as if this is a piece of information that we all have about GDWG.</li> <li>Q. Okay. You say, at paragraph 25 of your 2018 statement,</li> </ul>
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	sessions, I don't think I met the officer myself, or met her very briefly and didn't have any particular concerns. But I was made aware that she had been difficult. I heard about the incident with Anna where she invaded the meeting and accused us of having a second meeting. And I think, if I recall correctly, that Ana Szopa also had a very similar experience.  Q. I'm asked on behalf of Duncan Lewis to ask you what you think, if you do have a view on this, the reason for her attitude towards GDWG was?  A. It's hard to answer that. My impression was there was a strong hostility there towards us, our presence.  Q. Did you have any understanding or experience that there was any sort of communication from management towards DCOs and DCMs about the approach that should or that should be taken to GDWG?  A. I don't know that there was.  Q. Overall, did you consider that G4S were limiting your access to detained people?  A. Yes, yes.	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>Q. This was before you were director; yes?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. To your knowledge, what happened as a result of Ms Blackwell making that witness statement in terms of how GDWG were treated?</li> <li>A. I mean, my understanding was that it had firstly I think that was around October 2015, the statement. I think that had I understood subsequently that had prompted conversations that led to the draft memorandum of understanding around February 2016. Otherwise, in terms of how it's difficult to say, without obviously being in meetings, you know, internally, what the impact was specifically, but I can only reasonably assume that it was a very that it was a key part of either a cause of, or an excuse for, some suspicion and hostility we were receiving, because it was referred to in, I think, more or less every meeting I went on to have with the management, even, yeah, meetings that weren't so meetings towards the end of my time that were more amenable, it was still referred to as if this is a piece of information that we all have about GDWG.</li> </ul>

1	that Neil Davies, who I think we said was head of visits	1	have discussed if there had been a further request
2	at Brook House when you first started, told you,	2	for a witness statement from a solicitor in relation to
3	in July 2016, that he didn't want people providing	3	a particular client, we would have discussed it and done
4	witness statements in support of detainees' legal cases.	4	it if it felt appropriate to do so.
5	Was that said explicitly?	5	Q. So during the relevant period, if that had come up in
6	A. Yes. I recall him saying words to the effect of, but	6	a relevant case, you feel like you could have done so,
7	more or less these words, "We see you have been doing	7	if it was appropriate to do so, in your view?
8	social visits, no case work, not standing as sureties	8	A. Yes, yes.
9	and not giving witness statements".	9	Q. Now, we have already discussed the memorandum of
10	Q. Was any reason given for that?	10	understanding, but just so that we can follow this
11	A. I don't recall any reason being given for that.	11	chronologically, you had another meeting in June 2017 to
12	Q. You have said in evidence and you say in your statement	12	discuss that draft memorandum of understanding. You set
13	that this issue was raised repeatedly and you say in	13	that out at paragraph 38 of your 2018 statement.
14	your statement, actually, that this was raised,	14	I think, prior to that meeting, you'd requested that you
15	including by the Home Office, up to and including the	15	be accompanied at that meeting by somebody called
16	meeting with Michelle Smith in January 2018; is that	16	Ali McGinley of the Association of Visitors to
17	right?	17	Immigration Detainees; is that right?
18	A. That's correct.	18	A. That's correct, yes.
19	Q. I'm asked on behalf of Bhatt Murphy to ask if you have	19	Q. If we can bring up, please, <gdw000003>, page 18,</gdw000003>
20	a view as to why you think it was repeatedly raised?	20	firstly, why did you want to be accompanied by
21	A. I think that the meeting you're referring to in 2018	21	Ali McGinley?
22	I mean well, the prior meetings, I think it was being	22	A. So, as you said, Ali is was and is the director of
23	described to me as one of the as an example of GDWG	23	the Association of Visitors to Immigration Detainees
24	having stepped over a particular line. In the 2018	24	AVID who are an umbrella body supporting groups
25	meeting in relation to Tinsley, that was nothing to do	25	visiting people in detention around the UK. Their role
	D 22		D 25
	Page 33		Page 35
1	with Brook House and it wasn't, from my recollection,	1	is can be to train up new visitors groups and support
2	a difficult meeting, it was a positive meeting towards	2	visitors groups to gain access to centres. I knew
3	setting up a new drop-in space. It was referred to	3	anecdotally that there had sometimes been issues with
4	relatively in passing but as something that we know	4	access at Gatwick IRCs and other centres, and AVID would
5	about GDWG where you've stepped over a line in the past.	5	sometimes work with the local group. So I wanted and
6	Q. Other	6	Ali was very diplomatic and skilled at those
7	A. The impression sorry.	7	conversations and in providing assistance and I was,
8	Q. No, no.	8	I think, you know, reflecting on the fact that the last
9	A. The impression I had was that, "This is quite a wide	9	meeting had been difficult, there had been, since then,
10	this is a widely-known piece of information that we know	10	some refusals of second visits, so things seemed to be
11	as the wider management team across the IRCs".	11	deteriorating and I felt a back-up and support in that
12	Q. Is it fair to say that they saw this as an example of	12	meeting would be useful.
13	something negative that you'd done and you didn't see it	13	Q. Obviously we can see here that your suggestion to be
14	like that?	14	accompanied was refused by Stephen Skitt, saying:
15	A. Absolutely, that's correct, yes.	15	"In regards to attendance, this meeting is to
16	Q. Other than your own statement, which I'm referring to,	16	discuss an MoU with yourselves and a number of local
17	from 2018, are you aware in your time at GDWG whether	17	issues that involve your staff support, and I do not
18	staff provided statements in any other litigation in	18	feel it appropriate to involve other organisations at
19	support of detained people between 2015 and 2018?	19	this point, you can of course outside of this speak with
20	A. To my recollection, I don't recall us doing so.	20	AVID and they can offer you some advice."
21	Q. Did you ever tell them tell your staff or your	21	What was your response or how did you feel upon
22	visitors not to do so?	22	receiving this response?
23	A. No. It wasn't, as a matter of practice, something we	23	A. I was disappointed because I felt it might be an
24	would normally do, although I don't remember there ever	24	important back-up for me in the meetings but also
25	being any kind of rule around it. And I think we would	25	a useful kind of expert view in the room for the
25		25	a useful kind of expert view in the room for the  Page 36

### 1 1 discussions. So I was disappointed by that response. now we were getting -- not just being told, "You must 2 2 Q. Looking at the meeting that did take place in June, you request every time", but also being told, "You're 3 say at paragraph 39 of your 2018 statement that, at that 3 requesting this too much", so I was concerned by that 4 meeting, Steve Skitt complained that GDWG were 4 direction. 5 requesting repeated meetings and that -- and he implied 5 Q. You just said there, just to clarify, that there was an 6 that you were offering counselling. Why do you think 6 increasing sort of worsening of the tone of meetings; is 7 Brook House or management were concerned about you using 7 that right? That you felt that this was just getting 8 the drop-in surgeries to do casework or counselling? 8 worse with each meeting? 9 A. I think, on the counselling point, if I may take that 9 A. Yes. Yes, that's correct. 10 first, I'm not -- to be honest, I'm not sure why they 10 Q. If we can bring up page 29 of this document, please, 11 would think that would be the case. I didn't -- was 11 this is an email sent by you, Mr Wilson, the week after 12 never presented with any evidence as to that. We were 12 the meeting. If we can go to the bottom half of 13 clear we were not counsellors, and that was made clear 13 the page. You say in the bottom paragraph here: 14 to all staff, all volunteers, even if they happened to 14 "... grateful to Steve for raising the concern about 15 have, you know, in other parts of their life, experience 15 our implying the provision of counselling, and was sorry 16 we weren't able to finish this conversation. If you around therapeutic support. And I had no -- I don't 16 17 believe, or I was never given any evidence, that that 17 feel that we had somehow stepped over a line of what is 18 was happening. So I couldn't say what that was, other 18 acceptable, please do let me know. We are not 19 than we were raising, you know, in terms of our reasons 19 counsellors and are clear that we are not providing 20 for seeing -- wanting to see clients for a second time 20 a therapeutic or psychiatric service to detainees. 21 at the drop-in, sometimes we were referencing exploring 21 However, being a listening ear, a befriender, and a form 22 mental health issues, but that would have been to 22 of emotional support for detainees who need someone to 23 provide for appropriate, emotional, first-hand support 23 talk to is at the core of what we do. The distinction 24 but also to refer on to other specialist agencies. So 24 between providing emotional support and befriending, as 25 I'm unsure about that. 25 opposed to counselling, feels clear to me (one I am very Page 37 Page 39 1 In terms of the wider point around casework, they 1 familiar with from other jobs and from being a volunteer 2 2 seemed to have -- there seemed a deep, ongoing suspicion with Samaritans elsewhere). If we need to discuss 3 about doing casework, about doing anything, from their 3 further, though, please do say." 4 point of view, more than social visits and giving very 4 Did you feel at this time that G4S genuinely thought 5 practical things that we did, like second-hand clothing. 5 you were crossing the line over to providing counselling 6 If I might add, I was never clear why that suspicion 6 or did you think this was being used as some sort of 7 7 was there around casework, because we were very clear, excuse? 8 8 A. Taken alongside the other concerns they were and I spelt out to them, we were not solicitors, we were 9 not OISC regulated, we weren't giving that kind of 9 increasingly raising, it felt like an excuse. But, 10 10 advice, we were referring and signposting on. So, for again, particularly because I don't think I -- I'm not a variety of reasons, I never understood the basis for 11 11 sure whether I had a response to this particular email. 12 12 I'm clear I don't think I was ever presented with that suspicion. 13 Q. How would you, looking back, describe the tone of that 13 evidence that we were providing counselling or a basis 14 meeting in June 2017? 14 for that. 15 15 Q. You say at the end here, as we can see, "Thank you very A. I think it was in -- the pattern of meetings over those 16 few months was becoming increasingly difficult. It was 16 much again for your ongoing support". What should we 17 17 difficult. I think I felt that -- I think I felt that, take from that? 18 after the last meeting, after the March meeting. I had 18 A. I mean, I was seeking to be as diplomatic as possible, 19 19 responded on the two -- they raised two other issues, and I did -- would -- I was still -- I wanted there to 20 which I was able to respond to. And I had agreed that 20 be a conversation. So I wanted the issues, when they 21 we would seek agreement for the second visits, second 2.1 came up, to be raised to me as much as possible. There 22 drop-in appointments, so I'd hoped we'd reached 22 was a lot I was frustrated about with those 23 a reasonable point at that -- that things were 23 conversations but I was grateful for the dialogue. 24 deteriorating, we then had second visits being turned 24 Q. Did you feel like you were getting ongoing support? 25 down, and it seemed that things were worsening because A. I don't think I would -- I wouldn't -- no. I don't 25

Page 38

### 1 think that would be quite accurate. 1 that was June 2017, and then you come on in your 2 statement at paragraph 44 to discuss a further meeting Q. In paragraph 42 of your 2018 statement, you say that at 2 3 3 the time -- sorry, that the time at the meetings -- so that you had a couple of months later in August 2017 4 we have been through a couple of them -- was being 4 with Steve Skitt and Paul Gasson. You note in your 5 almost entirely taken up by complaints about GDWG and 5 statement that Steve Skitt and Paul Gasson said they 6 that you tried to encourage quarterly meetings and for 6 were seriously considering ending the drop-in surgeries 7 them to provide you with a list of issues for discussion 7 altogether. Did they give you a reason for that? 8 in advance which could allow you to prepare for meetings 8 A. In the meeting itself? q by consulting colleagues. 9 Q. Yes. 10 Now, we will be able to see later that you set that 10 A. Yes, they -- to a point, they referred to recent 11 out in a letter after the relevant period, I think, 11 incidents where they felt we had, in their view, stepped 12 in September 2017. Did you make that proposal about the 12 over a particular line, and the impression that they 13 quarterly meetings and the list of concerns in advance 13 were giving was that we were -- we had repeatedly -- or 14 prior to that? Do you know? 14 we were increasingly going over a particular line and 15 A. I don't recall. I think -- from memory, I made that 15 that, therefore, it should be taken away. 16 suggestion a few times, maybe in meetings rather than in 16 Q. If we can go through some of the things that you have 17 writing. But I can't recall, I'm afraid. 17 set out in your statement that occurred at this meeting, 18 Q. You say at paragraph 42: 18 or that you say occurred at this meeting, one of 19 "I tried to encourage them to set up quarterly 19 the things you say at paragraph 45 is that Steve Skitt 20 meetings and to provide me with a list of issues for 20 complained about two emails sent by your advocacy 21 discussion in advance so that I could prepare for 21 coordinator, Ms Szopa, in August 2017, about a detained 22 meetings (including by consulting with colleagues 22 person who had burn injuries. If we can turn -- for the 23 involved) but I got no response." 23 record, the emails are at <GDW000003> pages 36 to 37, 24 Is that right that you suggested it but didn't 24 but I think you summarise it in your witness statement 25 25 at paragraph 45. really receive a response? Page 43 Page 41 1 A. What I was increasingly feeling was, you know, 1 You say that Ms Szopa had explained she met the 2 I welcomed the conversations but they were happening 2 detained person at the drop-in surgery the day before, 3 very reactively. I think it's the case that in between 3 that his legs and feet had been burnt in a house fire 4 some of these meetings, maybe going back before the 4 ten years previously and he could not walk for more than 5 5 relevant period into, say, the autumn of 2016, I think a few minutes, was falling frequently on the stairs, 6 I'm right in saying that I was -- there were maybe times 6 could not access the shower or meals unless assisted and 7 7 when I suggested a meeting and got no response and then other detainees had to bring food to him. She asked if 8 he could be provided with crutches or a wheelchair as would get a response at a time later when there was Q a particular issue they wanted to discuss. So it was 9 soon as possible and suggested that GDWG could provide 10 10 both -- it was very reactive. It meant that the crutches if cost was an issue. She also requested that 11 general -- the fact that generally they would give me 11 he be referred to an occupational therapist. As she 12 12 little information before the meetings meant that received no response, she sent a remainder email on 13 13 15 August 2017, stressing that the detained person was I was -- would be limited and put in a difficult 14 14 position in the meeting itself. I also wanted, in my -in a lot of pain and could not do basic things such as 15 15 shower or carry food on a tray without help from others. I wanted the meeting to be a positive, regular space 16 where I could also say, you know, "We are seeing these 16 She commented that he was in a wheelchair before he was 17 17 issues. How can we work together to resolve them?" detained but had been told he was not allowed to bring 18 I wanted it to be as constructive as possible. 18 it into the centre with him. 19 Q. Anna Pincus said yesterday that she thought that G4S 19 If we can just bring up page 36, please. The 20 wasn't a listening organisation. Do you have a view on 20 response to this email from Michael Wells, who is listed 21 21 as healthcare practice manager at Brook House, ccing in 22 A. I think certainly the impression that I had from those 22 the Safer Community Team, Steve Skitt, Dan Haughton and 23 meetings was that that was not the -- I never felt that 23 yourself, says: 24 that was what they were seeking to do. 24 "Many thanks for your email stressing your 25 Q. I'm going to move on, again, a little bit in time, so 25 concern ... I can confirm that the healthcare department Page 42 Page 44

1	are aware of this patient and are caring for his medical	1	paragraph 48 it is actually at 49, that Mr Gasson
2	needs on site."	2	from the Home Office's criticism was that Ms Blackwell
3	What was your response upon receiving that email	3	had described the detainee as a "boy" and that she
4	three days prior to the meeting?	4	appeared to accept his account of being under age. Does
5	A. We were I remember being very concerned. I had	5	that feed into the thing you were just talking about
6	spoken with Ana Szopa about her concerns about this	6	there about taking things at face value?
7	particular client and the very bad state he appeared to	7	A. Yes.
8	be in. He needed additional support as a matter of	8	Q. You note that both Mr Gasson and Steve Skitt were
9	urgency, so this seemed a very limited and unreassuring	9	adamant that it was inappropriate to ask the IMB to
10	response.	10	intervene on behalf of detainees. Did you think that it
11	Q. You say in your witness statement that at the meeting	11	was appropriate to do so?
12	so it's three days after this, I believe Mr Skitt	12	A. I thought, firstly, that it was appropriate for us to
13	accepted that this concern had been raised through the	13	raise individual clients' situations with the IMB and,
14	appropriate channel but was strongly critical of what he	14	secondly, I think maybe it sounds like we will come
15	described as the "aggressive" tone and wording of	15	on to this, but if a particular request to the IMB was
16	the email, that it was patronising and that GDWG were	16	inappropriate, then the IMB would have a right to tell
17	inappropriately taking the detained person's story at	17	us that. But I didn't see why it was a matter for
18	face value. Did you agree with what Mr Skitt was	18	management.
19	saying?	19	Might I just add something to my previous answer
20	A. I strongly disagreed with it. I mean, on tone, that's	20	just in relation to Ana Szopa's request and the client
21	something only one you know, one can assess	21	who was badly burnt? There is another thing to say
22	individually on tone in an email, but, for me, the email	22	there in terms of, the client's account was, in this
23	was entirely polite and professional and appropriate.	23	case this wouldn't always be the case because a lot
24	In terms of that point around believing a client's	24	of contact with our clients was by phone, but she'd met
25	account, I think this was raised more than once to me in	25	him at the surgery, she'd seen visibly I think he
	D 45		D 47
	Page 45		Page 47
		I	
1	these meetings as an aside, that we took the client's	1	described him struggling into the room really not being
2	these meetings as an aside, that we took the client's the accusation, I suppose, was we just took the client's	1 2	described him struggling into the room really not being able to walk. There is no reason why she would
2	the accusation, I suppose, was we just took the client's	2	able to walk. There is no reason why she would
2 3	the accusation, I suppose, was we just took the client's story at face value. It's difficult to know how to	2 3	able to walk. There is no reason why she would exaggerate that or seek to inflate that. She was acting
2 3 4	the accusation, I suppose, was we just took the client's story at face value. It's difficult to know how to respond to that because we were responding that was	2 3 4	able to walk. There is no reason why she would exaggerate that or seek to inflate that. She was acting on genuine concern. I have no doubt about that.
2 3 4 5	the accusation, I suppose, was we just took the client's story at face value. It's difficult to know how to respond to that because we were responding that was our role, to assist clients, and so we would be, on the	2 3 4 5	able to walk. There is no reason why she would exaggerate that or seek to inflate that. She was acting on genuine concern. I have no doubt about that.  Q. Thank you, Mr Wilson. Just on this point about raising
2 3 4 5 6	the accusation, I suppose, was we just took the client's story at face value. It's difficult to know how to respond to that because we were responding that was our role, to assist clients, and so we would be, on the face of it, taking things at face value insofar as we	2 3 4 5 6	able to walk. There is no reason why she would exaggerate that or seek to inflate that. She was acting on genuine concern. I have no doubt about that.  Q. Thank you, Mr Wilson. Just on this point about raising things with the IMB, you say in your statement that you
2 3 4 5 6 7	the accusation, I suppose, was we just took the client's story at face value. It's difficult to know how to respond to that because we were responding — that was our role, to assist clients, and so we would be, on the face of it, taking things at face value insofar as we understand this person has a concern and we are	2 3 4 5 6 7	able to walk. There is no reason why she would exaggerate that or seek to inflate that. She was acting on genuine concern. I have no doubt about that.  Q. Thank you, Mr Wilson. Just on this point about raising things with the IMB, you say in your statement that you were told, I think by Mr Skitt, that disapproval of your
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	the accusation, I suppose, was we just took the client's story at face value. It's difficult to know how to respond to that because we were responding that was our role, to assist clients, and so we would be, on the face of it, taking things at face value insofar as we understand this person has a concern and we are following up on it. Every staff and volunteer	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	able to walk. There is no reason why she would exaggerate that or seek to inflate that. She was acting on genuine concern. I have no doubt about that.  Q. Thank you, Mr Wilson. Just on this point about raising things with the IMB, you say in your statement that you were told, I think by Mr Skitt, that disapproval of your referrals to the IMB had "got as high as board level at
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	the accusation, I suppose, was we just took the client's story at face value. It's difficult to know how to respond to that because we were responding — that was our role, to assist clients, and so we would be, on the face of it, taking things at face value insofar as we understand this person has a concern and we are following up on it. Every staff and volunteer understands more — understood there was — there could be more to a story, that the client might misunderstand	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	able to walk. There is no reason why she would exaggerate that or seek to inflate that. She was acting on genuine concern. I have no doubt about that.  Q. Thank you, Mr Wilson. Just on this point about raising things with the IMB, you say in your statement that you were told, I think by Mr Skitt, that disapproval of your referrals to the IMB had "got as high as board level at Brook House". What did you take that to mean?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	the accusation, I suppose, was we just took the client's story at face value. It's difficult to know how to respond to that because we were responding — that was our role, to assist clients, and so we would be, on the face of it, taking things at face value insofar as we understand this person has a concern and we are following up on it. Every staff and volunteer understands more — understood there was — there could be more to a story, that the client might misunderstand something or a client might occasionally be embellishing	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	able to walk. There is no reason why she would exaggerate that or seek to inflate that. She was acting on genuine concern. I have no doubt about that.  Q. Thank you, Mr Wilson. Just on this point about raising things with the IMB, you say in your statement that you were told, I think by Mr Skitt, that disapproval of your referrals to the IMB had "got as high as board level at Brook House". What did you take that to mean?  A. I remember being concerned but also frankly mystified by
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	the accusation, I suppose, was we just took the client's story at face value. It's difficult to know how to respond to that because we were responding — that was our role, to assist clients, and so we would be, on the face of it, taking things at face value insofar as we understand this person has a concern and we are following up on it. Every staff and volunteer understands more — understood there was — there could be more to a story, that the client might misunderstand something or a client might occasionally be embellishing something. There was that understanding. So we were	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	able to walk. There is no reason why she would exaggerate that or seek to inflate that. She was acting on genuine concern. I have no doubt about that.  Q. Thank you, Mr Wilson. Just on this point about raising things with the IMB, you say in your statement that you were told, I think by Mr Skitt, that disapproval of your referrals to the IMB had "got as high as board level at Brook House". What did you take that to mean?  A. I remember being concerned but also frankly mystified by it. Again, I didn't see why it was a matter for management. I didn't see why us raising what was
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	the accusation, I suppose, was we just took the client's story at face value. It's difficult to know how to respond to that because we were responding — that was our role, to assist clients, and so we would be, on the face of it, taking things at face value insofar as we understand this person has a concern and we are following up on it. Every staff and volunteer understands more — understood there was — there could be more to a story, that the client might misunderstand something or a client might occasionally be embellishing something. There was that understanding. So we were always very careful how we made referrals and we	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	able to walk. There is no reason why she would exaggerate that or seek to inflate that. She was acting on genuine concern. I have no doubt about that.  Q. Thank you, Mr Wilson. Just on this point about raising things with the IMB, you say in your statement that you were told, I think by Mr Skitt, that disapproval of your referrals to the IMB had "got as high as board level at Brook House". What did you take that to mean?  A. I remember being concerned but also frankly mystified by it. Again, I didn't see why it was a matter for management. I didn't see why us raising what was just — it was a request to IMB, was a matter for anyone
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	the accusation, I suppose, was we just took the client's story at face value. It's difficult to know how to respond to that because we were responding — that was our role, to assist clients, and so we would be, on the face of it, taking things at face value insofar as we understand this person has a concern and we are following up on it. Every staff and volunteer understands more — understood there was — there could be more to a story, that the client might misunderstand something or a client might occasionally be embellishing something. There was that understanding. So we were always very careful how we made referrals and we couldn't verify the truth of anything but we were acting	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	able to walk. There is no reason why she would exaggerate that or seek to inflate that. She was acting on genuine concern. I have no doubt about that.  Q. Thank you, Mr Wilson. Just on this point about raising things with the IMB, you say in your statement that you were told, I think by Mr Skitt, that disapproval of your referrals to the IMB had "got as high as board level at Brook House". What did you take that to mean?  A. I remember being concerned but also frankly mystified by it. Again, I didn't see why it was a matter for management. I didn't see why us raising what was just it was a request to IMB, was a matter for anyone other than us and the IMB. It wasn't clear.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	the accusation, I suppose, was we just took the client's story at face value. It's difficult to know how to respond to that because we were responding — that was our role, to assist clients, and so we would be, on the face of it, taking things at face value insofar as we understand this person has a concern and we are following up on it. Every staff and volunteer understands more — understood there was — there could be more to a story, that the client might misunderstand something or a client might occasionally be embellishing something. There was that understanding. So we were always very careful how we made referrals and we couldn't verify the truth of anything but we were acting on what we knew. So I never really understood that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	able to walk. There is no reason why she would exaggerate that or seek to inflate that. She was acting on genuine concern. I have no doubt about that.  Q. Thank you, Mr Wilson. Just on this point about raising things with the IMB, you say in your statement that you were told, I think by Mr Skitt, that disapproval of your referrals to the IMB had "got as high as board level at Brook House". What did you take that to mean?  A. I remember being concerned but also frankly mystified by it. Again, I didn't see why it was a matter for management. I didn't see why us raising what was just it was a request to IMB, was a matter for anyone other than us and the IMB. It wasn't clear.  Q. Do you have any insight as to what "board level" means?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	the accusation, I suppose, was we just took the client's story at face value. It's difficult to know how to respond to that because we were responding — that was our role, to assist clients, and so we would be, on the face of it, taking things at face value insofar as we understand this person has a concern and we are following up on it. Every staff and volunteer understands more — understood there was — there could be more to a story, that the client might misunderstand something or a client might occasionally be embellishing something. There was that understanding. So we were always very careful how we made referrals and we couldn't verify the truth of anything but we were acting on what we knew. So I never really understood that point.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	able to walk. There is no reason why she would exaggerate that or seek to inflate that. She was acting on genuine concern. I have no doubt about that.  Q. Thank you, Mr Wilson. Just on this point about raising things with the IMB, you say in your statement that you were told, I think by Mr Skitt, that disapproval of your referrals to the IMB had "got as high as board level at Brook House". What did you take that to mean?  A. I remember being concerned but also frankly mystified by it. Again, I didn't see why it was a matter for management. I didn't see why us raising what was just — it was a request to IMB, was a matter for anyone other than us and the IMB. It wasn't clear.  Q. Do you have any insight as to what "board level" means? Because we know that Mr Skitt was deputy director, so he
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	the accusation, I suppose, was we just took the client's story at face value. It's difficult to know how to respond to that because we were responding — that was our role, to assist clients, and so we would be, on the face of it, taking things at face value insofar as we understand this person has a concern and we are following up on it. Every staff and volunteer understands more — understood there was — there could be more to a story, that the client might misunderstand something or a client might occasionally be embellishing something. There was that understanding. So we were always very careful how we made referrals and we couldn't verify the truth of anything but we were acting on what we knew. So I never really understood that point.  Q. You say, at paragraph 48 of your statement, that at the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	able to walk. There is no reason why she would exaggerate that or seek to inflate that. She was acting on genuine concern. I have no doubt about that.  Q. Thank you, Mr Wilson. Just on this point about raising things with the IMB, you say in your statement that you were told, I think by Mr Skitt, that disapproval of your referrals to the IMB had "got as high as board level at Brook House". What did you take that to mean?  A. I remember being concerned but also frankly mystified by it. Again, I didn't see why it was a matter for management. I didn't see why us raising what was just it was a request to IMB, was a matter for anyone other than us and the IMB. It wasn't clear.  Q. Do you have any insight as to what "board level" means? Because we know that Mr Skitt was deputy director, so he is the second-in-command. Do you know what that means?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	the accusation, I suppose, was we just took the client's story at face value. It's difficult to know how to respond to that because we were responding — that was our role, to assist clients, and so we would be, on the face of it, taking things at face value insofar as we understand this person has a concern and we are following up on it. Every staff and volunteer understands more — understood there was — there could be more to a story, that the client might misunderstand something or a client might occasionally be embellishing something. There was that understanding. So we were always very careful how we made referrals and we couldn't verify the truth of anything but we were acting on what we knew. So I never really understood that point.  Q. You say, at paragraph 48 of your statement, that at the meeting in August 2017, Brook House also took great	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	able to walk. There is no reason why she would exaggerate that or seek to inflate that. She was acting on genuine concern. I have no doubt about that.  Q. Thank you, Mr Wilson. Just on this point about raising things with the IMB, you say in your statement that you were told, I think by Mr Skitt, that disapproval of your referrals to the IMB had "got as high as board level at Brook House". What did you take that to mean?  A. I remember being concerned but also frankly mystified by it. Again, I didn't see why it was a matter for management. I didn't see why us raising what was just it was a request to IMB, was a matter for anyone other than us and the IMB. It wasn't clear.  Q. Do you have any insight as to what "board level" means? Because we know that Mr Skitt was deputy director, so he is the second-in-command. Do you know what that means?  A. No, I wasn't clear on that.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	the accusation, I suppose, was we just took the client's story at face value. It's difficult to know how to respond to that because we were responding — that was our role, to assist clients, and so we would be, on the face of it, taking things at face value insofar as we understand this person has a concern and we are following up on it. Every staff and volunteer understands more — understood there was — there could be more to a story, that the client might misunderstand something or a client might occasionally be embellishing something. There was that understanding. So we were always very careful how we made referrals and we couldn't verify the truth of anything but we were acting on what we knew. So I never really understood that point.  Q. You say, at paragraph 48 of your statement, that at the meeting in August 2017, Brook House also took great exception to an email which a member of GDWG staff had	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	able to walk. There is no reason why she would exaggerate that or seek to inflate that. She was acting on genuine concern. I have no doubt about that.  Q. Thank you, Mr Wilson. Just on this point about raising things with the IMB, you say in your statement that you were told, I think by Mr Skitt, that disapproval of your referrals to the IMB had "got as high as board level at Brook House". What did you take that to mean?  A. I remember being concerned but also frankly mystified by it. Again, I didn't see why it was a matter for management. I didn't see why us raising what was just — it was a request to IMB, was a matter for anyone other than us and the IMB. It wasn't clear.  Q. Do you have any insight as to what "board level" means? Because we know that Mr Skitt was deputy director, so he is the second-in-command. Do you know what that means?  A. No, I wasn't clear on that.  Q. You also say at paragraph 50 of your statement that you
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	the accusation, I suppose, was we just took the client's story at face value. It's difficult to know how to respond to that because we were responding — that was our role, to assist clients, and so we would be, on the face of it, taking things at face value insofar as we understand this person has a concern and we are following up on it. Every staff and volunteer understands more — understood there was — there could be more to a story, that the client might misunderstand something or a client might occasionally be embellishing something. There was that understanding. So we were always very careful how we made referrals and we couldn't verify the truth of anything but we were acting on what we knew. So I never really understood that point.  Q. You say, at paragraph 48 of your statement, that at the meeting in August 2017, Brook House also took great exception to an email which a member of GDWG staff had sent to the IMB asking whether the IMB could check	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	able to walk. There is no reason why she would exaggerate that or seek to inflate that. She was acting on genuine concern. I have no doubt about that.  Q. Thank you, Mr Wilson. Just on this point about raising things with the IMB, you say in your statement that you were told, I think by Mr Skitt, that disapproval of your referrals to the IMB had "got as high as board level at Brook House". What did you take that to mean?  A. I remember being concerned but also frankly mystified by it. Again, I didn't see why it was a matter for management. I didn't see why us raising what was just — it was a request to IMB, was a matter for anyone other than us and the IMB. It wasn't clear.  Q. Do you have any insight as to what "board level" means? Because we know that Mr Skitt was deputy director, so he is the second-in-command. Do you know what that means?  A. No, I wasn't clear on that.  Q. You also say at paragraph 50 of your statement that you were told during this meeting that you shouldn't be
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	the accusation, I suppose, was we just took the client's story at face value. It's difficult to know how to respond to that because we were responding — that was our role, to assist clients, and so we would be, on the face of it, taking things at face value insofar as we understand this person has a concern and we are following up on it. Every staff and volunteer understands more — understood there was — there could be more to a story, that the client might misunderstand something or a client might occasionally be embellishing something. There was that understanding. So we were always very careful how we made referrals and we couldn't verify the truth of anything but we were acting on what we knew. So I never really understood that point.  Q. You say, at paragraph 48 of your statement, that at the meeting in August 2017, Brook House also took great exception to an email which a member of GDWG staff had sent to the IMB asking whether the IMB could check whether a request for a transfer to Tinsley House could	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	able to walk. There is no reason why she would exaggerate that or seek to inflate that. She was acting on genuine concern. I have no doubt about that.  Q. Thank you, Mr Wilson. Just on this point about raising things with the IMB, you say in your statement that you were told, I think by Mr Skitt, that disapproval of your referrals to the IMB had "got as high as board level at Brook House". What did you take that to mean?  A. I remember being concerned but also frankly mystified by it. Again, I didn't see why it was a matter for management. I didn't see why us raising what was just — it was a request to IMB, was a matter for anyone other than us and the IMB. It wasn't clear.  Q. Do you have any insight as to what "board level" means? Because we know that Mr Skitt was deputy director, so he is the second-in-command. Do you know what that means?  A. No, I wasn't clear on that.  Q. You also say at paragraph 50 of your statement that you were told during this meeting that you shouldn't be referring detained people on to other agencies, such as
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	the accusation, I suppose, was we just took the client's story at face value. It's difficult to know how to respond to that because we were responding that was our role, to assist clients, and so we would be, on the face of it, taking things at face value insofar as we understand this person has a concern and we are following up on it. Every staff and volunteer understands more understood there was there could be more to a story, that the client might misunderstand something or a client might occasionally be embellishing something. There was that understanding. So we were always very careful how we made referrals and we couldn't verify the truth of anything but we were acting on what we knew. So I never really understood that point.  Q. You say, at paragraph 48 of your statement, that at the meeting in August 2017, Brook House also took great exception to an email which a member of GDWG staff had sent to the IMB asking whether the IMB could check whether a request for a transfer to Tinsley House could be addressed by them. We will deal a little bit later	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	able to walk. There is no reason why she would exaggerate that or seek to inflate that. She was acting on genuine concern. I have no doubt about that.  Q. Thank you, Mr Wilson. Just on this point about raising things with the IMB, you say in your statement that you were told, I think by Mr Skitt, that disapproval of your referrals to the IMB had "got as high as board level at Brook House". What did you take that to mean?  A. I remember being concerned but also frankly mystified by it. Again, I didn't see why it was a matter for management. I didn't see why us raising what was just it was a request to IMB, was a matter for anyone other than us and the IMB. It wasn't clear.  Q. Do you have any insight as to what "board level" means? Because we know that Mr Skitt was deputy director, so he is the second-in-command. Do you know what that means?  A. No, I wasn't clear on that.  Q. You also say at paragraph 50 of your statement that you were told during this meeting that you shouldn't be referring detained people on to other agencies, such as RAPT or, as they are now known, or were known, the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	the accusation, I suppose, was we just took the client's story at face value. It's difficult to know how to respond to that because we were responding — that was our role, to assist clients, and so we would be, on the face of it, taking things at face value insofar as we understand this person has a concern and we are following up on it. Every staff and volunteer understands more — understood there was — there could be more to a story, that the client might misunderstand something or a client might occasionally be embellishing something. There was that understanding. So we were always very careful how we made referrals and we couldn't verify the truth of anything but we were acting on what we knew. So I never really understood that point.  Q. You say, at paragraph 48 of your statement, that at the meeting in August 2017, Brook House also took great exception to an email which a member of GDWG staff had sent to the IMB asking whether the IMB could check whether a request for a transfer to Tinsley House could be addressed by them. We will deal a little bit later with the IMB's response to that, but just looking at the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	able to walk. There is no reason why she would exaggerate that or seek to inflate that. She was acting on genuine concern. I have no doubt about that.  Q. Thank you, Mr Wilson. Just on this point about raising things with the IMB, you say in your statement that you were told, I think by Mr Skitt, that disapproval of your referrals to the IMB had "got as high as board level at Brook House". What did you take that to mean?  A. I remember being concerned but also frankly mystified by it. Again, I didn't see why it was a matter for management. I didn't see why us raising what was just — it was a request to IMB, was a matter for anyone other than us and the IMB. It wasn't clear.  Q. Do you have any insight as to what "board level" means? Because we know that Mr Skitt was deputy director, so he is the second-in-command. Do you know what that means?  A. No, I wasn't clear on that.  Q. You also say at paragraph 50 of your statement that you were told during this meeting that you shouldn't be referring detained people on to other agencies, such as RAPT or, as they are now known, or were known, the Forward Trust or any other organisations. Was there any
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	the accusation, I suppose, was we just took the client's story at face value. It's difficult to know how to respond to that because we were responding — that was our role, to assist clients, and so we would be, on the face of it, taking things at face value insofar as we understand this person has a concern and we are following up on it. Every staff and volunteer understands more — understood there was — there could be more to a story, that the client might misunderstand something or a client might occasionally be embellishing something. There was that understanding. So we were always very careful how we made referrals and we couldn't verify the truth of anything but we were acting on what we knew. So I never really understood that point.  Q. You say, at paragraph 48 of your statement, that at the meeting in August 2017, Brook House also took great exception to an email which a member of GDWG staff had sent to the IMB asking whether the IMB could check whether a request for a transfer to Tinsley House could be addressed by them. We will deal a little bit later with the IMB's response to that, but just looking at the fact that this was raised by G4S and the Home Office at	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	able to walk. There is no reason why she would exaggerate that or seek to inflate that. She was acting on genuine concern. I have no doubt about that.  Q. Thank you, Mr Wilson. Just on this point about raising things with the IMB, you say in your statement that you were told, I think by Mr Skitt, that disapproval of your referrals to the IMB had "got as high as board level at Brook House". What did you take that to mean?  A. I remember being concerned but also frankly mystified by it. Again, I didn't see why it was a matter for management. I didn't see why us raising what was just — it was a request to IMB, was a matter for anyone other than us and the IMB. It wasn't clear.  Q. Do you have any insight as to what "board level" means? Because we know that Mr Skitt was deputy director, so he is the second-in-command. Do you know what that means?  A. No, I wasn't clear on that.  Q. You also say at paragraph 50 of your statement that you were told during this meeting that you shouldn't be referring detained people on to other agencies, such as RAPT or, as they are now known, or were known, the Forward Trust or any other organisations. Was there any main reason given as to why you shouldn't be referring
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	the accusation, I suppose, was we just took the client's story at face value. It's difficult to know how to respond to that because we were responding — that was our role, to assist clients, and so we would be, on the face of it, taking things at face value insofar as we understand this person has a concern and we are following up on it. Every staff and volunteer understands more — understood there was — there could be more to a story, that the client might misunderstand something or a client might occasionally be embellishing something. There was that understanding. So we were always very careful how we made referrals and we couldn't verify the truth of anything but we were acting on what we knew. So I never really understood that point.  Q. You say, at paragraph 48 of your statement, that at the meeting in August 2017, Brook House also took great exception to an email which a member of GDWG staff had sent to the IMB asking whether the IMB could check whether a request for a transfer to Tinsley House could be addressed by them. We will deal a little bit later with the IMB's response to that, but just looking at the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	able to walk. There is no reason why she would exaggerate that or seek to inflate that. She was acting on genuine concern. I have no doubt about that.  Q. Thank you, Mr Wilson. Just on this point about raising things with the IMB, you say in your statement that you were told, I think by Mr Skitt, that disapproval of your referrals to the IMB had "got as high as board level at Brook House". What did you take that to mean?  A. I remember being concerned but also frankly mystified by it. Again, I didn't see why it was a matter for management. I didn't see why us raising what was just — it was a request to IMB, was a matter for anyone other than us and the IMB. It wasn't clear.  Q. Do you have any insight as to what "board level" means? Because we know that Mr Skitt was deputy director, so he is the second-in-command. Do you know what that means?  A. No, I wasn't clear on that.  Q. You also say at paragraph 50 of your statement that you were told during this meeting that you shouldn't be referring detained people on to other agencies, such as RAPT or, as they are now known, or were known, the Forward Trust or any other organisations. Was there any
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	the accusation, I suppose, was we just took the client's story at face value. It's difficult to know how to respond to that because we were responding — that was our role, to assist clients, and so we would be, on the face of it, taking things at face value insofar as we understand this person has a concern and we are following up on it. Every staff and volunteer understands more — understood there was — there could be more to a story, that the client might misunderstand something or a client might occasionally be embellishing something. There was that understanding. So we were always very careful how we made referrals and we couldn't verify the truth of anything but we were acting on what we knew. So I never really understood that point.  Q. You say, at paragraph 48 of your statement, that at the meeting in August 2017, Brook House also took great exception to an email which a member of GDWG staff had sent to the IMB asking whether the IMB could check whether a request for a transfer to Tinsley House could be addressed by them. We will deal a little bit later with the IMB's response to that, but just looking at the fact that this was raised by G4S and the Home Office at	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	able to walk. There is no reason why she would exaggerate that or seek to inflate that. She was acting on genuine concern. I have no doubt about that.  Q. Thank you, Mr Wilson. Just on this point about raising things with the IMB, you say in your statement that you were told, I think by Mr Skitt, that disapproval of your referrals to the IMB had "got as high as board level at Brook House". What did you take that to mean?  A. I remember being concerned but also frankly mystified by it. Again, I didn't see why it was a matter for management. I didn't see why us raising what was just — it was a request to IMB, was a matter for anyone other than us and the IMB. It wasn't clear.  Q. Do you have any insight as to what "board level" means? Because we know that Mr Skitt was deputy director, so he is the second-in-command. Do you know what that means?  A. No, I wasn't clear on that.  Q. You also say at paragraph 50 of your statement that you were told during this meeting that you shouldn't be referring detained people on to other agencies, such as RAPT or, as they are now known, or were known, the Forward Trust or any other organisations. Was there any main reason given as to why you shouldn't be referring

1	A. I think that there was some message there around IMB in	1	with us doing that.
2	particular, around us perhaps misunderstanding IMB's	2	Q. You also note that you were accused of "raising the
3	role. Again, I thought that was a matter for the IMB.	3	expectations of detainees as to what they could expect
4	I think, in terms of RAPT, the drug support charity, the	4	from Brook House management". What did you take that to
5	message that I was given was that they are "These	5	mean?
6	issues are considered on induction into the centre. We	6	A. I don't know what that was based on. No, I don't know
7	will take care of those referrals, you don't need	7	what that was based on. I am confident that we would
8	these needs are being taken care of". I think sorry,	8	always we would always be careful about managing
9	I was just going to add, I think something that was, if	9	expectations wherever we were raising a particular issue
10	not explicitly spelt out, but the language here became	10	to, because we knew, whether we were referring to
11	much broader than was also broader than "Don't refer	11	another NGO or to healthcare or to management, there
12	to IMB or don't refer to RAPT". I think Steve Skitt	12	were limitations in what you know, what the response
13	used more or less words along the lines of, "You are	13	that we might get or what might be possible. So I
14	making referrals", full stop. By implication, that	14	yeah.
15	would imply that any referrals were becoming, they	15	Q. You say at paragraph 52 of your statement:
16	considered, inappropriate. So whether regular referrals	16	"I repeatedly pointed out that it was legitimate for
17	we might make to Medical Justice, Bail for Immigration	17	GDWG to raise concerns about detainees. This drew
18	Detainees, even organisations such as Red Cross or	18	a heated response that we were not doing this 'in the
19	Samaritans who had some presence in the centre.	19	right way'. I said that if I received a complaint about
20	Q. Just talking about referrals, because you said that	20	GDWG's work, for example, from someone who had been
21	their approach was that, "People are told about RAPT and	21	turned down for a voluntary role, I would respond to the
22	the Forward Trust at the time of their induction, so you	22	complaint, so what was the issue with Brook House
23	can leave that to us". I asked Ms Pincus this	23	management acting in the same way? Mr Skitt's response
24	yesterday, but do you have any understanding about what	24	was, 'But are you being audited?' I thought this was
25	detained people were told about GDWG upon induction?	25	telling. I took it as an important indication of what
	Page 49		Page 51
1	A. Romanda and Romanda and Anna Anna	1	
1	A. I'm not sure I'm not certain on that.	1	was motivating their attitude to this."
2	Q. Now, you refer at paragraph 51 of your statement, your	2	What do you mean by "I thought it was a telling and
3	2018 statement, to some other discussions at that	3	important indication of what was motivating their
4	meeting and you note that Steve Skitt expressed the view	5	attitude"?
5	that he thought that you didn't seem to think that	1	A. Well, I think it seemed a very strange comment, the
6	Brook House management was doing the best for detainees.	6	comment about being audited. It seemed to imply they
7	Did you think that Brook House management was doing the	7	felt under pressure about how they were running the
8	best for detainees?	8	centre and that this was causing more aggravation.
9	A. No. It's fair to say we had significant concerns about	9	I just didn't as I said at the time, I didn't
10	that. What we were certain of, from the range of our	10	understand where that was coming from because, surely,
11	experience throughout and before and after the relevant	11	any organisation, any body, should welcome complaints.
12	period, is that there were a large we hadn't there	12	If it thinks the complaint is unfounded, it can respond
13	were a large number of concerning things happening in	13	to say that. It should investigate properly and then
14	terms of clients' cases and the support they were	14	respond to say that.
15	receiving. It doesn't mean that in every case the fault	15	I didn't understand the issue and I didn't
16	was with management, but there were a number concerns	16	understand the suggestion that we were doing so to
17	were coming up increasingly. So the message made,	17	start with, around the complaints, I thought that was
18	I think, really clear at this meeting was that they	18	entirely legitimate for us to do, and I was never given
19	that I was being given in more or less these words was,	19	any evidence of us doing so, when we did so, in any way
20	"You are being insulting. You are implying we don't	20	that seemed anything other than very respectful and
21	have all of these things covered", and we knew that	21	polite.
22	there were needs not being met, we knew that there were	22	Q. You say here, "I took it as an important indication of
23	things, through whatever reason, not being picked up and	23	what was motivating their attitude". What did you think
24	we were trying to refer appropriately, and I didn't	24	was motivating their attitude or what was the
25	understand, and don't understand, what the issue was	25	indication?
	Page 50		Page 52

1	A. I thought that they I felt that they felt under	1	with the Home Office?
2	pressure. I couldn't say from where, but they felt	2	A. I'm so sorry, do you mind repeating the question?
3	under pressure to be seen to be covering or to be how	3	Q. Yes. The suggestion is that Mr Gasson expressed during
4	they all needs met or all safeguarding concerns	4	that meeting that a key issue for the Home Office was
5	addressed in an appropriate way and that us doing this	5	that concerns were being raised by your organisation
6	was undermining that in some way.	6	about detainees but not being shared with the IRC or
7	Q. Do you know what they meant by "being audited"?	7	with the Home Office. So, presumably, that they were
8	A. No, I assume that related to their contract with the	8	being raised with other people and not shared with the
9	Home Office in terms of running the centre.	9	IRC or the Home Office?
10	Q. I have already asked you a little bit about this, but	10	A. I don't recall that being explicitly said. It was in
11	you say that, at this meeting, they repeatedly said they	11	some ways, it seemed at that meeting, and I wouldn't
12	might end GDWG's drop-in sessions and surgeries and that	12	draw a distinction between G4S and the Home Office in
13	you were left in no doubt this might happen if you	13	terms of who was giving this message, it was very much
14	raised any further concerns. Was this threatened	14	both were leading the meeting, giving the same message.
15	explicitly?	15	They seemed to be objecting to both things, to both us
16	A. Yes, very explicitly and repeatedly.	16	referring to other agencies, where, again, we felt that
17	Q. You say in your statement that this had an obvious	17	was entirely appropriate to do, and to us having raised
18	impact on you, presumably personally and as an	18	direct things to IRC management.
19	organisation, and must have been intended to do so.	19	Q. If we can bring up on screen <gdw000008>, please.</gdw000008>
20	What do you think that intention was?	20	Chair, that's at tab 5 of your bundle. If we can just
21	A. I felt, and this is a reflection I've had more since,	21	enlarge all of the text, please. This is an email which
22	but I remember it very vividly coming out of	22	you sent at 4.16 pm. Was it an email that was sent to
23	the meeting, that there was a dynamic, in that room in	23	colleagues at GDWG?
24	particular, in that moment, that meeting, that was	24	A. Yes.
25	tantamount to bullying towards me and towards GDWG and	25	Q. It says:
	tantanount to sain, ing towards me and towards of the and		
	Page 53		Page 55
1	the organisation. I felt I was being almost toyed with.	1	" this sort of thing is why it's nice to lighten
2	I think the threat was being they raised it	2	the mood with baby news, et cetera
3	repeatedly during the meeting. It was a very heated	3	"I just a pretty gruelling meeting with Brook
4	meeting. I remember both Steve Skitt and Paul Gasson	4	management. The continuation of the drop-ins is on
5	being very heated, shouting at points. I was in the		
6		5	something of a knife-edge.
	meeting on my own. It felt a very difficult one. I	5 6	something of a knife-edge.  "For the time being, if you are considering raising
7	meeting on my own. It felt a very difficult one. I — my focus and my top priority on behalf of		
7 8	· ·	6	"For the time being, if you are considering raising
	my focus and my top priority on behalf of	6 7	"For the time being, if you are considering raising any concerns with G4S (including healthcare) or with any
8	my focus and my top priority on behalf of the organisation was and this was very much at the	6 7 8	"For the time being, if you are considering raising any concerns with G4S (including healthcare) or with any of the agencies that work within Brook or Tinsley House
8 9	my focus and my top priority on behalf of the organisation was and this was very much at the forefront of my mind access to the centre is so vital	6 7 8 9	"For the time being, if you are considering raising any concerns with G4S (including healthcare) or with any of the agencies that work within Brook or Tinsley House (IMB, RAPT, et cetera), please let me know and we can
8 9 10	my focus and my top priority on behalf of the organisation was — and this was very much at the forefront of my mind — access to the centre is so vital to what we do. If we lose that, we lose — you know, we	6 7 8 9 10	"For the time being, if you are considering raising any concerns with G4S (including healthcare) or with any of the agencies that work within Brook or Tinsley House (IMB, RAPT, et cetera), please let me know and we can discuss I've offered to make any necessary contacts
8 9 10 11	my focus and my top priority on behalf of the organisation was and this was very much at the forefront of my mind access to the centre is so vital to what we do. If we lose that, we lose you know, we lose what we you know, that's what we are able to do.	6 7 8 9 10 11	"For the time being, if you are considering raising any concerns with G4S (including healthcare) or with any of the agencies that work within Brook or Tinsley House (IMB, RAPT, et cetera), please let me know and we can discuss I've offered to make any necessary contacts for the next few weeks. In other words, [this is in
8 9 10 11 12	my focus and my top priority on behalf of the organisation was and this was very much at the forefront of my mind access to the centre is so vital to what we do. If we lose that, we lose you know, we lose what we you know, that's what we are able to do. We provide we can only provide any kind of emotional	6 7 8 9 10 11 12	"For the time being, if you are considering raising any concerns with G4S (including healthcare) or with any of the agencies that work within Brook or Tinsley House (IMB, RAPT, et cetera), please let me know and we can discuss I've offered to make any necessary contacts for the next few weeks. In other words, [this is in bold] please make sure any concerns raised are going
8 9 10 11 12 13	my focus and my top priority on behalf of the organisation was and this was very much at the forefront of my mind access to the centre is so vital to what we do. If we lose that, we lose you know, we lose what we you know, that's what we are able to do. We provide we can only provide any kind of emotional and practical support to clients if we have some access	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	"For the time being, if you are considering raising any concerns with G4S (including healthcare) or with any of the agencies that work within Brook or Tinsley House (IMB, RAPT, et cetera), please let me know and we can discuss I've offered to make any necessary contacts for the next few weeks. In other words, [this is in bold] please make sure any concerns raised are going through me.
8 9 10 11 12 13 14	my focus and my top priority on behalf of the organisation was — and this was very much at the forefront of my mind — access to the centre is so vital to what we do. If we lose that, we lose — you know, we lose what we — you know, that's what we are able to do. We provide — we can only provide any kind of emotional and practical support to clients if we have some access to the centre. They are now threatening taking away a	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	"For the time being, if you are considering raising any concerns with G4S (including healthcare) or with any of the agencies that work within Brook or Tinsley House (IMB, RAPT, et cetera), please let me know and we can discuss I've offered to make any necessary contacts for the next few weeks. In other words, [this is in bold] please make sure any concerns raised are going through me.  "I realise this sounds quite draconian but it's
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	my focus and my top priority on behalf of the organisation was and this was very much at the forefront of my mind access to the centre is so vital to what we do. If we lose that, we lose you know, we lose what we you know, that's what we are able to do. We provide we can only provide any kind of emotional and practical support to clients if we have some access to the centre. They are now threatening taking away a major part of that. In my head was very clearly,	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	"For the time being, if you are considering raising any concerns with G4S (including healthcare) or with any of the agencies that work within Brook or Tinsley House (IMB, RAPT, et cetera), please let me know and we can discuss I've offered to make any necessary contacts for the next few weeks. In other words, [this is in bold] please make sure any concerns raised are going through me.  "I realise this sounds quite draconian but it's a serious situation."
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	my focus and my top priority on behalf of the organisation was and this was very much at the forefront of my mind access to the centre is so vital to what we do. If we lose that, we lose you know, we lose what we you know, that's what we are able to do. We provide we can only provide any kind of emotional and practical support to clients if we have some access to the centre. They are now threatening taking away a major part of that. In my head was very clearly, "I must get out of this room without that having	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	"For the time being, if you are considering raising any concerns with G4S (including healthcare) or with any of the agencies that work within Brook or Tinsley House (IMB, RAPT, et cetera), please let me know and we can discuss I've offered to make any necessary contacts for the next few weeks. In other words, [this is in bold] please make sure any concerns raised are going through me.  "I realise this sounds quite draconian but it's a serious situation."  You say:
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	my focus and my top priority on behalf of the organisation was and this was very much at the forefront of my mind access to the centre is so vital to what we do. If we lose that, we lose you know, we lose what we you know, that's what we are able to do. We provide we can only provide any kind of emotional and practical support to clients if we have some access to the centre. They are now threatening taking away a major part of that. In my head was very clearly, "I must get out of this room without that having happened. I need to" and I think I use this	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	"For the time being, if you are considering raising any concerns with G4S (including healthcare) or with any of the agencies that work within Brook or Tinsley House (IMB, RAPT, et cetera), please let me know and we can discuss I've offered to make any necessary contacts for the next few weeks. In other words, [this is in bold] please make sure any concerns raised are going through me.  "I realise this sounds quite draconian but it's a serious situation."  You say:  "No immediate silver lining, but here's that classic
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	my focus and my top priority on behalf of the organisation was and this was very much at the forefront of my mind access to the centre is so vital to what we do. If we lose that, we lose you know, we lose what we you know, that's what we are able to do. We provide we can only provide any kind of emotional and practical support to clients if we have some access to the centre. They are now threatening taking away a major part of that. In my head was very clearly, "I must get out of this room without that having happened. I need to" and I think I use this language in my statement, that I almost felt I needed	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	"For the time being, if you are considering raising any concerns with G4S (including healthcare) or with any of the agencies that work within Brook or Tinsley House (IMB, RAPT, et cetera), please let me know and we can discuss I've offered to make any necessary contacts for the next few weeks. In other words, [this is in bold] please make sure any concerns raised are going through me.  "I realise this sounds quite draconian but it's a serious situation."  You say:  "No immediate silver lining, but here's that classic video of a baby monkey riding backwards on a pig."
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	my focus and my top priority on behalf of the organisation was and this was very much at the forefront of my mind access to the centre is so vital to what we do. If we lose that, we lose you know, we lose what we you know, that's what we are able to do. We provide we can only provide any kind of emotional and practical support to clients if we have some access to the centre. They are now threatening taking away a major part of that. In my head was very clearly, "I must get out of this room without that having happened. I need to" and I think I use this language in my statement, that I almost felt I needed to was in a position of having to beg for that access	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	"For the time being, if you are considering raising any concerns with G4S (including healthcare) or with any of the agencies that work within Brook or Tinsley House (IMB, RAPT, et cetera), please let me know and we can discuss I've offered to make any necessary contacts for the next few weeks. In other words, [this is in bold] please make sure any concerns raised are going through me.  "I realise this sounds quite draconian but it's a serious situation."  You say:  "No immediate silver lining, but here's that classic video of a baby monkey riding backwards on a pig."  Which I'm sure we have all seen. Why did you
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	my focus and my top priority on behalf of the organisation was and this was very much at the forefront of my mind access to the centre is so vital to what we do. If we lose that, we lose you know, we lose what we you know, that's what we are able to do. We provide we can only provide any kind of emotional and practical support to clients if we have some access to the centre. They are now threatening taking away a major part of that. In my head was very clearly, "I must get out of this room without that having happened. I need to" and I think I use this language in my statement, that I almost felt I needed to was in a position of having to beg for that access to continue.	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	"For the time being, if you are considering raising any concerns with G4S (including healthcare) or with any of the agencies that work within Brook or Tinsley House (IMB, RAPT, et cetera), please let me know and we can discuss I've offered to make any necessary contacts for the next few weeks. In other words, [this is in bold] please make sure any concerns raised are going through me.  "I realise this sounds quite draconian but it's a serious situation."  You say:  "No immediate silver lining, but here's that classic video of a baby monkey riding backwards on a pig."  Which I'm sure we have all seen. Why did you describe this as "quite draconian"?
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	my focus and my top priority on behalf of the organisation was and this was very much at the forefront of my mind access to the centre is so vital to what we do. If we lose that, we lose you know, we lose what we you know, that's what we are able to do. We provide we can only provide any kind of emotional and practical support to clients if we have some access to the centre. They are now threatening taking away a major part of that. In my head was very clearly, "I must get out of this room without that having happened. I need to" and I think I use this language in my statement, that I almost felt I needed to was in a position of having to beg for that access to continue.  Q. I'm asked to ask you this on behalf of the Home Office.	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	"For the time being, if you are considering raising any concerns with G4S (including healthcare) or with any of the agencies that work within Brook or Tinsley House (IMB, RAPT, et cetera), please let me know and we can discuss I've offered to make any necessary contacts for the next few weeks. In other words, [this is in bold] please make sure any concerns raised are going through me.  "I realise this sounds quite draconian but it's a serious situation."  You say:  "No immediate silver lining, but here's that classic video of a baby monkey riding backwards on a pig."  Which I'm sure we have all seen. Why did you describe this as "quite draconian"?  A. So this was, just to be clear, only four staff members
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	my focus and my top priority on behalf of the organisation was and this was very much at the forefront of my mind access to the centre is so vital to what we do. If we lose that, we lose you know, we lose what we you know, that's what we are able to do. We provide we can only provide any kind of emotional and practical support to clients if we have some access to the centre. They are now threatening taking away a major part of that. In my head was very clearly, "I must get out of this room without that having happened. I need to" and I think I use this language in my statement, that I almost felt I needed to was in a position of having to beg for that access to continue.  Q. I'm asked to ask you this on behalf of the Home Office. During this meeting, do you recall if Mr Gasson	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	"For the time being, if you are considering raising any concerns with G4S (including healthcare) or with any of the agencies that work within Brook or Tinsley House (IMB, RAPT, et cetera), please let me know and we can discuss I've offered to make any necessary contacts for the next few weeks. In other words, [this is in bold] please make sure any concerns raised are going through me.  "I realise this sounds quite draconian but it's a serious situation."  You say:  "No immediate silver lining, but here's that classic video of a baby monkey riding backwards on a pig."  Which I'm sure we have all seen. Why did you describe this as "quite draconian"?  A. So this was, just to be clear, only four staff members at that time, so this was me and three caseworkers.
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	my focus and my top priority on behalf of the organisation was and this was very much at the forefront of my mind access to the centre is so vital to what we do. If we lose that, we lose you know, we lose what we you know, that's what we are able to do. We provide we can only provide any kind of emotional and practical support to clients if we have some access to the centre. They are now threatening taking away a major part of that. In my head was very clearly, "I must get out of this room without that having happened. I need to" and I think I use this language in my statement, that I almost felt I needed to was in a position of having to beg for that access to continue.  Q. I'm asked to ask you this on behalf of the Home Office. During this meeting, do you recall if Mr Gasson expressed that a key issue for the Home Office was that	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	"For the time being, if you are considering raising any concerns with G4S (including healthcare) or with any of the agencies that work within Brook or Tinsley House (IMB, RAPT, et cetera), please let me know and we can discuss I've offered to make any necessary contacts for the next few weeks. In other words, [this is in bold] please make sure any concerns raised are going through me.  "I realise this sounds quite draconian but it's a serious situation."  You say:  "No immediate silver lining, but here's that classic video of a baby monkey riding backwards on a pig."  Which I'm sure we have all seen. Why did you describe this as "quite draconian"?  A. So this was, just to be clear, only four staff members at that time, so this was me and three caseworkers.  Q. Is that Anna Pincus, Naomi Blackwell and Ana Szopa?
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	my focus and my top priority on behalf of the organisation was and this was very much at the forefront of my mind access to the centre is so vital to what we do. If we lose that, we lose you know, we lose what we you know, that's what we are able to do. We provide we can only provide any kind of emotional and practical support to clients if we have some access to the centre. They are now threatening taking away a major part of that. In my head was very clearly, "I must get out of this room without that having happened. I need to" and I think I use this language in my statement, that I almost felt I needed to was in a position of having to beg for that access to continue.  Q. I'm asked to ask you this on behalf of the Home Office.  During this meeting, do you recall if Mr Gasson expressed that a key issue for the Home Office was that concerns were being raised about detainees by your organisation but were not being shared with the IRC or	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	"For the time being, if you are considering raising any concerns with G4S (including healthcare) or with any of the agencies that work within Brook or Tinsley House (IMB, RAPT, et cetera), please let me know and we can discuss I've offered to make any necessary contacts for the next few weeks. In other words, [this is in bold] please make sure any concerns raised are going through me.  "I realise this sounds quite draconian but it's a serious situation."  You say:  "No immediate silver lining, but here's that classic video of a baby monkey riding backwards on a pig."  Which I'm sure we have all seen. Why did you describe this as "quite draconian"?  A. So this was, just to be clear, only four staff members at that time, so this was me and three caseworkers.  Q. Is that Anna Pincus, Naomi Blackwell and Ana Szopa?  A. That's correct. Because if I had suggested it without context, that would have sounded very controlling.
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	my focus and my top priority on behalf of the organisation was and this was very much at the forefront of my mind access to the centre is so vital to what we do. If we lose that, we lose you know, we lose what we you know, that's what we are able to do. We provide we can only provide any kind of emotional and practical support to clients if we have some access to the centre. They are now threatening taking away a major part of that. In my head was very clearly, "I must get out of this room without that having happened. I need to" and I think I use this language in my statement, that I almost felt I needed to was in a position of having to beg for that access to continue.  Q. I'm asked to ask you this on behalf of the Home Office.  During this meeting, do you recall if Mr Gasson expressed that a key issue for the Home Office was that concerns were being raised about detainees by your	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	"For the time being, if you are considering raising any concerns with G4S (including healthcare) or with any of the agencies that work within Brook or Tinsley House (IMB, RAPT, et cetera), please let me know and we can discuss I've offered to make any necessary contacts for the next few weeks. In other words, [this is in bold] please make sure any concerns raised are going through me.  "I realise this sounds quite draconian but it's a serious situation."  You say:  "No immediate silver lining, but here's that classic video of a baby monkey riding backwards on a pig."  Which I'm sure we have all seen. Why did you describe this as "quite draconian"?  A. So this was, just to be clear, only four staff members at that time, so this was me and three caseworkers.  Q. Is that Anna Pincus, Naomi Blackwell and Ana Szopa?  A. That's correct. Because if I had suggested it without

1	These were three very experienced caseworkers who were	1	and us having the chance to discuss them."
2	leading the case. I was doing some casework and client	2	What are we to take from your description of it as
3	work myself because of the size of the organisation, but	3	a useful meeting?
4	they were leading on it, they were all very capable.	4	A. Yes. I think I was being polite and diplomatic.
5	They wouldn't normally they would normally raise	5	I mean, the subsequent phrase about raising I did
6	things of particular issues or safeguarding or	6	appreciate them raising concerns directly and us
7	particular things to me, but they wouldn't be running	7	discussing them. I would rather that than I guess
8	every you know, referrals of one type or another are	8	the alternative is they just cut access without
9	a very regular part of casework.	9	discussing them. But it is a stretch to describe it as
10	Q. Is the draconian bit that, previously, they were senior	10	useful, from our point of view.
11	enough that they could email people, whereas you were	11	Q. In your inquiry statement, which is, for the
12	now saying, "I have to be the filter for everything that	12	transcribers, at <dpg000003> at page 3, paragraph 8, you</dpg000003>
13	goes out"?	13	describe Mr Gasson and Mr Skitt as having taken
14	A. Yes. If I had sent this out without context or just	14	"a highly combative and distrustful approach at [the]
15	said this, I think it would have sounded very	15	meeting". How do you reconcile this description of it
16	unnecessarily top-down and of a micro-management style	16	as a useful meeting with your description of them having
17	I would never, unless absolutely necessary, adopt. So	17	taken a highly combative and distrustful approach?
18	I needed to explain.	18	A. Well, I mean, I wanted, and needed, the relationship to
19	It may be stating the obvious, but the context was,	19	be as for us to be able to progress, so, again, my
20	this was an agreement I had made at the end of that	20	absolute focus was on maintaining our access to the
21	meeting verbally as, you know, I didn't think it was	21	centres. So I wanted to be as diplomatic and polite as
22	something that was going to be sustainable for very long	22	I possibly could be. I felt in a very powerless
23	because of the volume apart from anything else, the	23	situation. I would go back to my feeling in the meeting
24	volume would have needed me to be signing things off	24	of almost needing to beg for the access to continue. So
25	very, very frequently.	25	I was very much in that mode: what can I put in place?
	Page 57		Page 59
1	Q. So you say "for the next few weeks"?	1	You know, within reason, but what can I put in place
2	A. It was something I agreed in the moment because, again,	2	organisationally now for us to keep the access intact?
3	my top priority was to get out of the meeting with our	3	So that was the situation.
4	access intact.	4	Q. You describe in your inquiry statement, and also you
5	Q. I notice you say there you don't list there about	5	have repeated just now, that the approach to GDWG was
6	raising any concerns with the Home Office directly. Is	6	increasingly becoming one that was tantamount to
7	that was that a deliberate omission or did you	7	bullying. Why do you say that?
8	consider that they could have raised something with the	8	A. That was a dynamic that I felt was increasing there.
9	Home Office directly without going through you?	9	I was particularly I was vividly aware of that in
10	A. No. I mean, it would be rare we were never	10	that meeting, the dynamic. I remember — I can remember
11	I don't think we were ever told to raise you know,	11	the meeting very vividly. I remember it was just it
12	Paul Gasson wouldn't have been our first point it	12	was Steve Skitt and Paul Gasson who were in the meeting.
13	would have been management, which would usually have	13	They were nearest the door. I was on my own. They were
14	been Steve Skitt or Dan Haughton. We might have copied	14	very, very agitated. Very as I put it, I felt that
15	everyone in. I think I would maybe I should have	15	they were toying with me, they were threatening with
16	said explicitly, but where I say "raising any concerns	16	something, with something a very immediate threat to
17	with G4S", I meant management plus any other parts of	17	our access. I remember it being in my recollection,
18	G4S.	18	it was a dark and rainy day, I remember walking out of
19	Q. So that's then at 4.16 pm. If we can also bring up on	19	the centre feeling shaken by the meeting, and I'd had
20	screen, back to <gdw000003>, page 40, please, this is an</gdw000003>	20	meetings before where they had been difficult, but I was
21	email which is sent on the same day at 16:37, so about	21	really shaken by the meeting.
22	20 minutes after the email sent to your colleagues, and	22	Q. When you talk about that approach that was tantamount to
23	here you say:	23	bullying, are you referring to G4S, to the Home Office
24	"Thank you for the useful meeting this afternoon.	24	or both?
25	I very much appreciate your raising concerns directly	25	A. To both. I didn't feel, again, a distinction between
	Page 58		Page 60
	- 70 7		15 (Pages 57 to 60)

1	them in the meeting.	1	it explicitly or not, a decision, essentially, that you
2	Q. I'm asked on behalf of Duncan Lewis to ask you if you	2	came to, or whether it developed or not as well, that
3	have any understanding of why G4S and the Home Office	3	you would somewhat restrict the amount of work that you
4	became so hostile, as you describe it?	4	did for people, somewhat restrict how far you would go
5	A. It's difficult. It's difficult to say. Obviously, the	5	in order to try to mollify or maintain a relationship
6	subsequent development of Panorama puts a context on	6	with G4S and the Home Office. Is that fair?
7	that time, but I didn't know that at the time. Again,	7	A. Yes.
8	I they were raising things to me, but looked at	8	Q. Looking back on that obviously, you could have gone
9	individually, I didn't understand the basis of those	9	one of a few ways, presumably. You could have tried to
10	concerns.	10	get that balance. You could have just decided, you
11	MR LIVINGSTON: Chair, I think that might be an appropriate	11	know, "I don't care. I'm just going to keep raising
12	time to have a break. I probably have another half an	12	everything and we will see what happens" or you could
13	hour or 45 minutes or so with this witness, and then we	13	have completely acceded to the Home Office and G4S
14	will move to reading-in after that. So if we could	14	requests and stopped raising things at all, if that's
15	perhaps have the half-hour break that we usually have on	15	what they requested. Did you weigh up those options?
16	Fridays now.	16	A. That feeling that I described, in terms of me being in
17	THE CHAIR: Shall we begin again at 11.30?	17	that particular particularly in that August meeting
18	MR LIVINGSTON: Yes.	18	and the immediate aftermath, you know, my I was just
19	THE CHAIR: Thank you, Mr Wilson. See you at 11.30.	19	absolutely focused on maintaining our access, so we
20	(10.58 am)	20	were, as you put it, seeking to mollify or to avoid
21	(A short break)	21	antagonising, much as I was confused about the reasons
22	(11.30 am)	22	for the reaction we were getting, that was a very big
23	MR LIVINGSTON: Thank you, chair.	23	focus for us.
24	Mr Wilson, we have discussed up to the middle	24	I think it's fair to say that Panorama then came out
25	of August 2017, how your relationship with G4S and the	25	soon after that, and I felt this was not something that
	Page 61		Page 63
	1 age 01		1 age 03
1	Home Office developed. I now want to ask you a little	1	was explicit, and, actually, one of the trends over the
2	bit about the impact of that relationship. At	2	subsequent time into 2018 was less communication from
3	paragraph 58 of your 2018 statement, you said that the	3	management, certainly far fewer requests for meetings or
4	behaviour of managers towards GDWG, the criticisms and	4	issues being raised. But I felt that that had changed
5	attempts to restrict your visits and the type of work	5	the dynamic and the power situation a bit, because it
6	that you did, had an impact on the way you advocated for	6	felt clear to me, to us, that, at that point, Brook
7	detainees. How would you describe that impact?	7	management would surely be there was fallout
8	A. I think there were a few consequences. So, at that	8	happening from Panorama, and would be relatively on the
9	point, as of August/September 2017, we felt, I think, as	9	back foot, so there was a change in dynamic. That was
10	I had put it in the email to my staff at the time, it	10	a transition point. I do reflect a lot, I do reflect on
11	felt on a knife-edge in terms of access continuing, so	11	that period and that dynamic that I do think had become
12	we were very conscious of that. So I'm sure that, in my	12	increasingly one of a bullying dynamic towards me, as an
13	mind, and in the staff, whether this was always	13	individual, but the organisation in particular, and I do
14	conscious or not, we were holding back on making for	14	think, you know, in the relevant period and after and
15	example, in particular, requesting second appointments	15	before, should we have been different? And my instinct
16	at the drop-in, when that was becoming so difficult. So	16	is, there is a cliche around, a truism around you
17	that would then have a direct impact on the client	17	know, if you're the victim standing up to a bully, they
18	because then we were trying to do everything we could in	18	will often back down. Should we have been more
19	a first meeting. It meant we couldn't necessarily give	19	forthright, should we have pushed more things?
20	the client the space that we would like to. You then	20	Instinctively, I feel maybe I wish at some level we had,
21	you build in complications like having a phone	21	but, then again, I don't know where that would have led
22	interpreter, and it limits very much what you can cover	22	to and there were very good reasons why I and
	in that time. So those kind of consequences were	23	my predecessor I think felt we had to mollify, pacify,
23	in that times so those him of consequences were		
23 24	affecting a lot of our work.	24	because we were so focused on keeping access and, on the
	•	24 25	because we were so focused on keeping access and, on the face of it, they had the power.
24	affecting a lot of our work.		

1	Q. Was there any "dissent" is maybe putting it too	1	particular client details.
2	highly, but were there any people within GDWG who	2	Q. I suppose, more broadly, then, because I think you've
3	disagreed with your approach?	3	you state in one of your statements that perhaps it
4	A. I don't I wouldn't say that I remember anyone	4	was in evidence somewhere else you found it shocking
5	disagreeing, as such. I would say I think I would	5	when you saw it. Were you surprised about the type of
6	I think that the casework team and any visitors, where	6	mistreatment that was shown on Panorama?
7	this is appropriate, would want to be raising particular	7	A. I don't know whether maybe shocked but not surprised is
8	things and pushing more, where possible. I think there	8	coherent as a reaction. I think we heard anecdotally
9	was clear understanding of the situation we were in and	9	from clients about issues with officers. You know,
10	why we were where we were.	10	there would be you know, issues within the centre;
11	Q. Okay.	11	references to mistreatment. Sometimes, and maybe quite
12	A. I would understand if they had frustrations at points	12	often, not by the client who allegedly experienced this,
13	around my willing my, small c, conservative	13	but by a third party mentioning things.
14	reluctance to raise certain things but I think they	14	I can't remember I'm sorry, I'm having to talk
15	understood why we were having to do that.	15	generally just because I can't refresh myself on the
16	Q. Jamie MacPherson, one of the visitors at the time, and	16	details, but that was something that was quite often the
17	I think still, gave evidence on Wednesday and said that	17	case. We wouldn't know we would often be very much
18	he understood that you had been told that it was not	18	aware, going back to that point around taking what the
19	GDWG's place to make complaints about healthcare and	19	client says at face value, that we didn't know the full
20	that you were told, in no uncertain terms, that visitors	20	story. Clients would often say, or friends of clients
21	should stay out of it and stick to visiting. Does that	21	would say specifically explicitly, "I don't want this to
22	accord with your recollection?	22	be raised but this is happening, I'm letting you know".
23	A. I can't remember which in terms of a management	23	So there wouldn't really be unless we felt a certain
24	conversation, which that relates to particularly, but	24	threshold much we could do without being much more
25	that's certainly the impression I was being given, yes.	25	explicit. What was shocking was seeing it happening so
	D 45		
	Page 65		Page 67
1	Q. I'm going to come on to your personal and organisational	1	directly. Obviously, particularly the physical incident
2	awareness of what was seen on Panorama. Firstly, before	2	where a person is being restrained on the ground where
3	Panorama was shown, were you aware of any of	3	there are racist remarks being issued. It was, yes,
4	the specific incidents of mistreatment which were	4	shocking. It was shocking.
5	featured, even if you didn't witness them yourself,	5	Q. Did you reflect at the time about how you had missed or
6	obviously?	6	how you didn't know of this sort of stuff happening?
7	A. To my recollection, no, not specifically.	7	A. Yes, to a point. I mean, I'm a reflective and
8	Q. Did you have any when did you first learn that	8	self-critical person. I think GDWG was also a very
9	Panorama was going to be broadcast? Do you remember?	9	reflective organisation. I don't think you can work,
10	A. As I recall, we knew a few days I think the Panorama	10	you know, as a charity providing this sort of service
11	was on the Monday night. I think we knew during the	11	if you are a person who has gone in to do that as your
12	Demonstrate de la constant de la con	l	
	previous week there was a Panorama about detention	12	work or an organisation trying to do that, you can't
13	coming up. I think we found out I can't remember	12	work or an organisation trying to do that, you can't help but want to do more because the needs in this area
13 14	•		
	coming up. I think we found out I can't remember	13	help but want to do more because the needs in this area
14	coming up. I think we found out I can't remember how, but it was to feature Gatwick, in particular, very	13 14	help but want to do more because the needs in this area of work are so immense. You can't help but reflect on that.
14 15	coming up. I think we found out I can't remember how, but it was to feature Gatwick, in particular, very late on, maybe three days before, no more than that.	13 14 15	help but want to do more because the needs in this area of work are so immense. You can't help but reflect on that.  I think, being very fair to myself, and to ourselves
14 15 16	coming up. I think we found out I can't remember how, but it was to feature Gatwick, in particular, very late on, maybe three days before, no more than that.  Q. The first time you was the first time that you learnt of the contents when you saw it?	13 14 15 16	help but want to do more because the needs in this area of work are so immense. You can't help but reflect on that.  I think, being very fair to myself, and to ourselves as an organisation, I think the reasons why we had very
14 15 16 17	coming up. I think we found out I can't remember how, but it was to feature Gatwick, in particular, very late on, maybe three days before, no more than that.  Q. The first time you was the first time that you learnt	13 14 15 16 17	help but want to do more because the needs in this area of work are so immense. You can't help but reflect on that.  I think, being very fair to myself, and to ourselves
14 15 16 17 18	coming up. I think we found out I can't remember how, but it was to feature Gatwick, in particular, very late on, maybe three days before, no more than that.  Q. The first time you was the first time that you learnt of the contents when you saw it?  A. Was watching it, absolutely.	13 14 15 16 17 18	help but want to do more because the needs in this area of work are so immense. You can't help but reflect on that.  I think, being very fair to myself, and to ourselves as an organisation, I think the reasons why we had very limited awareness of the issues were quite there's quite clear reasons in terms of our level of access to
14 15 16 17 18	coming up. I think we found out I can't remember how, but it was to feature Gatwick, in particular, very late on, maybe three days before, no more than that.  Q. The first time you was the first time that you learnt of the contents when you saw it?  A. Was watching it, absolutely.  Q. So you've said that you weren't aware of any of	13 14 15 16 17 18 19	help but want to do more because the needs in this area of work are so immense. You can't help but reflect on that.  I think, being very fair to myself, and to ourselves as an organisation, I think the reasons why we had very limited awareness of the issues were quite — there's quite clear reasons in terms of our level of access to the centre, particularly how limited we were in terms of
14 15 16 17 18 19 20	coming up. I think we found out I can't remember how, but it was to feature Gatwick, in particular, very late on, maybe three days before, no more than that.  Q. The first time you was the first time that you learnt of the contents when you saw it?  A. Was watching it, absolutely.  Q. So you've said that you weren't aware of any of the specific incidents of mistreatment seen on Panorama.	13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	help but want to do more because the needs in this area of work are so immense. You can't help but reflect on that.  I think, being very fair to myself, and to ourselves as an organisation, I think the reasons why we had very limited awareness of the issues were quite there's quite clear reasons in terms of our level of access to
14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	coming up. I think we found out I can't remember how, but it was to feature Gatwick, in particular, very late on, maybe three days before, no more than that.  Q. The first time you was the first time that you learnt of the contents when you saw it?  A. Was watching it, absolutely.  Q. So you've said that you weren't aware of any of the specific incidents of mistreatment seen on Panorama.  Were you personally aware of any similar types of	13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	help but want to do more because the needs in this area of work are so immense. You can't help but reflect on that.  I think, being very fair to myself, and to ourselves as an organisation, I think the reasons why we had very limited awareness of the issues were quite — there's quite clear reasons in terms of our level of access to the centre, particularly how limited we were in terms of not even having a presence in the welfare space, where,
14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	coming up. I think we found out I can't remember how, but it was to feature Gatwick, in particular, very late on, maybe three days before, no more than that.  Q. The first time you was the first time that you learnt of the contents when you saw it?  A. Was watching it, absolutely.  Q. So you've said that you weren't aware of any of the specific incidents of mistreatment seen on Panorama.  Were you personally aware of any similar types of mistreatment to that shown on Panorama?	13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	help but want to do more because the needs in this area of work are so immense. You can't help but reflect on that.  I think, being very fair to myself, and to ourselves as an organisation, I think the reasons why we had very limited awareness of the issues were quite — there's quite clear reasons in terms of our level of access to the centre, particularly how limited we were in terms of not even having a presence in the welfare space, where, again, that's not being on the wings, but, you know, we
14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	coming up. I think we found out I can't remember how, but it was to feature Gatwick, in particular, very late on, maybe three days before, no more than that.  Q. The first time you was the first time that you learnt of the contents when you saw it?  A. Was watching it, absolutely.  Q. So you've said that you weren't aware of any of the specific incidents of mistreatment seen on Panorama. Were you personally aware of any similar types of mistreatment to that shown on Panorama?  A. It's difficult for me, at this point, to recollect, and	13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	help but want to do more because the needs in this area of work are so immense. You can't help but reflect on that.  I think, being very fair to myself, and to ourselves as an organisation, I think the reasons why we had very limited awareness of the issues were quite — there's quite clear reasons in terms of our level of access to the centre, particularly how limited we were in terms of not even having a presence in the welfare space, where, again, that's not being on the wings, but, you know, we were so far back, we were — our contact with the client
14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	coming up. I think we found out I can't remember how, but it was to feature Gatwick, in particular, very late on, maybe three days before, no more than that.  Q. The first time you was the first time that you learnt of the contents when you saw it?  A. Was watching it, absolutely.  Q. So you've said that you weren't aware of any of the specific incidents of mistreatment seen on Panorama. Were you personally aware of any similar types of mistreatment to that shown on Panorama?  A. It's difficult for me, at this point, to recollect, and without, you know, without being at GDWG currently to refresh my memory in terms of access to the database and	13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	help but want to do more because the needs in this area of work are so immense. You can't help but reflect on that.  I think, being very fair to myself, and to ourselves as an organisation, I think the reasons why we had very limited awareness of the issues were quite — there's quite clear reasons in terms of our level of access to the centre, particularly how limited we were in terms of not even having a presence in the welfare space, where, again, that's not being on the wings, but, you know, we were so far back, we were — our contact with the client was kept to — clients was kept at a certain distance. There were lots of reasons why clients might not have
14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	coming up. I think we found out I can't remember how, but it was to feature Gatwick, in particular, very late on, maybe three days before, no more than that.  Q. The first time you was the first time that you learnt of the contents when you saw it?  A. Was watching it, absolutely.  Q. So you've said that you weren't aware of any of the specific incidents of mistreatment seen on Panorama. Were you personally aware of any similar types of mistreatment to that shown on Panorama?  A. It's difficult for me, at this point, to recollect, and without, you know, without being at GDWG currently to	13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	help but want to do more because the needs in this area of work are so immense. You can't help but reflect on that.  I think, being very fair to myself, and to ourselves as an organisation, I think the reasons why we had very limited awareness of the issues were quite — there's quite clear reasons in terms of our level of access to the centre, particularly how limited we were in terms of not even having a presence in the welfare space, where, again, that's not being on the wings, but, you know, we were so far back, we were — our contact with the client was kept to — clients was kept at a certain distance.

1	felt able or wanted us to escalate certain things.	1	as a sort of safeguarding concern, and you talked about
2	I don't know how much more we could have done with those	2	immediacy being a key factor for you, at least, that you
3	restrictions in place.	3	applied. Taking the situation where a detained person
4	Q. I was going to ask, with those restrictions in place,	4	tells you something but says, "I don't want to make
5	looking back, do you think there is anything that you,	5	a complaint", would you have reported, for example, if
6	as an organisation, or as a person, could have done to	6	there was physical violence outside of a use of force?
7	increase the likelihood that you would be aware of	7	A. It's very hard to comment generally without a specific
8	the type of things shown?	8	example, I think, in mind.
9	A. I'm not aware of any, as you say, with that caveat, with	9	Q. I will ask you again, but maybe it's the same answer,
10	those restrictions in place. I think I would feel	10	but if a client, a detained person, told you that they'd
11	confident that if I had if I was to look back and	11	been subjected to racial abuse but said they didn't want
12	review cases from the time where there were issues	12	to report it, is that something you would feel that you
13	raised, whether we raised them or how we raised them was	13	had to report as a safeguarding concern, or as any
14	thought about very carefully and careful decisions made.	14	concern?
15	So I don't think that there was more we could do.	15	A. Again, I'm sorry, I think it's difficult without
16	Q. On a sort of similar issue, but not specifically in	16	specific examples in mind. I think we wouldn't
17	relation to what was shown on Panorama, you say at	17	necessarily have reported that, particularly if the
18	paragraph 16 of your inquiry statement, which is at	18	client was telling us not to.
19	page 5 of that document, that you wouldn't have reported	19	Q. Is it fair to say that, in these situations, really, you
20	a safeguarding concern in relation to each and every use	20	took a fact-specific approach, rather than a sort of
21	of force that was applied during the relevant period.	21	any sort of categorical one where this category of
22	I think you say that because you thought there was	22	reports always goes forward?
23	already channels where those were being recorded and	23	A. Yes. Beyond that threshold, as I mentioned, of an
24	reviewed; is that right?	24	immediate risk, particularly through suicide or
25	A. Yes.	25	self-harm, yes. That's correct.
	Page 69		Page 71
1	Q. Is it right that you were the safeguarding lead for GDWG	1	Q. You set out in your inquiry statement at paragraph 19
2	at the time?	2	a number of possible reasons why GDWG were unaware of
3	A. Yes, that's correct.	3	the mistreatment that was shown on Panorama. I've
4	Q. I'm asked on behalf of G4S to ask you whether you would	4	already we can see those in your statement and we
5	have reported any use of force if you were concerned or	5	have already dealt with that with Ms Pincus. But just
6	told that it was disproportionate or unnecessary?	6	on one of the things, one thing you say is that detained
7	A. I'm as confident as I can be that we would have raised	7	people sometimes lacked faith, even in third parties'
8	use of force at a certain I think what was often the	8	independence, like NGOs, and you also talk about how, in
9	case was that the client might refer to us to a use	9	your experience, detainees were fearful of raising
10	of force in quite general terms, but not want us to	10	concerns or complaints and that that can lead to
11	raise anything or tell us explicitly they thought things	11	punitive measures or damage in some way for their
12	would be made worse for them if it was raised. That	12	immigration cases, applications for bail or other
13	might have happened.	13	claims.
14	I think there's lots a context to a lot of	14	Were you ever told by a detained person that they
15	the concerns we might have about clients is often you	15	lacked faith or trust in your own independence as an
16	know, in a number of cases, it might be the welfare	16	organisation?
17	officers that are referring us to the client in the	17	A. I don't recall instances of that happening. I certainly
18	first place. So they would tell us so, for	18	recall examples of clients being frustrated with our
19	example yeah, they might give us context about what	19	limitations as an organisation, so, for example, not
20	had happened to a client or what the client alleged had	20	being able to give legal advice or make bail
21	happened, so it was already made clear to us at the	21	applications or other limitations we were hitting.
22	outset that the centre were aware, or should be aware,	22	I don't remember our independence, so to speak, being
23	of the particular thing.	23	directly questioned by clients.
24	Q. We talked a little bit before about the sort of	24	If I might just add, what I think was definitely the
25	threshold that might apply for you referring something	25	case was a more general, pervasive sense of distrust.
l	6LL-7 7		F
	Page 70		Page 72

1	I think it's you know, clients put in indefinite	1	purpose of the drop-in sessions and the reasons why they
2	detention in prison conditions and increasingly, at this	2	needed to take place in a private room. Why did you
3	point, in crowded rooms in desperate situations, I think	3	feel that they needed to be set out in this way at this
4	it's reasonably understandable that clients would be	4	time?
5	people detained would find it difficult to know who to	5	A. I wanted to my purpose of this letter was to try and
6	trust, find it difficult to know how to distinguish	6	be as diplomatic as possible but also as clear as
7	between who is, you know, a G4S representative versus	7	possible. I wanted to both reassure them, so I wanted
8	who is an NGO, where do those sit. I think	8	to you know, I stressed again to management that we
9	a generalised sense of, "Nobody is helping me" was	9	weren't providing legal advice, that we weren't
10	understandable and probably common.	10	providing counselling, that we were clear and that
11	Q. You also state that a large number of people were not	11	everyone volunteering or working for us was clear on
12	aware of GDWG and did not realise that they could raise	12	those boundaries, "Here are the, we think, completely
13	welfare or other concerns with GDWG or receive help with	13	reasonable things to do". I think even in the context
14	making complaints. What, if any, steps did you take to	14	
15		15	of that time and the aftermath of that August meeting
	try and tackle those issues as an organisation?		well, I wasn't prepared to agree to what they thought
16	A. In terms of knowledge of our	16	that what they really wanted was me to say, "We will
17	Q. Yes, increasing awareness or increasing awareness about	17	meet clients in a private room to assign a social
18	what they could report to you or talk to you about as an	18	visitor, check that this came up in meetings at points
19	organisation?	19	to check because we also gave out second-hand
20	A. Well, I think the main things, we would certainly have	20	clothing on request, to check measurements for clothing.
21	tried, where possible it was again, our limited	21	"These are the things we will do, and absolutely no more
22	physical access into the centre was a barrier. So, for	22	than that". I wasn't going to commit to that because
23	example, we tried to ensure there were posters with, you	23	that wasn't where we saw the remit of our work stopping.
24	know, contact information and basic information about	24	Q. Did you feel like you could be more assertive, as at
25	our services available, and I think in different	25	25 September 2017, because Panorama had been shown and
	Page 73		Page 75
	1 age 75		1 age 73
1	languages within the centre. But because we weren't	1	you already said there was a sort of slight change in
2	actually going in ourselves, even to put things on	2	the balance of power?
3	a notice board, we were reliant on staff putting those	3	A. I'm sure that was in my mind. Although, you know,
4	up, checking they were up, updating them. I don't know	4	I think this letter is quite detailed and I wanted to
5	how often that was happening. Otherwise, we were	5	respond as constructively as possible, but I think that
6	dependent very much on the welfare officers referring to	6	dynamic was in my mind, yes.
7	us frequently and spreading the word about us, which	7	Q. If we go over to page 43, which is still part of that
8	I think they generally very much did, and on strong word	8	letter, you also set out here you address some of
9	of mouth around clients and on keeping our access going,	9	the concerns that had been raised at the most recent
10	I mean, keeping we were responsive on our free	10	meeting in August, which you have already talked about.
11	helpline, keeping our drop-ins running, even when we	11	In relation to referring people to IMB and RAPT, you
12	were, you know, a very small-staffed team, but keeping	12	emphasise in your letter that, in your view, the nature
13	those running as much as possible so we were there as	13	of your contact with those agencies was a matter for you
14	much as possible so that we were known as much as	14	and those organisations. Is that right?
15	possible.	15	A. Yes.
16	Q. I want to come on to talk about some stuff after	16	Q. You also respond to the concerns raised about the tone
17	Panorama and how the relationship was in the immediate	17	of emails, saying that your view was that you didn't
18	aftermath.	18	think the tone was disrespectful, but noting that tone
19	We can see, if we can bring up on screen <gdw000003></gdw000003>	19	can be subjective. Is that right?
		20	A. Yes, that's correct.
20	at page 41, this is a letter that you sent on	20	Q. You say that you're happy to continue the arrangement
21	25 September 2017, so about three weeks after Panorama	21 22	you offered immediately after the meeting and it says
22	was broadcast, to Steve Skitt, but copying in	23	
23	Paul Gasson. The letter carries on from 41 to 44, and		"where I will be the individual conduit for any concerns
24	without going through each bit of it, in summary, you	24	raised to you by GDWG for the time being". Was that
	set out in this letter in detail the work of GDWG, the	25	what happened in the period from this time?
25			
25	Page 74		Page 76

1	A. Yes, as far as I can recall. I don't think I had	1	what it was made clear to me was that, in the
2	a response to this letter, and I think there was then	2	0.01 per cent of issues, they were very, very agitated
3	a period following on from this where there were far	3	about that.
4	fewer requests for meetings from management. But	4	Q. At paragraph 57 of your 2018 statement, you say that it
5	I think, as far as I'm aware, we continued with that	5	must have been around a week after this you refer to the
6	arrangement.	6	fact that your colleague, Ms Blackwell, emailed the
7	Q. You go on, from the bottom here, to make suggestions	7	Forward Trust, Anton Bole, who was a witness on
8	about the future conduct of the meetings, saying you'd	8	Wednesday, to check that GDWG could continue to refer
9	like to bring a trustee to meetings. You say in your	9	detainees directly to the Forward Trust, and that they
10	statement that was so that somebody could take a note;	10	could refer people directly to you for help in return.
11	is that right?	11	If we can turn up page 46 of this document, you will see
12	A. Yes. Yes, that's correct. I mean, I also yeah,	12	the email there:
13	I mean, I also felt that, having had that experience of	13	"Can you confirm we both continue to agree that we
14	that August meeting, I wanted a back-up, another witness	14	can refer cases directly to you and vice versa?"
15	in the room, apart from anything else, but also	15	And then if we go up, in response:
16	additional support for me, given that dynamic.	16	"Dear Naomi, I hope you are well. I was informed
17	Q. Because in meetings it was you and at least two other	17	that referral process has to go through Welfare Office
18	people	18	please."
19	A. Three managers, yes.	19	If we can go to page 45, the previous page.
20	Q. As you say you also say in here, and these are the	20	Naomi Blackwell responds saying:
21	proposals we talked about before, that you would like,	21	"Can you tell me when you were informed this and by
22	for future meetings, there to be an agenda agreed	22	whom? If you get a chance, can we discuss this?"
23	beforehand and, if they had concerns, you'd like them to	23	The response from Anton Bole is:
24	them out in summary before the meeting. Did you ever	24	"I am not allowed to give any information regarding
25	receive a response to this?	25	your questions. It would be best to contact Deputy
	Page 77		Page 79
1	A. I don't believe I did, no.	1	Director Stephen Skitt who can give you more informed
2	Q. At the bottom of page 44, if we can sorry, the top of	2	information."
3	that page. You say in the final paragraph:	3	And Stephen Skitt is cc'd in there. Do you now know
4	"Finally, to end on a positive note, I was really	4	or have any view as to who made this decision?
5	encouraged to hear you say at the meeting that you felt	5	A. I don't. Well, no, I don't know for certain. I mean,
6	that in 99.9 per cent of cases that GDWG was doing good	6	this chimes very much with the message I was given and
7	work."	7	the fact that the referrals to the RAPT organisation,
8	How do you reconcile the I'm asked to ask you	8	the Forward Trust, was one of the things they wanted to
9	this on behalf of the Home Office or G4S, I can't	9	discuss at that August meeting and were clear they
10	remember exactly which one how do you reconcile this	10	didn't think was appropriate.
11	comment that had been made, that in 99.9 per cent of	11	Q. So although you'd said previously that you felt there
12	cases you were doing good work, with the suggestion at	12	was some shift in the balance of power after Panorama,
13	that meeting that they were being bullying and combative	13	this was three or four weeks on from Panorama, and
14	and distrustful?	14	you're being told that you can't refer people to the
15	A. I don't recall the exact wording in the meeting, so I	15	drugs and alcohol charity and they can't refer them to
16	but I'm confident it happened because I referred to it.	16	you directly. Is that right?
17	My recollection of that meeting is that it was strongly	17	A. Yes. If I might add, and the context was that, prior to
18	hostile and, as I described, repeated threats to take	18	this, although I think I think, for a variety of
19	the drop-in away, raised voices. I think somebody may	19	reasons, we may not have referred large numbers of
20	have banged the table at some point. It was a very	20	clients to RAPT, but Anton had been into our office
		21	earlier that year, I think to train staff and talk about
21	agitated meeting. So I think I'm confident in saying		-
	agitated meeting. So I think — I'm confident in saying that this comment would have been an effective aside.	22	his work. He was very welcoming and friendly,
21		22 23	his work. He was very welcoming and friendly, encouraging referrals. He was a very open,
21 22	that this comment would have been an effective aside.		· ·
21 22 23	that this comment would have been an effective aside.  It would have been a specific reference to visiting,	23	encouraging referrals. He was a very open,
21 22 23 24	that this comment would have been an effective aside. It would have been a specific reference to visiting, which they didn't have an issue with. So it was a, "This is what you are doing. You are doing well", but	23 24	encouraging referrals. He was a very open, straightforward person offering that support, and we found him very easy to speak with and refer to. So it
21 22 23 24	that this comment would have been an effective aside. It would have been a specific reference to visiting, which they didn't have an issue with. So it was a,	23 24	encouraging referrals. He was a very open, straightforward person offering that support, and we

1 seemed clear this wasn't -- I would be very surprised to 1 A. Yes. 2 2 learn it doesn't fit with the August meeting that all of Q. I think in your 2018 statement, you said, and without 3 3 this was led by -- that this was driven by RAPT deciding going to the specific paragraph, I think it's fair to 4 that things were inappropriate. It seemed clear that 4 summarise that you were slightly concerned when you were 5 that was management influencing and saying this wasn't 5 giving that statement that there might be negative 6 6 consequences for you? appropriate. 7 Q. In fact, Anton Bole gave evidence on Wednesday saying 7 A. Yes. 8 that they were told not to contact GDWG but not given an 8 O. Is that fair? 9 explanation as to why. Does that surprise you or does 9 10 that accord with what you thought at the time? 10 Q. But I think it's right you say in your inquiry witness 11 11 A. No, that accords with what I thought. statement that, in fact, there weren't any negative 12 consequences for you, after giving that statement? 12 Q. So we have seen your letter, which was in 13 September 2017, two or three weeks after Panorama, and 13 A. No, that's correct. 14 14 you say in your inquiry statement, at paragraph 10, that Q. But you do -- sorry, carry on? 15 Brook House management did not arrange a further meeting 15 A. I was just going to mention that we also actually had 16 16 with you until September 2018, a full year after a positive development at Tinsley House rather than 17 Brook, in that, in the early part of 2018, where we had 17 Panorama. Is that right? 18 18 long wanted to set up an equivalent drop-in surgery A. Yes. 19 space within Tinsley House, and that was able to happen 19 Q. Had you made any requests for meetings? 20 A. I don't recall -- I don't recall doing so. I think 20 quite positively. 21 O. Was it the same -- I think we have heard evidence my -- the assessment that I made was that we were --21 22 there's the same management, G4S management, that were 22 strategically, the context of Panorama meant that the 23 running Brook House and Tinsley House at the relevant 23 power dynamic was different. I would have welcomed what 24 24 period, and I think some Home Office staff as well. Was I'd set out, you know, previously, but also in 25 it the same people you were dealing with? 25 that September 2017 letter, in terms of quarterly Page 81 Page 83 1 meetings but an agreed format. I would have welcomed 1 A. From recollection, Naomi Blackwell and I met with 2 2 that. They never responded on that. Since the dynamic a manager at Tinsley who had certainly worked across 3 3 leading up to then, over a period of time, and I think both sites and referred back to, relatively, in passing, 4 it had been the time -- it had been the case in the time 4 the witness statement alleged issue. 5 5 Q. You say in your inquiry statement that, despite these of my predecessor too, was of management effectively --6 and it felt like this to me and I think my predecessor 6 sort of improvements, you remained cautious about what 7 7 alluded to this too, that it was us being sort of called issues you raised, even after Panorama, and you give the 8 example of a detained person being put on closed visits in to be told off, for want of a better way of putting Q it, about a particular incident. I wasn't, therefore, Q as an apparently punitive measure -- that's at 10 chasing particular meetings, apart from that point, 10 paragraph 12 of your inquiry statement. We heard unless they wanted to agree to a new format. 11 11 evidence from Jamie MacPherson on Wednesday that he, in 12 Q. Was there any change, for example, in the willingness of 12 fact, raised an occasion with you when he thought 13 Brook House management to agree to repeat visits after 13 a detained person, D191, had been put on closed visits 14 14 Panorama? as a punitive measure, and you had said that you didn't 15 A. My recollection is that -- a subtle one. My 15 feel that you could raise that with G4S without 16 16 destabilising the relationship. Is that the occasion recollection is that there were at least some occasions 17 17 in the year or so after the relevant period that there that you are talking about or was there more than one? 18 18 would be occasions where we would request -- a staff A. Oh, in terms of us going ahead with a second --19 19 member would request a second visit and not get Q. So you were saying -- you say in your statement that 20 20 a response and we would make a judgment call that -- and there's an example of detained people being put on 21 probably chase it and still get no response. So we 21 closed visits as an apparently punitive measure. 22 22 Jamie MacPherson gave evidence about one of those. Was would make a judgment call that we would, in effect, 23 risk their wrath because we would put the person in 23 there only one situation like that or were there more 24 anyway and it wouldn't be an issue. I don't remember --24 situations like that? 25 Q. You were more willing to risk the wrath from then; yes? 25 A. My apologies, I'm clear now. From my recollection, that Page 82 Page 84

		_	
1	wasn't the only example of that. There weren't	1	"G4S don't like them referring cases to others.
2	numerous many examples, but I think, in a similar	2	"Meets Steve Skitt, Dan Haughton, Paul Gasson
3	period, there may have been one or two other examples of	3	"G4S feel openly threatened.
4	different visitors experiencing that issue.	4	"Don't want them [or you] contacting IMB, HO
5	Q. I'm asked on behalf of G4S to ask you how you knew that	5	caseworker."
6	this was happening as a punitive measure, as opposed to	6	"Struck by level of hostility."
7	for any other reason?	7	I presume that's from you:
8	A. I think I was certainly clear on it was certainly	8	"Included Ben Saunders."
9	clear from the time. I mean, I remember we certainly	9	Is that saying that the hostility included hostility
10	were clear on that from our understanding of what the	10	from Ben Saunders?
11	person detained was being told and the fact that the	11	A. Yes, although certainly it felt that was also I think
12	closed visits seemed to be happening on a kind of	12	I only met with Ben Saunders on that one occasion
13	effectively on an indefinite basis, and our	13	relatively early in post, but he echoed very much the
14	understanding was that shouldn't be the case. I think	14	concerns I'd heard before and since.
15	the conclusion that Jamie reached was that the in	15	Q. "JW has never been in centre. Thinks G4S refused."
16	relation to this particular client was that the visits	16	Had you requested to go into the heart of the centre
17	had been stopped because the client was allegedly	17	before?
18	receiving drugs, no-one else was visiting him apart from	18	A. We'd requested a tour of the centre so we had a better
19	Jamie, there was an implied accusation to the GDWG	19	understanding of the layout, which I knew was something
20	visitor.	20	that wasn't unprecedented in terms of other NGOs and,
21	Q. Is it fair to say, essentially, you believed what your	21	actually, I had at other centres outside of Gatwick.
22	visitors were telling you?	22	Q. Do you remember when that request was made and refused?
23	A. Yes. Yes. I'm sorry to be vague. I think, if I could	23	A. I don't recall. I think I would have requested that
24	review the client information, I'd be clear on that.	24	fairly early on in post in 2016, but I don't recall.
25	But I remember being very clear, it seemed, we were	25	Q. Was there a reason ever given to you for refusing that
	Page 85		Page 87
		1	
1	clear, we were looking back we were looking at the	1	request?
1 2	clear, we were looking back we were looking at the wording of the Detention Service Orders and checking on	1 2	•
			request?  A. I don't remember being given one, no.  Q. We see at the bottom under "Incidents", starting from
2	wording of the Detention Service Orders and checking on	2	A. I don't remember being given one, no.
2 3	wording of the Detention Service Orders and checking on this point and it seemed clear to us it was being	2 3	A. I don't remember being given one, no.  Q. We see at the bottom under "Incidents", starting from
2 3 4	wording of the Detention Service Orders and checking on this point and it seemed clear to us it was being applied as a punitive measure, that there weren't other	2 3 4	<ul><li>A. I don't remember being given one, no.</li><li>Q. We see at the bottom under "Incidents", starting from the third bullet point, a question:</li></ul>
2 3 4 5	wording of the Detention Service Orders and checking on this point and it seemed clear to us it was being applied as a punitive measure, that there weren't other legitimate reasons for the closed visits being imposed.	2 3 4 5	A. I don't remember being given one, no.  Q. We see at the bottom under "Incidents", starting from the third bullet point, a question:  "Where does BBC programme fit in JW's experience?"
2 3 4 5 6	wording of the Detention Service Orders and checking on this point and it seemed clear to us it was being applied as a punitive measure, that there weren't other legitimate reasons for the closed visits being imposed. Q. I want to come on to discuss your interviews with Verita	2 3 4 5 6	A. I don't remember being given one, no.  Q. We see at the bottom under "Incidents", starting from the third bullet point, a question:  "Where does BBC programme fit in JW's experience?"  Presumably a note of your response:
2 3 4 5 6 7	wording of the Detention Service Orders and checking on this point and it seemed clear to us it was being applied as a punitive measure, that there weren't other legitimate reasons for the closed visits being imposed.  Q. I want to come on to discuss your interviews with Verita which happened after 2017/2018. You were interviewed	2 3 4 5 6 7	A. I don't remember being given one, no.  Q. We see at the bottom under "Incidents", starting from the third bullet point, a question:  "Where does BBC programme fit in JW's experience?"  Presumably a note of your response:  "Can't place it. Shocked him. But had heard
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	wording of the Detention Service Orders and checking on this point and it seemed clear to us it was being applied as a punitive measure, that there weren't other legitimate reasons for the closed visits being imposed.  Q. I want to come on to discuss your interviews with Verita which happened after 2017/2018. You were interviewed firstly by you met firstly with Ed Marsden from	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	A. I don't remember being given one, no.  Q. We see at the bottom under "Incidents", starting from the third bullet point, a question:  "Where does BBC programme fit in JW's experience?"  Presumably a note of your response:  "Can't place it. Shocked him. But had heard rumours. Can't compare it over time."
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	wording of the Detention Service Orders and checking on this point and it seemed clear to us it was being applied as a punitive measure, that there weren't other legitimate reasons for the closed visits being imposed.  Q. I want to come on to discuss your interviews with Verita which happened after 2017/2018. You were interviewed firstly by you met firstly with Ed Marsden from Verita, I understand, on 24 October 2017. If we can	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	A. I don't remember being given one, no.  Q. We see at the bottom under "Incidents", starting from the third bullet point, a question:  "Where does BBC programme fit in JW's experience?"  Presumably a note of your response:  "Can't place it. Shocked him. But had heard rumours. Can't compare it over time."  What does "Can't place it" mean? I know these are
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	wording of the Detention Service Orders and checking on this point and it seemed clear to us it was being applied as a punitive measure, that there weren't other legitimate reasons for the closed visits being imposed.  Q. I want to come on to discuss your interviews with Verita which happened after 2017/2018. You were interviewed firstly by you met firstly with Ed Marsden from Verita, I understand, on 24 October 2017. If we can bring that document up on screen, <ver000198>, please.</ver000198>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	A. I don't remember being given one, no.  Q. We see at the bottom under "Incidents", starting from the third bullet point, a question:  "Where does BBC programme fit in JW's experience?"  Presumably a note of your response:  "Can't place it. Shocked him. But had heard rumours. Can't compare it over time."  What does "Can't place it" mean? I know these are only notes, but if you can help.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	wording of the Detention Service Orders and checking on this point and it seemed clear to us it was being applied as a punitive measure, that there weren't other legitimate reasons for the closed visits being imposed.  Q. I want to come on to discuss your interviews with Verita which happened after 2017/2018. You were interviewed firstly by you met firstly with Ed Marsden from Verita, I understand, on 24 October 2017. If we can bring that document up on screen, <ver000198>, please. So these are the notes from the meeting. Have you had</ver000198>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	A. I don't remember being given one, no.  Q. We see at the bottom under "Incidents", starting from the third bullet point, a question:  "Where does BBC programme fit in JW's experience?"  Presumably a note of your response:  "Can't place it. Shocked him. But had heard rumours. Can't compare it over time."  What does "Can't place it" mean? I know these are only notes, but if you can help.  A. "Can't place it". I think the context of the question
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	wording of the Detention Service Orders and checking on this point and it seemed clear to us it was being applied as a punitive measure, that there weren't other legitimate reasons for the closed visits being imposed.  Q. I want to come on to discuss your interviews with Verita which happened after 2017/2018. You were interviewed firstly by you met firstly with Ed Marsden from Verita, I understand, on 24 October 2017. If we can bring that document up on screen, <ver000198>, please. So these are the notes from the meeting. Have you had the chance to look at these before?</ver000198>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	A. I don't remember being given one, no.  Q. We see at the bottom under "Incidents", starting from the third bullet point, a question:  "Where does BBC programme fit in JW's experience?"  Presumably a note of your response:  "Can't place it. Shocked him. But had heard rumours. Can't compare it over time."  What does "Can't place it" mean? I know these are only notes, but if you can help.  A. "Can't place it". I think the context of the question was, how did this stand out as an unusual — how did
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	wording of the Detention Service Orders and checking on this point and it seemed clear to us it was being applied as a punitive measure, that there weren't other legitimate reasons for the closed visits being imposed.  Q. I want to come on to discuss your interviews with Verita which happened after 2017/2018. You were interviewed firstly by you met firstly with Ed Marsden from Verita, I understand, on 24 October 2017. If we can bring that document up on screen, <ver000198>, please. So these are the notes from the meeting. Have you had the chance to look at these before?  A. Yes.</ver000198>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	A. I don't remember being given one, no.  Q. We see at the bottom under "Incidents", starting from the third bullet point, a question:  "Where does BBC programme fit in JW's experience?"  Presumably a note of your response:  "Can't place it. Shocked him. But had heard rumours. Can't compare it over time."  What does "Can't place it" mean? I know these are only notes, but if you can help.  A. "Can't place it". I think the context of the question was, how did this stand out as an unusual — how did this relate to what happened — experience of detention
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	wording of the Detention Service Orders and checking on this point and it seemed clear to us it was being applied as a punitive measure, that there weren't other legitimate reasons for the closed visits being imposed.  Q. I want to come on to discuss your interviews with Verita which happened after 2017/2018. You were interviewed firstly by you met firstly with Ed Marsden from Verita, I understand, on 24 October 2017. If we can bring that document up on screen, <ver000198>, please. So these are the notes from the meeting. Have you had the chance to look at these before?  A. Yes.  Q. We can see from the bottom it sets out the big</ver000198>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	A. I don't remember being given one, no.  Q. We see at the bottom under "Incidents", starting from the third bullet point, a question:  "Where does BBC programme fit in JW's experience?"  Presumably a note of your response:  "Can't place it. Shocked him. But had heard rumours. Can't compare it over time."  What does "Can't place it" mean? I know these are only notes, but if you can help.  A. "Can't place it". I think the context of the question was, how did this stand out as an unusual — how did this relate to what happened — experience of detention before that. I think that that phrase, "Can't compare
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	wording of the Detention Service Orders and checking on this point and it seemed clear to us it was being applied as a punitive measure, that there weren't other legitimate reasons for the closed visits being imposed.  Q. I want to come on to discuss your interviews with Verita which happened after 2017/2018. You were interviewed firstly by you met firstly with Ed Marsden from Verita, I understand, on 24 October 2017. If we can bring that document up on screen, <ver000198>, please. So these are the notes from the meeting. Have you had the chance to look at these before?  A. Yes.  Q. We can see from the bottom it sets out the big issues, some notes on what your activities were at</ver000198>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	A. I don't remember being given one, no.  Q. We see at the bottom under "Incidents", starting from the third bullet point, a question:  "Where does BBC programme fit in JW's experience?"  Presumably a note of your response:  "Can't place it. Shocked him. But had heard rumours. Can't compare it over time."  What does "Can't place it" mean? I know these are only notes, but if you can help.  A. "Can't place it". I think the context of the question was, how did this stand out as an unusual — how did this relate to what happened — experience of detention before that. I think that that phrase, "Can't compare it over time" is probably accurate because we only had
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	wording of the Detention Service Orders and checking on this point and it seemed clear to us it was being applied as a punitive measure, that there weren't other legitimate reasons for the closed visits being imposed.  Q. I want to come on to discuss your interviews with Verita which happened after 2017/2018. You were interviewed firstly by you met firstly with Ed Marsden from Verita, I understand, on 24 October 2017. If we can bring that document up on screen, <ver000198>, please. So these are the notes from the meeting. Have you had the chance to look at these before?  A. Yes.  Q. We can see from the bottom it sets out the big issues, some notes on what your activities were at Brook House. At the bottom, it summarises your</ver000198>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	A. I don't remember being given one, no.  Q. We see at the bottom under "Incidents", starting from the third bullet point, a question:  "Where does BBC programme fit in JW's experience?"  Presumably a note of your response:  "Can't place it. Shocked him. But had heard rumours. Can't compare it over time."  What does "Can't place it" mean? I know these are only notes, but if you can help.  A. "Can't place it". I think the context of the question was, how did this stand out as an unusual — how did this relate to what happened — experience of detention before that. I think that that phrase, "Can't compare it over time" is probably accurate because we only had the undercover footage at that particular point.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	wording of the Detention Service Orders and checking on this point and it seemed clear to us it was being applied as a punitive measure, that there weren't other legitimate reasons for the closed visits being imposed.  Q. I want to come on to discuss your interviews with Verita which happened after 2017/2018. You were interviewed firstly by you met firstly with Ed Marsden from Verita, I understand, on 24 October 2017. If we can bring that document up on screen, <ver000198>, please. So these are the notes from the meeting. Have you had the chance to look at these before?  A. Yes.  Q. We can see from the bottom it sets out the big issues, some notes on what your activities were at Brook House. At the bottom, it summarises your relationship with G4S. It says:</ver000198>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	A. I don't remember being given one, no.  Q. We see at the bottom under "Incidents", starting from the third bullet point, a question:  "Where does BBC programme fit in JW's experience?"  Presumably a note of your response:  "Can't place it. Shocked him. But had heard rumours. Can't compare it over time."  What does "Can't place it" mean? I know these are only notes, but if you can help.  A. "Can't place it". I think the context of the question was, how did this stand out as an unusual — how did this relate to what happened — experience of detention before that. I think that that phrase, "Can't compare it over time" is probably accurate because we only had the undercover footage at that particular point.  Q. It says:
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	wording of the Detention Service Orders and checking on this point and it seemed clear to us it was being applied as a punitive measure, that there weren't other legitimate reasons for the closed visits being imposed.  Q. I want to come on to discuss your interviews with Verita which happened after 2017/2018. You were interviewed firstly by you met firstly with Ed Marsden from Verita, I understand, on 24 October 2017. If we can bring that document up on screen, <ver000198>, please. So these are the notes from the meeting. Have you had the chance to look at these before?  A. Yes.  Q. We can see from the bottom it sets out the big issues, some notes on what your activities were at Brook House. At the bottom, it summarises your relationship with G4S. It says:  "[Difficult] relationship with G4S."</ver000198>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	A. I don't remember being given one, no.  Q. We see at the bottom under "Incidents", starting from the third bullet point, a question:  "Where does BBC programme fit in JW's experience?"  Presumably a note of your response:  "Can't place it. Shocked him. But had heard rumours. Can't compare it over time."  What does "Can't place it" mean? I know these are only notes, but if you can help.  A. "Can't place it". I think the context of the question was, how did this stand out as an unusual — how did this relate to what happened — experience of detention before that. I think that that phrase, "Can't compare it over time" is probably accurate because we only had the undercover footage at that particular point.  Q. It says:  "GDWG have good relations with some officers. Know
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	wording of the Detention Service Orders and checking on this point and it seemed clear to us it was being applied as a punitive measure, that there weren't other legitimate reasons for the closed visits being imposed.  Q. I want to come on to discuss your interviews with Verita which happened after 2017/2018. You were interviewed firstly by you met firstly with Ed Marsden from Verita, I understand, on 24 October 2017. If we can bring that document up on screen, <ver000198>, please. So these are the notes from the meeting. Have you had the chance to look at these before?  A. Yes.  Q. We can see from the bottom it sets out the big issues, some notes on what your activities were at Brook House. At the bottom, it summarises your relationship with G4S. It says:  "[Difficult] relationship with G4S."  On the next page at the top:</ver000198>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	A. I don't remember being given one, no.  Q. We see at the bottom under "Incidents", starting from the third bullet point, a question:  "Where does BBC programme fit in JW's experience?"  Presumably a note of your response:  "Can't place it. Shocked him. But had heard rumours. Can't compare it over time."  What does "Can't place it" mean? I know these are only notes, but if you can help.  A. "Can't place it". I think the context of the question was, how did this stand out as an unusual — how did this relate to what happened — experience of detention before that. I think that that phrase, "Can't compare it over time" is probably accurate because we only had the undercover footage at that particular point.  Q. It says:  "GDWG have good relations with some officers. Know that they are caring."
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	wording of the Detention Service Orders and checking on this point and it seemed clear to us it was being applied as a punitive measure, that there weren't other legitimate reasons for the closed visits being imposed.  Q. I want to come on to discuss your interviews with Verita which happened after 2017/2018. You were interviewed firstly by you met firstly with Ed Marsden from Verita, I understand, on 24 October 2017. If we can bring that document up on screen, <ver000198>, please. So these are the notes from the meeting. Have you had the chance to look at these before?  A. Yes.  Q. We can see from the bottom it sets out the big issues, some notes on what your activities were at Brook House. At the bottom, it summarises your relationship with G4S. It says:  "[Difficult] relationship with G4S."  On the next page at the top: " meets them quarterly.</ver000198>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	A. I don't remember being given one, no.  Q. We see at the bottom under "Incidents", starting from the third bullet point, a question:  "Where does BBC programme fit in JW's experience?"  Presumably a note of your response:  "Can't place it. Shocked him. But had heard rumours. Can't compare it over time."  What does "Can't place it" mean? I know these are only notes, but if you can help.  A. "Can't place it". I think the context of the question was, how did this stand out as an unusual — how did this relate to what happened — experience of detention before that. I think that that phrase, "Can't compare it over time" is probably accurate because we only had the undercover footage at that particular point.  Q. It says:  "GDWG have good relations with some officers. Know that they are caring."  "No notice removal adds to anxiety."
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	wording of the Detention Service Orders and checking on this point and it seemed clear to us it was being applied as a punitive measure, that there weren't other legitimate reasons for the closed visits being imposed.  Q. I want to come on to discuss your interviews with Verita which happened after 2017/2018. You were interviewed firstly by you met firstly with Ed Marsden from Verita, I understand, on 24 October 2017. If we can bring that document up on screen, <ver000198>, please. So these are the notes from the meeting. Have you had the chance to look at these before?  A. Yes.  Q. We can see from the bottom it sets out the big issues, some notes on what your activities were at Brook House. At the bottom, it summarises your relationship with G4S. It says:  "[Difficult] relationship with G4S."  On the next page at the top:  " meets them quarterly.  "G4S are defensive and suspicious want to restrict their role.</ver000198>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	A. I don't remember being given one, no.  Q. We see at the bottom under "Incidents", starting from the third bullet point, a question:  "Where does BBC programme fit in JW's experience?"  Presumably a note of your response:  "Can't place it. Shocked him. But had heard rumours. Can't compare it over time."  What does "Can't place it" mean? I know these are only notes, but if you can help.  A. "Can't place it". I think the context of the question was, how did this stand out as an unusual — how did this relate to what happened — experience of detention before that. I think that that phrase, "Can't compare it over time" is probably accurate because we only had the undercover footage at that particular point.  Q. It says:  "GDWG have good relations with some officers. Know that they are caring."  "No notice removal adds to anxiety."  Presumably of detained people:
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	wording of the Detention Service Orders and checking on this point and it seemed clear to us it was being applied as a punitive measure, that there weren't other legitimate reasons for the closed visits being imposed.  Q. I want to come on to discuss your interviews with Verita which happened after 2017/2018. You were interviewed firstly by you met firstly with Ed Marsden from Verita, I understand, on 24 October 2017. If we can bring that document up on screen, <ver000198>, please. So these are the notes from the meeting. Have you had the chance to look at these before?  A. Yes.  Q. We can see from the bottom it sets out the big issues, some notes on what your activities were at Brook House. At the bottom, it summarises your relationship with G4S. It says:  "[Difficult] relationship with G4S."  On the next page at the top:  " meets them quarterly.  "G4S are defensive and suspicious want to</ver000198>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	A. I don't remember being given one, no.  Q. We see at the bottom under "Incidents", starting from the third bullet point, a question:  "Where does BBC programme fit in JW's experience?"  Presumably a note of your response:  "Can't place it. Shocked him. But had heard rumours. Can't compare it over time."  What does "Can't place it" mean? I know these are only notes, but if you can help.  A. "Can't place it". I think the context of the question was, how did this stand out as an unusual — how did this relate to what happened — experience of detention before that. I think that that phrase, "Can't compare it over time" is probably accurate because we only had the undercover footage at that particular point.  Q. It says:  "GDWG have good relations with some officers. Know that they are caring."  "No notice removal adds to anxiety."  Presumably of detained people:  "Paul Gasson — hostile.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	wording of the Detention Service Orders and checking on this point and it seemed clear to us it was being applied as a punitive measure, that there weren't other legitimate reasons for the closed visits being imposed.  Q. I want to come on to discuss your interviews with Verita which happened after 2017/2018. You were interviewed firstly by you met firstly with Ed Marsden from Verita, I understand, on 24 October 2017. If we can bring that document up on screen, <ver000198>, please. So these are the notes from the meeting. Have you had the chance to look at these before?  A. Yes.  Q. We can see from the bottom it sets out the big issues, some notes on what your activities were at Brook House. At the bottom, it summarises your relationship with G4S. It says:  "[Difficult] relationship with G4S."  On the next page at the top:  " meets them quarterly.  "G4S are defensive and suspicious want to restrict their role.  "Happy with them doing non-controversial practical</ver000198>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	A. I don't remember being given one, no.  Q. We see at the bottom under "Incidents", starting from the third bullet point, a question:  "Where does BBC programme fit in JW's experience?"  Presumably a note of your response:  "Can't place it. Shocked him. But had heard rumours. Can't compare it over time."  What does "Can't place it" mean? I know these are only notes, but if you can help.  A. "Can't place it". I think the context of the question was, how did this stand out as an unusual — how did this relate to what happened — experience of detention before that. I think that that phrase, "Can't compare it over time" is probably accurate because we only had the undercover footage at that particular point.  Q. It says:  "GDWG have good relations with some officers. Know that they are caring."  "No notice removal adds to anxiety."  Presumably of detained people:  "Paul Gasson — hostile.  "Steve Skitt — was helpful and now less so. Become
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	wording of the Detention Service Orders and checking on this point and it seemed clear to us it was being applied as a punitive measure, that there weren't other legitimate reasons for the closed visits being imposed.  Q. I want to come on to discuss your interviews with Verita which happened after 2017/2018. You were interviewed firstly by you met firstly with Ed Marsden from Verita, I understand, on 24 October 2017. If we can bring that document up on screen, <ver000198>, please. So these are the notes from the meeting. Have you had the chance to look at these before?  A. Yes.  Q. We can see from the bottom it sets out the big issues, some notes on what your activities were at Brook House. At the bottom, it summarises your relationship with G4S. It says:  "[Difficult] relationship with G4S."  On the next page at the top:  " meets them quarterly.  "G4S are defensive and suspicious want to restrict their role.  "Happy with them doing non-controversial practical tasks.  "Suspicious of casework.</ver000198>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	A. I don't remember being given one, no.  Q. We see at the bottom under "Incidents", starting from the third bullet point, a question:  "Where does BBC programme fit in JW's experience?"  Presumably a note of your response:  "Can't place it. Shocked him. But had heard rumours. Can't compare it over time."  What does "Can't place it" mean? I know these are only notes, but if you can help.  A. "Can't place it". I think the context of the question was, how did this stand out as an unusual how did this relate to what happened experience of detention before that. I think that that phrase, "Can't compare it over time" is probably accurate because we only had the undercover footage at that particular point.  Q. It says:  "GDWG have good relations with some officers. Know that they are caring."  "No notice removal adds to anxiety."  Presumably of detained people:  "Paul Gasson hostile.  "Steve Skitt was helpful and now less so. Become more hostile. Don't refer to other agencies etc."  Then it talks about a defensive response.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	wording of the Detention Service Orders and checking on this point and it seemed clear to us it was being applied as a punitive measure, that there weren't other legitimate reasons for the closed visits being imposed.  Q. I want to come on to discuss your interviews with Verita which happened after 2017/2018. You were interviewed firstly by you met firstly with Ed Marsden from Verita, I understand, on 24 October 2017. If we can bring that document up on screen, <ver000198>, please. So these are the notes from the meeting. Have you had the chance to look at these before?  A. Yes.  Q. We can see from the bottom it sets out the big issues, some notes on what your activities were at Brook House. At the bottom, it summarises your relationship with G4S. It says:  "[Difficult] relationship with G4S."  On the next page at the top:  " meets them quarterly.  "G4S are defensive and suspicious want to restrict their role.  "Happy with them doing non-controversial practical tasks.</ver000198>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	A. I don't remember being given one, no.  Q. We see at the bottom under "Incidents", starting from the third bullet point, a question:  "Where does BBC programme fit in JW's experience?"  Presumably a note of your response:  "Can't place it. Shocked him. But had heard rumours. Can't compare it over time."  What does "Can't place it" mean? I know these are only notes, but if you can help.  A. "Can't place it". I think the context of the question was, how did this stand out as an unusual how did this relate to what happened experience of detention before that. I think that that phrase, "Can't compare it over time" is probably accurate because we only had the undercover footage at that particular point.  Q. It says:  "GDWG have good relations with some officers. Know that they are caring."  "No notice removal adds to anxiety."  Presumably of detained people:  "Paul Gasson hostile.  "Steve Skitt was helpful and now less so. Become more hostile. Don't refer to other agencies etc."

1	Then we know, Mr Wilson, that you gave an interview	1	being followed correctly" without saying, "We will look
2	to Kate Lampard's investigation in February 2018 that	2	into this", which I would expect an Independent
3	covers much of the issues we have already discussed, so	3	Monitoring Board to do.
4	I don't need to ask you about specific bits, but, chair,	4	Q. The bottom couple of lines say:
5	I ask for that to be adduced in full and that is at	5	"If you have concerns about a detainee we should
6	<ver000249>.</ver000249>	6	always be more than glad to hear from you and where
7	Mr Wilson, I want to come on to ask you about your	7	appropriate pass the information to the Brook House
8	relationship with the IMB. In your 2018 witness	8	safeguarding manager, whose specific role is to protect
9	statement, you speak about your dealings with the IMB,	9	the vulnerable."
10	the Independent Monitoring Board, at paragraphs 61 to	10	Did you believe that during the relevant period
11	64. You refer to three meetings you had with IMB	11	first of all, do you know who the safeguarding manager
12	members since becoming a director. You talk about one	12	was during the relevant period?
13	when you first started in summer 2016, where you say	13	A. We had a safeguarding the safeguarding contact email
14	that you gained the impression that the IMB was too	14	and phone number to call. There was a member of staff
15	close to Brook House management and that they had	15	called James Begg who would often be the person
16	advised you they were keen to advise you not to	16	responding. I'm not sure I don't think his job title
17	overstep the mark with Brook House management. Is that	17	was the safeguarding manager, so I'm not certain on that
18	right?	18	point.
19	A. Yes, that's correct.	19	Q. Do you feel like Brook House whether it is safer
20	Q. We have an email exchange between Ms Blackwell and	20	custody or whatever it was called at the relevant
21	Jackie Colbran from the IMB which we have already seen	21	period, do you think that they did undertake a specific
22	when looking at G4S's response to this. If we can bring	22	role to protect the vulnerable?
23	up on screen again <gdw000003>, page 38. Dealing now</gdw000003>	23	A. I think that should have been part of that role.
24	with the IMB's response, with Jackie Colbran's response,	24	I think you know, it was clear to us we would
25	this was where Ms Blackwell wanted them to intervene to	25	never we had nothing to be gained by raising things
	D 90		D 01
	Page 89		Page 91
1	check whether his request to move to Tinsley House would	1	unless we felt they needed to be raised. So if we were
2	be dealt with. She says:	2	raising something to the IMB, it was because things
3	"This is beginning to step outside our remit"	3	weren't support wasn't in place, for whatever reason,
4	And that it would be inappropriate for them to	4	within the centre and we were asking an independent
5	follow it up. There was no indication that correct	5	organisation to do it if there was anything they could
6	procedures were not being followed. Did you think this	6	do to look into that.
7	was a reasonable response by the IMB?	7	Q. Did you ever attend a safer custody meeting?
8	A. No. I think our understanding of the IMB's role was	8	A. No.
9	that they were, you know, encouraging concerns to be	9	Q. Were you ever invited to do so?
10	raised, particularly directly from people detained.	10	A. No, I don't believe I was ever invited. I'm sure
11	There was the actual complaints box system for that to	11	I would have attended.
12	happen. Our impression was it was not used very much	12	Q. I'm asked to ask you a rule 10 from the IMB. Other than
13	but that was there, they had a regular presence in the	13	this occasion, do you remember whether there were other
14	centres. So I I felt it was entirely appropriate	14	occasions during the relevant period when your
15	that we that Naomi had raised this with them.	15	organisation sent emails to the IMB raising concerns
16	I don't I think it would also have been it would	16	about specific detained people?
17	have been appropriate for them to not be able to give us	17	A. I'm not certain. I think certainly not frequently.
18	very much information back, but to say, "We will take	18	I think we would occasionally, but I don't recall, I'm
19	this away. Thank you for raising that". But I felt	19	afraid.
20	this was, yes, very unnecessary.	20	Q. What about emails raising concerns about more general
21	The phrase "There's no indication that the correct	21	matters, such as facilities on the wings and things like
22	procedures have not been followed", I think there was	22	that? Do you remember whether those types of issues
23	quite a quick turnaround between emails here. It seemed	23	were raised with the IMB?
24	to me at the time, and seems now, looking back, to have	24	A. I don't remember us doing that outside of where the
25	been a very quick, "We are confident that everything is	25	small number of meetings you mentioned during my time at
		I .	
	Page 90		Page 92

1	the organisation. I don't remember that kind of	1	A. I'd had very little experience of going into prisons and
2	correspondence.	2	working with prison officers, so we wouldn't be able to
3	Q. Did the IMB take up any referrals that you gave them	3	make that comparison ourselves. I mean I think maybe
4	during the relevant period, to the best of your	4	you were going to ask I mean, I felt very much they
5	recollection?	5	were passing on without having critically kind of
6	A. I don't remember them doing so, no.	6	processed the comments from management about what they
7	Q. Were there occasions when the IMB would refer people to	7	thought our approach was. I felt this was quite
8	you as an organisation?	8	defensive and did seem further evidence of a closeness
9	A. I don't remember that happening, no. I'm not certain it	9	which I had picked up at that first meeting I had with
10	didn't, but I don't remember that happening.	10	them in 2016.
11	Q. If we can bring up on screen, please, <ver000110>.</ver000110>	11	Q. Just so we know, did you know the provenance of this
12	Chair, that's at tab 7 of your bundle.	12	meeting note? Was this a note that was done by someone
13	A. Thank you.	13	within GDWG?
14	Q. These are notes of a meeting that you had with IMB	14	A. Yes, a member of the team.
15	members in November 2017. So this was two months after	15	Q. The penultimate dash there says:
16	Panorama had been broadcast.	16	"Our contract with HO at Brook House: Paul [Gasson]
17	You say in your statement, at paragraph 62, that	17	closed and hostile."
18	they, the IMB, had clearly been in discussion with	18	Is that referring is that you saying that
19	Brook House management about management's criticisms of	19	Paul Gasson was closed and hostile or is that IMB saying
20	your organisation, as they repeated a list of G4S	20	that? Do you remember?
21	complaints. Is that right?	21	A. I honestly can't remember at this point. It's hard to
22	A. Yes.	22	imagine it was IMB saying that.
23	Q. We can see from the top there:	23	Q. Going further down the page, please, if we could bring
24	"BH management suspicious that we give legal advice	24	up the bottom half, just picking out another couple of
25	that we are not qualified to do, eg referral of	25	things there about how the IMB operates, it says they
	Page 93		Page 95
1	detainees to other agencies; these should be referred to	1	are a "Monitoring role, not there to help the detainees
2	_		
	BH management; described as 'insulting' and	2	on an individual basis". Did they tell you that it
3	BH management; described as 'insulting' and 'patronising'."	2 3	on an individual basis". Did they tell you that it wasn't their role to help detainees on an individual
	BH management; described as 'insulting' and 'patronising'."  Is that what the IMB told you?		·
3	'patronising'."	3	wasn't their role to help detainees on an individual
3 4 5	'patronising'."  Is that what the IMB told you?  A. Yes.	3 4	wasn't their role to help detainees on an individual basis?  A. Yes. I mean – yes. Yes.
3 4 5 6	'patronising'."  Is that what the IMB told you?  A. Yes.  Q. Just so that we can be as clear as possible, when we are	3 4 5	wasn't their role to help detainees on an individual basis?
3 4 5 6 7	'patronising'."  Is that what the IMB told you?  A. Yes.  Q. Just so that we can be as clear as possible, when we are talking about the IMB here, who were the individuals	3 4 5 6	wasn't their role to help detainees on an individual basis?  A. Yes. I mean yes. Yes.  Q. The third dash says:  "Detainees treated fairly and humanely."
3 4 5 6 7 8	'patronising'."  Is that what the IMB told you?  A. Yes.  Q. Just so that we can be as clear as possible, when we are talking about the IMB here, who were the individuals that you met; do you remember?	3 4 5 6 7	wasn't their role to help detainees on an individual basis?  A. Yes. I mean – yes. Yes.  Q. The third dash says:  "Detainees treated fairly and humanely."  Was that them saying that detainees were treated
3 4 5 6 7 8 9	'patronising'."  Is that what the IMB told you?  A. Yes.  Q. Just so that we can be as clear as possible, when we are talking about the IMB here, who were the individuals that you met; do you remember?  A. At this particular meeting?	3 4 5 6 7 8	wasn't their role to help detainees on an individual basis?  A. Yes. I mean yes. Yes.  Q. The third dash says:  "Detainees treated fairly and humanely."  Was that them saying that detainees were treated fairly and humanely
3 4 5 6 7 8 9	'patronising'."  Is that what the IMB told you?  A. Yes.  Q. Just so that we can be as clear as possible, when we are talking about the IMB here, who were the individuals that you met; do you remember?  A. At this particular meeting?  Q. Yes. I think we know, if it helps, that Jackie Colbran	3 4 5 6 7 8 9	wasn't their role to help detainees on an individual basis?  A. Yes. I mean yes. Yes.  Q. The third dash says:  "Detainees treated fairly and humanely."  Was that them saying that detainees were treated fairly and humanely  A. I think they were saying their job was to ensure that
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	'patronising'."  Is that what the IMB told you?  A. Yes.  Q. Just so that we can be as clear as possible, when we are talking about the IMB here, who were the individuals that you met; do you remember?  A. At this particular meeting?  Q. Yes. I think we know, if it helps, that Jackie Colbran was the chair of the IMB up until January 2018?	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	wasn't their role to help detainees on an individual basis?  A. Yes. I mean yes. Yes.  Q. The third dash says:  "Detainees treated fairly and humanely."  Was that them saying that detainees were treated fairly and humanely  A. I think they were saying their job was to ensure that happened.
3 4 5 6 7 8 9	'patronising'."  Is that what the IMB told you?  A. Yes.  Q. Just so that we can be as clear as possible, when we are talking about the IMB here, who were the individuals that you met; do you remember?  A. At this particular meeting?  Q. Yes. I think we know, if it helps, that Jackie Colbran was the chair of the IMB up until January 2018?  A. She was handing over to Mary.	3 4 5 6 7 8 9	wasn't their role to help detainees on an individual basis?  A. Yes. I mean yes. Yes.  Q. The third dash says:  "Detainees treated fairly and humanely."  Was that them saying that detainees were treated fairly and humanely  A. I think they were saying their job was to ensure that
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	'patronising'."  Is that what the IMB told you?  A. Yes.  Q. Just so that we can be as clear as possible, when we are talking about the IMB here, who were the individuals that you met; do you remember?  A. At this particular meeting?  Q. Yes. I think we know, if it helps, that Jackie Colbran was the chair of the IMB up until January 2018?  A. She was handing over to Mary.  Q. To Mary Molyneux?	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	wasn't their role to help detainees on an individual basis?  A. Yes. I mean — yes. Yes.  Q. The third dash says:  "Detainees treated fairly and humanely."  Was that them saying that detainees were treated fairly and humanely  A. I think they were saying their job was to ensure that happened.  Q. The penultimate bullet point says:  "Complaint re staff member, they do a full-scale
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	'patronising'."  Is that what the IMB told you?  A. Yes.  Q. Just so that we can be as clear as possible, when we are talking about the IMB here, who were the individuals that you met; do you remember?  A. At this particular meeting?  Q. Yes. I think we know, if it helps, that Jackie Colbran was the chair of the IMB up until January 2018?  A. She was handing over to Mary.  Q. To Mary Molyneux?  A. I think they were both present there. I think there was	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	wasn't their role to help detainees on an individual basis?  A. Yes. I mean — yes. Yes.  Q. The third dash says:  "Detainees treated fairly and humanely."  Was that them saying that detainees were treated fairly and humanely —  A. I think they were saying their job was to ensure that happened.  Q. The penultimate bullet point says:  "Complaint re staff member, they do a full-scale investigation if it's serious."
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	'patronising'."  Is that what the IMB told you?  A. Yes.  Q. Just so that we can be as clear as possible, when we are talking about the IMB here, who were the individuals that you met; do you remember?  A. At this particular meeting?  Q. Yes. I think we know, if it helps, that Jackie Colbran was the chair of the IMB up until January 2018?  A. She was handing over to Mary.  Q. To Mary Molyneux?  A. I think they were both present there. I think there was at least one or two other members of the IMB there.	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	wasn't their role to help detainees on an individual basis?  A. Yes. I mean yes. Yes.  Q. The third dash says:  "Detainees treated fairly and humanely."  Was that them saying that detainees were treated fairly and humanely  A. I think they were saying their job was to ensure that happened.  Q. The penultimate bullet point says:  "Complaint re staff member, they do a full-scale investigation if it's serious."  Was that the IMB saying that if there was
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	'patronising'."  Is that what the IMB told you?  A. Yes.  Q. Just so that we can be as clear as possible, when we are talking about the IMB here, who were the individuals that you met; do you remember?  A. At this particular meeting?  Q. Yes. I think we know, if it helps, that Jackie Colbran was the chair of the IMB up until January 2018?  A. She was handing over to Mary.  Q. To Mary Molyneux?  A. I think they were both present there. I think there was at least one or two other members of the IMB there. I can't recollect the names.	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	wasn't their role to help detainees on an individual basis?  A. Yes. I mean — yes. Yes.  Q. The third dash says:  "Detainees treated fairly and humanely."  Was that them saying that detainees were treated fairly and humanely  A. I think they were saying their job was to ensure that happened.  Q. The penultimate bullet point says:  "Complaint re staff member, they do a full-scale investigation if it's serious."  Was that the IMB saying that if there was a complaint about a staff member, they would do
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	'patronising'."  Is that what the IMB told you?  A. Yes.  Q. Just so that we can be as clear as possible, when we are talking about the IMB here, who were the individuals that you met; do you remember?  A. At this particular meeting?  Q. Yes. I think we know, if it helps, that Jackie Colbran was the chair of the IMB up until January 2018?  A. She was handing over to Mary.  Q. To Mary Molyneux?  A. I think they were both present there. I think there was at least one or two other members of the IMB there. I can't recollect the names.  Q. Still looking at that, a few lines down, it was noted:	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	wasn't their role to help detainees on an individual basis?  A. Yes. I mean — yes. Yes.  Q. The third dash says:  "Detainees treated fairly and humanely."  Was that them saying that detainees were treated fairly and humanely  A. I think they were saying their job was to ensure that happened.  Q. The penultimate bullet point says:  "Complaint re staff member, they do a full-scale investigation if it's serious."  Was that the IMB saying that if there was a complaint about a staff member, they would do a full-scale investigation if it was serious?
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	'patronising'."  Is that what the IMB told you?  A. Yes.  Q. Just so that we can be as clear as possible, when we are talking about the IMB here, who were the individuals that you met; do you remember?  A. At this particular meeting?  Q. Yes. I think we know, if it helps, that Jackie Colbran was the chair of the IMB up until January 2018?  A. She was handing over to Mary.  Q. To Mary Molyneux?  A. I think they were both present there. I think there was at least one or two other members of the IMB there.  I can't recollect the names.  Q. Still looking at that, a few lines down, it was noted:  "IMB: G4S staff are more humane and have better	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	wasn't their role to help detainees on an individual basis?  A. Yes. I mean — yes. Yes.  Q. The third dash says:  "Detainees treated fairly and humanely."  Was that them saying that detainees were treated fairly and humanely —  A. I think they were saying their job was to ensure that happened.  Q. The penultimate bullet point says:  "Complaint re staff member, they do a full-scale investigation if it's serious."  Was that the IMB saying that if there was a complaint about a staff member, they would do a full-scale investigation if it was serious?  A. Or that it would happen. I don't know whether IMB would
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	'patronising'."  Is that what the IMB told you?  A. Yes.  Q. Just so that we can be as clear as possible, when we are talking about the IMB here, who were the individuals that you met; do you remember?  A. At this particular meeting?  Q. Yes. I think we know, if it helps, that Jackie Colbran was the chair of the IMB up until January 2018?  A. She was handing over to Mary.  Q. To Mary Molyneux?  A. I think they were both present there. I think there was at least one or two other members of the IMB there.  I can't recollect the names.  Q. Still looking at that, a few lines down, it was noted:  "IMB: G4S staff are more humane and have better social skills than prison officers; co-operation and	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	wasn't their role to help detainees on an individual basis?  A. Yes. I mean — yes. Yes.  Q. The third dash says:  "Detainees treated fairly and humanely."  Was that them saying that detainees were treated fairly and humanely —  A. I think they were saying their job was to ensure that happened.  Q. The penultimate bullet point says:  "Complaint re staff member, they do a full-scale investigation if it's serious."  Was that the IMB saying that if there was a complaint about a staff member, they would do a full-scale investigation if it was serious?  A. Or that it would happen. I don't know whether IMB would do that. They were referring to G4S doing that.
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	'patronising'."  Is that what the IMB told you?  A. Yes.  Q. Just so that we can be as clear as possible, when we are talking about the IMB here, who were the individuals that you met; do you remember?  A. At this particular meeting?  Q. Yes. I think we know, if it helps, that Jackie Colbran was the chair of the IMB up until January 2018?  A. She was handing over to Mary.  Q. To Mary Molyneux?  A. I think they were both present there. I think there was at least one or two other members of the IMB there. I can't recollect the names.  Q. Still looking at that, a few lines down, it was noted:  "IMB: G4S staff are more humane and have better social skills than prison officers; co-operation and openness."	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	wasn't their role to help detainees on an individual basis?  A. Yes. I mean — yes. Yes.  Q. The third dash says:    "Detainees treated fairly and humanely."    Was that them saying that detainees were treated fairly and humanely  A. I think they were saying their job was to ensure that happened.  Q. The penultimate bullet point says:    "Complaint re staff member, they do a full-scale investigation if it's serious."    Was that the IMB saying that if there was a complaint about a staff member, they would do a full-scale investigation if it was serious?  A. Or that it would happen. I don't know whether IMB would do that. They were referring to G4S doing that.  Q. Okay. The bullet point above that, while I see it, is:
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	'patronising'."  Is that what the IMB told you?  A. Yes.  Q. Just so that we can be as clear as possible, when we are talking about the IMB here, who were the individuals that you met; do you remember?  A. At this particular meeting?  Q. Yes. I think we know, if it helps, that Jackie Colbran was the chair of the IMB up until January 2018?  A. She was handing over to Mary.  Q. To Mary Molyneux?  A. I think they were both present there. I think there was at least one or two other members of the IMB there.  I can't recollect the names.  Q. Still looking at that, a few lines down, it was noted:  "IMB: G4S staff are more humane and have better social skills than prison officers; co-operation and openness."  So was that the IMB saying that, actually, G4S staff	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	wasn't their role to help detainees on an individual basis?  A. Yes. I mean — yes. Yes.  Q. The third dash says:  "Detainees treated fairly and humanely."  Was that them saying that detainees were treated fairly and humanely  A. I think they were saying their job was to ensure that happened.  Q. The penultimate bullet point says:  "Complaint re staff member, they do a full-scale investigation if it's serious."  Was that the IMB saying that if there was a complaint about a staff member, they would do a full-scale investigation if it was serious?  A. Or that it would happen. I don't know whether IMB would do that. They were referring to G4S doing that.  Q. Okay. The bullet point above that, while I see it, is:  "Three officers and a manager on each wing; now
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	'patronising'."  Is that what the IMB told you?  A. Yes.  Q. Just so that we can be as clear as possible, when we are talking about the IMB here, who were the individuals that you met; do you remember?  A. At this particular meeting?  Q. Yes. I think we know, if it helps, that Jackie Colbran was the chair of the IMB up until January 2018?  A. She was handing over to Mary.  Q. To Mary Molyneux?  A. I think they were both present there. I think there was at least one or two other members of the IMB there.  I can't recollect the names.  Q. Still looking at that, a few lines down, it was noted:  "IMB: G4S staff are more humane and have better social skills than prison officers; co-operation and openness."  So was that the IMB saying that, actually, G4S staff are more humane and have better skills than prison	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	wasn't their role to help detainees on an individual basis?  A. Yes. I mean — yes. Yes.  Q. The third dash says:  "Detainees treated fairly and humanely."  Was that them saying that detainees were treated fairly and humanely —  A. I think they were saying their job was to ensure that happened.  Q. The penultimate bullet point says:  "Complaint re staff member, they do a full-scale investigation if it's serious."  Was that the IMB saying that if there was a complaint about a staff member, they would do a full-scale investigation if it was serious?  A. Or that it would happen. I don't know whether IMB would do that. They were referring to G4S doing that.  Q. Okay. The bullet point above that, while I see it, is:  "Three officers and a manager on each wing; now 150 detainees per wing with just two officers."
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	'patronising'."  Is that what the IMB told you?  A. Yes.  Q. Just so that we can be as clear as possible, when we are talking about the IMB here, who were the individuals that you met; do you remember?  A. At this particular meeting?  Q. Yes. I think we know, if it helps, that Jackie Colbran was the chair of the IMB up until January 2018?  A. She was handing over to Mary.  Q. To Mary Molyneux?  A. I think they were both present there. I think there was at least one or two other members of the IMB there.  I can't recollect the names.  Q. Still looking at that, a few lines down, it was noted:  "IMB: G4S staff are more humane and have better social skills than prison officers; co-operation and openness."  So was that the IMB saying that, actually, G4S staff are more humane and have better skills than prison officers?	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	wasn't their role to help detainees on an individual basis?  A. Yes. I mean — yes. Yes.  Q. The third dash says:  "Detainees treated fairly and humanely."  Was that them saying that detainees were treated fairly and humanely —  A. I think they were saying their job was to ensure that happened.  Q. The penultimate bullet point says:  "Complaint re staff member, they do a full-scale investigation if it's serious."  Was that the IMB saying that if there was a complaint about a staff member, they would do a full-scale investigation if it was serious?  A. Or that it would happen. I don't know whether IMB would do that. They were referring to G4S doing that.  Q. Okay. The bullet point above that, while I see it, is:  "Three officers and a manager on each wing; now 150 detainees per wing with just two officers."  Was that an issue about staffing levels?
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	'patronising'."  Is that what the IMB told you?  A. Yes.  Q. Just so that we can be as clear as possible, when we are talking about the IMB here, who were the individuals that you met; do you remember?  A. At this particular meeting?  Q. Yes. I think we know, if it helps, that Jackie Colbran was the chair of the IMB up until January 2018?  A. She was handing over to Mary.  Q. To Mary Molyneux?  A. I think they were both present there. I think there was at least one or two other members of the IMB there.  I can't recollect the names.  Q. Still looking at that, a few lines down, it was noted:  "IMB: G4S staff are more humane and have better social skills than prison officers; co-operation and openness."  So was that the IMB saying that, actually, G4S staff are more humane and have better skills than prison officers?  A. Yes.	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	wasn't their role to help detainees on an individual basis?  A. Yes. I mean — yes. Yes.  Q. The third dash says:     "Detainees treated fairly and humanely."     Was that them saying that detainees were treated fairly and humanely  A. I think they were saying their job was to ensure that happened.  Q. The penultimate bullet point says:     "Complaint re staff member, they do a full-scale investigation if it's serious."     Was that the IMB saying that if there was a complaint about a staff member, they would do a full-scale investigation if it was serious?  A. Or that it would happen. I don't know whether IMB would do that. They were referring to G4S doing that.  Q. Okay. The bullet point above that, while I see it, is:     "Three officers and a manager on each wing; now  150 detainees per wing with just two officers."     Was that an issue about staffing levels?  A. Yes.
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	'patronising'."  Is that what the IMB told you?  A. Yes.  Q. Just so that we can be as clear as possible, when we are talking about the IMB here, who were the individuals that you met; do you remember?  A. At this particular meeting?  Q. Yes. I think we know, if it helps, that Jackie Colbran was the chair of the IMB up until January 2018?  A. She was handing over to Mary.  Q. To Mary Molyneux?  A. I think they were both present there. I think there was at least one or two other members of the IMB there.  I can't recollect the names.  Q. Still looking at that, a few lines down, it was noted:  "IMB: G4S staff are more humane and have better social skills than prison officers; co-operation and openness."  So was that the IMB saying that, actually, G4S staff are more humane and have better skills than prison officers?	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	wasn't their role to help detainees on an individual basis?  A. Yes. I mean — yes. Yes.  Q. The third dash says:  "Detainees treated fairly and humanely."  Was that them saying that detainees were treated fairly and humanely —  A. I think they were saying their job was to ensure that happened.  Q. The penultimate bullet point says:  "Complaint re staff member, they do a full-scale investigation if it's serious."  Was that the IMB saying that if there was a complaint about a staff member, they would do a full-scale investigation if it was serious?  A. Or that it would happen. I don't know whether IMB would do that. They were referring to G4S doing that.  Q. Okay. The bullet point above that, while I see it, is:  "Three officers and a manager on each wing; now 150 detainees per wing with just two officers."  Was that an issue about staffing levels?
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	'patronising'."  Is that what the IMB told you?  A. Yes.  Q. Just so that we can be as clear as possible, when we are talking about the IMB here, who were the individuals that you met; do you remember?  A. At this particular meeting?  Q. Yes. I think we know, if it helps, that Jackie Colbran was the chair of the IMB up until January 2018?  A. She was handing over to Mary.  Q. To Mary Molyneux?  A. I think they were both present there. I think there was at least one or two other members of the IMB there.  I can't recollect the names.  Q. Still looking at that, a few lines down, it was noted:  "IMB: G4S staff are more humane and have better social skills than prison officers; co-operation and openness."  So was that the IMB saying that, actually, G4S staff are more humane and have better skills than prison officers?  A. Yes.	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	wasn't their role to help detainees on an individual basis?  A. Yes. I mean — yes. Yes.  Q. The third dash says:     "Detainees treated fairly and humanely."     Was that them saying that detainees were treated fairly and humanely  A. I think they were saying their job was to ensure that happened.  Q. The penultimate bullet point says:     "Complaint re staff member, they do a full-scale investigation if it's serious."     Was that the IMB saying that if there was a complaint about a staff member, they would do a full-scale investigation if it was serious?  A. Or that it would happen. I don't know whether IMB would do that. They were referring to G4S doing that.  Q. Okay. The bullet point above that, while I see it, is:     "Three officers and a manager on each wing; now  150 detainees per wing with just two officers."     Was that an issue about staffing levels?  A. Yes.

1	bullet point from the bottom says:	1	much direct contact with the IMB. I remember I think it
2	"IMB 'did not know' about Panorama issues raised(!).	2	was at this point that we had agreed a system where the
3	They felt that Panorama gave a distorted picture: in	3	IMB were copied in to safeguarding emails. I don't
4	their (IMB's) [presuming 'mind'] there were undoubtedly	4	remember IMB then ever responding specifically on
5	'a couple' of serious incidents captured (including the	5	a chain. I don't remember that happening. I remember
6	strangulation) but much of the programme was dramatic	6	communication being quite little.
7	music, blurry images giving an impression of chaos and	7	Q. One final question, Mr Wilson, is, looking back on the
8	'fluff'."	8	relevant period, and we have gone through it sort of
9	Was that the message that came to you from the IMB?	9	chronologically, your relationship personally and as an
10	A. Very clearly, yes.	10	organisation with Brook House management and with
11	Q. Do you remember who said that?	11	Home Office managers, do you have any reflections on how
12	A. I think it was Jackie leading the conversation and	12	GDWG were treated and how you were treated?
13	saying that, but I'm not 100 per cent sure at this	13	A. Yes. It was baffling to me at the time, and I think is
14	point.	14	maybe more so in looking back, I think one of
15	Q. How did you react to that during the meeting?	15	the things I never understood what we have discussed
16	A. I was very surprised, and I remember, as a staff team,	16	and discussed in the statements, there were specific
17	we discussed afterwards we were all taken aback by that.	17	things that management brought to me at particular
18	We were we had an impression of IMB having of	18	points, none of which I felt were you know,
19	being very close to management. We were concerned about	19	I responded as best I could to those concerns, but there
20	how they were doing their role. We'd had that the	20	was never there was very little I felt was justified
21	issues around being told not you know, around the	21	or required, you know, corrective measures by us or that
22	contact that had happened earlier in the year. We were	22	were something we needed to apologise for or amend for.
23	expecting at this point so this is November 2017,	23	What I didn't understand I didn't understand, and
24	a couple of months after Panorama, we were expecting	24	don't understand, what was behind that and the culture
25	and, I have to say, IMB were always you know, in the	25	that we were facing in terms of this deep suspicion and
	Page 97		Page 99
1	meetings, were very friendly to us, but we were	1	the need to restrict our work, because we were clear
2	expecting there to be some reflection going on at the	2	I didn't see how we were a threat. We weren't even
3	IMB about how the incidents during the relevant period	3	and we would have been legitimate if we had been
4	happened, how they'd missed them, given their very	4	qualified to do the things and we were doing them, but
5	active presence in the centre, and not for them to, you	5	we weren't giving legal advice, we weren't counselling.
6	know, acknowledge responsibility or to have an awareness	6	We gave clear parameters for our visitors around you
7	of that, to be learning from it, to want to and, from	7	know, we were working in a wider sense of
8	our point of view, we thought we could only help them in	8	the organisation for reform of the detention system, and
9	doing their role in raising issues to them so that they	9	particularly for an end to indefinite detention, but
10	could we could help them to help make it a safer	10	that was very much about wider policy reform. We
11	environment. We were expecting that kind of tone to the	11	weren't protesting about the Gatwick centres in
12	meeting, and instead, although, again, they were	12	particular. We made volunteers agree not to take part
13	friendly, there's a lot of, you know, this note	13	in protests outside the centres or do anything that
14	accurately captures they were very defensive and, it	14	might harm our relationship with management.
15	felt to us, were very much apologising for G4S, for	15	In terms of all that our work was doing, you know,
16	Brook management, what had happened.	16	in effect, we were offering additional support to people
17	Q. We heard evidence from Anna Pincus yesterday that the	17	detained who were for whatever reason, the staffing
18	relationship with the IMB, and certainly her confidence	18	levels seemed extremely stretched, there were clearly
19	in them, improved going forward. She referred to there	19	things being missed. We were were being and
20	being a new chair. You were still at GDWG for another	20	were in discussions, such as the request to have
21	year or so after this, I think. Was that your	21	a presence within welfare. In effect, we were
22	experience, that the relationship improved or that your	22	offering I think I use this phrase in my witness
23	confidence in them improved at all?	23	statement. We were, and were offering to further be, an
24	A. That feels right, although I don't remember, during	24	auxiliary form of welfare service. That's not
25	2018 so my last year at GDWG, I don't remember very	25	necessarily what GDWG would have how we would have
	2010 So my mor your ac 020 to 0, 1 don't remember tory	23	and the most real mark and the most recorded mark
	Page 98		Page 100
			25 (D 07 + 100)

1	framed that or, you know, there's a wider thing about	1	Home Office, G4S or the IMB?
2	whether charities should be doing that. But that's what	2	A. No. To my recollection, no.
3	we effectively were doing. We were flagging up	3	THE CHAIR: Connected to that, we heard from Ms Pincus
4	everything when we thought that was appropriate to do	4	yesterday that she had experience of detainees being
5	so. I didn't see, and don't see, how that was anything	5	told directly not to make complaints by a member of
6	other than a help to the centre, and so this deep	6	staff. Did you have any experience of that or observe
7	suspicion of us was mystifying, and is mystifying.	7	any of that yourself?
8	MR LIVINGSTON: Thank you, Mr Wilson. Those are all my	8	A. I don't recall personally, and I was because we were
9	questions, chair. You may have some questions.	9	a small team speaking to clients, visiting clients,
10	THE CHAIR: Thank you. I do have a few, Mr Wilson. One of	10	myself, but less so than other members of staff.
11	the questions that I had relates, in one respect, to the	11	I don't recall clients saying that to me directly.
12	IMB but a little bit more broadly as well. I understand	12	I remember certainly a culture of a great reluctance to
13	from how you've explained it where you did have	13	raise complaints for a variety of reasons.
14	concerns, whether we describe those as safeguarding	14	THE CHAIR: But you can't think of any particular instances
15	if I give an example of the kind of thing that I mean.	15	yourself?
16	So if somebody were to tell one of your volunteers or	16	A. I can't think of examples of a client reporting to me
17	members of staff that they felt at risk from another	17	that a staff member had actually said that explicitly,
18	person, another detained person, or from a member of	18	"Do not make a complaint". Just that it was not
19	staff, or that a use of force had been used against them	19	encouraged. It wasn't something clients felt able to
20	and that they felt it had been excessive, those kind of	20	do.
21	concerns. I understand from your evidence that you may	21	THE CHAIR: What about members of your organisation
22	have made case-by-case decisions on whether or not to	22	reporting to you that detained people had said that to
23	whom you would report particular concerns like that.	23	them? Does that make sense? Did you hear
24	My question, really, is whether, as an organisation,	24	A. I don't remember that happening.
25	you kept records yourselves. Even if you decided not to	25	THE CHAIR: Thank you. That's helpful. The other question
	D 101		D 402
	Page 101		Page 103
1	disclose that information or to make a referral or to	1	that I had for you was in relation to the meeting that
2	raise a complaint, did your staff, did your	2	you told us about on 18 August, which you described as
3	organisation, keep records yourself so that you had	3	hostile. One of the things that you said was mentioned
4	a picture of the type of issues that were being raised?	4	in that meeting was that you talked about I will read
5	A. Yes. We had an access database for all interactions	5	it to you, just so I'm not kind of paraphrasing you:
6	from the office with clients, and we would have	6	"I repeatedly pointed out that it was legitimate for
7	completed it endeavoured to complete a case note on	7	GDWG to raise concerns about detainees."
8	every interaction and for every action we were doing for	8	You said in your statement that Mr Skitt's response
9	a client.	9	was:
10	THE CHAIR: Had you been asked to provide anonymised data in	10	"But are you being audited?"
11	whatever form you needed to, would you could you	11	Can I just clarify, at that meeting when that was
12	have provided that to G4S, the Home Office and the IMB	12	said, was Paul Gasson from the Home Office present in
13	to give them a picture of the type of issues that were	13	that meeting?
14	being raised to you as an organisation?	14	A. Yes.
15	A. We certainly would have endeavoured to do that. The	15	THE CHAIR: Do you remember him saying anything in relation
16	barrier would have been a technological one. We were	16	to the question of being audited?
17	using quite a limited access database that was based	17	A. I don't recall him doing that, no.
18	a lot around text, notes, rather than categories, so	18	THE CHAIR: Thank you. That's helpful. They're the end of
19	analysis of those notes at points would have been	19	my questions. Thank you very much, Mr Wilson.
20	difficult. It might have been difficult to draw some of	20	MR LIVINGSTON: Chair, thank you, and thank you, Mr Wilson.
21	those issues out. That would have been the barrier.	21	Chair, if I might suggest we have possibly
22	THE CHAIR: I suspect I know the answer to this	22	a five-minute break or so, maybe a ten-minute break, so
23	A. We	23	that we can then proceed with reading in evidence. So
24	THE CHAIR: Sorry, do go ahead. I was going to say, were	24	I would suggest, if you are okay with it, returning at
25	you ever asked for that information from either the	25	12.40 pm?
I			
	Page 102		Page 104

1	THE CHAIR: That's fine. Mr Wilson, thank you very much.	1	House. He states that the Home Office did not accept
2	It has been a long morning, I'm sure, but I'm very	2	this and had given him an earlier date of birth. Last
3	grateful for your evidence.	3	year, the Upper Tribunal decided to accept his date of
4	A. Thank you.	4	birth as claimed but the Home Office continues to state
5	(The witness withdrew)	5	he was born earlier, despite the Upper Tribunal's order.
6	THE CHAIR: We will see you at 12.40 pm.	6	The documents are available, but not being adduced
7	(12.32 pm)	7	at present:
8	(A short break)	8	"I was detained at Brook House IRC from 3 April 2017
9	(12.44 pm)	9	until 11 April 2017, when I was unlawfully removed from
10	MS MOORE: We are now moving on to some evidence in respect	10	the UK to Germany.
11	of three detained persons who are not able to attend to	11	"I myself don't remember which wing I was kept on,
12	give live evidence at this time. First in respect of	12	but I know that I was transferred from one wing to
13	D2033. Chair, we have received a witness statement from	13	another during [this] week that I was at Brook House.
14	D2033 which is at <dl0000149>. I would ask for that to</dl0000149>	14	Because I had argued with the officers about my age
15	be adduced in full.	15	during the induction, they put me in an isolation wing.
16	THE CHAIR: Thank you.	16	I have been advised by my solicitors that this was
17	MS MOORE: Counsel to the Inquiry have also prepared	17	probably E wing. After a couple of days they put me in
18	a summary of that statement. D2033 has requested,	18	a wing where I had to share a room. Again I complained
19	through his representatives, that Mr Goodman be	19	to the officers I was under 18 and then I was moved back
20	permitted to read out the inquiry's summary of his	20	to an isolation wing and from there I was unlawfully
21	evidence, and, chair, you agreed to that request.	21	removed to Germany."
22	THE CHAIR: Indeed, thank you.	22	I summarise paragraphs 7 to 12 as follows.
23	MS MOORE: As such, you will now hear that summary from	23	D2033 provides some detail about his background,
24	Mr Goodman.	24	including that he was kidnapped, tortured and sexually
25		25	abused in Afghanistan and his brother and father were
	Page 105		Page 107
	1 agc 103		rage 107
1	Reading in Evidence re D2033	1	killed. He arrived in the UK and was looked after by
2	MR GOODMAN: Chair, thank you for the opportunity. D2033	2	social services and then by his uncle. He accessed
3	has asked me to thank you specifically for this because	3	mental health services in the community, was diagnosed
4	he is too unwell to attend himself and give evidence,	4	with PTSD and depression, and was started on medication.
5	and he is grateful for the opportunity for his statement	5	D2033 is still working for a decision on his claim to
6	to be read through me, his counsel. Can I also thank	6	asylum.
7	the inquiry counsel and solicitor team and of course the	7	"Detention". Paragraph 13:
8	staff, and particularly the stenographers for their hard	8	"I was detained by the Home Office after I attended
9	work and impeccable work throughout this.	9	the reporting centre in Croydon on 3 April 2017. Prior
10	So this is the witness statement of D2033:	10	to being asked to report on this date, I had not
11	"I D2033, [redacted date of birth], state as	11	previously been required to report to the Home Office.
12	follows:	12	I did not expect that I would be taken to a detention
13	"I make this statement as a witness in the inquiry	13	centre from the reporting centre and so I had not
14	into Brook House IRC where I was detained in April 2017	14	brought my medication with me or other belongings such
15	when I was [a minor]. As it has been four years since	15	as spare clothes and toiletries. When the Home Office
16	I was detained at Brook House and I have memory problems	16	took me to a detention centre from the reporting centre,
17	because I suffer from post-traumatic stress disorder,	17	this dealt me a mental shock. When I saw what the
18	I cannot recall every detail I reserve to right to	18	detention centre was like, I became very afraid. The
19	add or amend my account at a later date, in particular	19	act of taking me to the detention centre conjured up all
20	in light of the content of further disclosure received	20	of the memories of what had happened to me in
21	from the inquiry or questions posed by the inquiry."	21	Afghanistan when I was abducted and detained against my
22	I summarise paragraphs 2 to 4 as follows. D2033	22	will.
23	provides his full name and states he is a national of	23	"Induction.
24	Afghanistan. He provides his date of birth, which would	24	"I was taken to Brook House from the reporting
25	make him a minor at the time of the detention in Brook	25	centre in the evening after I had waited at the
	Page 106		Page 108

,			·
1	reporting centre until the evening. When we entered	1	a result of this I was put in an isolation wing for
2	through the main entrance there was a reception and the	2	something like two nights.
3	officers took me to the reception and went through the	3	"Physical environment.
4	induction and registration process with me. In the	4	"I don't know which wing I was accommodated in at
5	meantime the officers were joking about me and laughing	5	Brook House, but my solicitors have told me that it was
6	at me. They were asking me ridiculous questions,	6	E wing. When I arrived at the wing on my first night
7	whether I was working with the army and whether I had	7	I realised that the wing I had been placed in was where
8	killed any people because I am from Afghanistan.	8	the troublemakers or disturbed people were, those who
9	I found this very confusing and insulting, especially as	9	were fighting and causing trouble. It was clear that
10	I was a child at the time. During the induction, I was	10	this was an exceptional wing for exceptional people.
11	asked a number of questions, but I don't now remember	11	The reason why I say this is that when I was taken to my
12	them. It was very stressful for me being detained and	12	room the troublemakers were shouting and banging on the
13	on top of that the officers asked me very offensive;	13	doors to their rooms. The person just next to my room
14	questions.	14	was constantly kicking the door throughout the night.
15	"I found the entire induction process to be very	15	This was very alarming.
16	stressful. I never had an experience like it before and	16	"After around two nights, I was transferred to
17	I haven't since. It was dark when I arrived at	17	another wing where they mixed me with adults. I was
18		18	Ç
19	Brook House sometime between 7 pm and 10 pm. After the induction they just put me in a cell on my own. As soon	19	placed in a cell with one other man, but several people came and left whilst I was there. It was scary for me
20	as I arrived in this cell, I was locked in by officers.	20	to share with adults. I wasn't able to sleep at night
21	It was an experience like nothing I had ever encountered	21	and I always worried that my roommate might attack me or
22	I was very scared and afraid and anxious. It was a real	22	sexually assault me during the night. I think that
23	shock to me. It felt like they had dealt me a real	23	I was especially afraid of this because of my past
24	psychological blow, worsening my feelings of self-harm	24	experiences of sexual assault in Afghanistan. I pleaded
25		25	
23	and suicide, which I had been experiencing since my	23	with the officers that I should be kept somewhere safe
	Page 109		Page 111
1	experiences of being captured and tortured in	1	and transferred back to the first wing where I had
2	Afghanistan. I felt that the Home Office were making	2	a room by myself. Although it wasn't easy for me being
3	any problems worse considering that I was a very young	3	in a room by myself, I thought it was preferable to me
4	person and I was already suffering from post-traumatic	4	sharing with adults. When they transferred me to the
5	stress disorder and depression, for which I was	5	public wing there was a lady, a middle aged woman, who
6	prescribed medication. They did not give me a tour of	6	used to come to check in on me. I think that probably
7	Brook House, and no healthcare professional visited me.	7	she was from welfare. I believe this was because they
8	I remember that they measured my waist and height during	8	realised that I was underage. She used to come and talk
9	the induction, but I'm not sure whether the person who	9	to me and ask how I am. Every night she would come to
10	did this was from the healthcare department.	10	my room. I am not sure how many times, but she came at
11	"I do not remember whether I had access to an	11	late hours."
12	interpreter during the induction. As far as I can	12	Here I'm just going to summarise
13	recall, I had to communicate in English. At that time,	13	paragraph 75(c)(ii). D2033 adds that, as far as he can
14	my level of English was not good, but I just did my	14	recall, every time he had an opportunity to, he would
15	best to answer [the] questions. From what I can recall,	15	ask the officers and the lady from welfare if he could
16	I was asked basic questions such as my name and what	16	transfer rooms.
17	country I came from. I didn't know that I could ask for	17	Paragraph 21:
18	an interpreter.	18	"After a few nights, I was transferred back to the
19	"I don't recall being given any written materials	19	first wing where I was detained on the first day.
20	during my induction or being informed of my rights as	20	"I am told that this wing is called the Care and
21	a detainee.	21	Separation Unit, or E wing, but there was no 'care'
22	"When I arrived at Brook House I pleaded with the	22	there. The measures in that wing were very tough and
23	officers to put me somewhere safe as I was a young	23	there was a high level of security and custody. I think
24	person and I was afraid. I feared I might be sexually	24	they kept me in E wing as a precautionary measure as
25	assaulted as I had been in Afghanistan. I think as	25	I was underage and they didn't want any problems later
23	assumed as I had occir in raghamstan. I think as		1 mas anderage and they didn't want any problems later
	Page 110		Page 112
	<del>-</del>		-

1			
	on. The people who were kept in this wing were under	1	sewn and bleeding. I had no contact with him; all I can
2	[strict] supervision. There were around ten detainees	2	tell you is that I saw him in that condition. This was
3	held in separate rooms in my corridor and there were	3	the first time that I had seen that kind of thing and
4	around six security guards for these detainees, and so	4	I was scared. That incident always comes back to me and
5	there was a high ratio of guards to detainees.	5	I still have scary nightmares and flashbacks about that
6	"It was a horrible experience for me being detained	6	incident and about being in detention in general.
7	at Brook House. Most of the people there were suffering	7	I understand from my solicitors that they also represent
8	from mental health problems and some of the detainees	8	this man in the inquiry and that he is a core
9	looked like they were dangerous criminals. Some of them	9	participant.
10	had tattoos on their bodies and looked like very angry	10	"In both wings, the toilet was embedded inside of
11	people, and this made me feel very afraid. I kept	11	the room and there was a very narrow partition which
12	thinking that all I had done was come to the UK to seek	12	made the toilet separate from the rest of the room, but
13	asylum and protection and instead the authorities had	13	there was no door. It wasn't private. When someone was
14	placed me in detention with dangerous and damaged	14	using the toilet, you could also hear and smell the
15	adults, some of whom were using drugs.	15	stench of the toilet. That made me feel an additional
16	"I was afraid that the other detainees would rape	16	psychological blow and emotional torment. I had to wait
17	me, and I constantly felt in danger. Being detained at	17	for the other roommate to go out or to dinner or lunch
18	Brook House IRC reminded me of the torture that	18	and then there was a bit of space before I felt
19	I suffered in Afghanistan, which included rape; it was	19	comfortable to go to the toilet. Whenever my roommate
20	very traumatising for me.	20	was in the room I did not feel comfortable to go to the
21	"For a few nights I was kept in a room with another	21	toilet. Being in Brook House was a nightmare for me.
22	detainee who was very angry and was always shouting and	22	"The layout of the shared room was as follows. When
23	screaming. I was afraid that he would attack me. For	23	you entered the room, in front of you were two
24	those few nights, I could not sleep at all. One time	24	detainees' beds and to the side of the room there was
25	when I returned to the room from getting some food I saw	25	a toilet bowl that you could see. So if the other
	Page 113		Page 115
1	that he had ripped up the bedsheets and made a mess in	1	detainee was on his bed he couldn't see you going to the
2	the room. He had destroyed and broken everything in the	2	toilet but if he walked to the side or went to leave the
3	room. I felt very afraid; this was like a nightmare for	3	room he could see you. It was not safe, always exposed.
4	me. At one point this other detainee had a plastic	١.	
		4	It was a small room.
5	object in his hand and threatened me that if I stepped	5	It was a small room.  "I do not remember exactly the timetable when I was
6	object in his hand and threatened me that if I stepped forward he would hit me up with it. I think it was	5 6	It was a small room.  "I do not remember exactly the timetable when I was at Brook House. During the night we had to stay in our
6 7	object in his hand and threatened me that if I stepped forward he would hit me up with it. I think it was a plastic knife."	5 6 7	It was a small room.  "I do not remember exactly the timetable when I was at Brook House. During the night we had to stay in our rooms and during the day there were certain hours when
6 7 8	object in his hand and threatened me that if I stepped forward he would hit me up with it. I think it was a plastic knife."  He has summarised in paragraph 75(d) as follows.	5 6 7 8	It was a small room.  "I do not remember exactly the timetable when I was at Brook House. During the night we had to stay in our rooms and during the day there were certain hours when we were allowed to go outside. Sometimes we were
6 7 8 9	object in his hand and threatened me that if I stepped forward he would hit me up with it. I think it was a plastic knife."  He has summarised in paragraph 75(d) as follows.  D2033 said he did not have anything of his own in the	5 6 7 8 9	It was a small room.  "I do not remember exactly the timetable when I was at Brook House. During the night we had to stay in our rooms and during the day there were certain hours when we were allowed to go outside. Sometimes we were allowed to go to the corridors or kitchen and there were
6 7 8 9	object in his hand and threatened me that if I stepped forward he would hit me up with it. I think it was a plastic knife."  He has summarised in paragraph 75(d) as follows.  D2033 said he did not have anything of his own in the room, which was destroyed, as he was brought to	5 6 7 8 9 10	It was a small room.  "I do not remember exactly the timetable when I was at Brook House. During the night we had to stay in our rooms and during the day there were certain hours when we were allowed to go outside. Sometimes we were allowed to go to the corridors or kitchen and there were some times when we were able to walk to other wings.
6 7 8 9 10 11	object in his hand and threatened me that if I stepped forward he would hit me up with it. I think it was a plastic knife."  He has summarised in paragraph 75(d) as follows.  D2033 said he did not have anything of his own in the room, which was destroyed, as he was brought to Brook House in just the clothes he was wearing, although	5 6 7 8 9 10 11	It was a small room.  "I do not remember exactly the timetable when I was at Brook House. During the night we had to stay in our rooms and during the day there were certain hours when we were allowed to go outside. Sometimes we were allowed to go to the corridors or kitchen and there were some times when we were able to walk to other wings.  "Every day when I was at Brook House we had
6 7 8 9 10 11	object in his hand and threatened me that if I stepped forward he would hit me up with it. I think it was a plastic knife."  He has summarised in paragraph 75(d) as follows.  D2033 said he did not have anything of his own in the room, which was destroyed, as he was brought to Brook House in just the clothes he was wearing, although he may have had some documents.	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	It was a small room.  "I do not remember exactly the timetable when I was at Brook House. During the night we had to stay in our rooms and during the day there were certain hours when we were allowed to go outside. Sometimes we were allowed to go to the corridors or kitchen and there were some times when we were able to walk to other wings.  "Every day when I was at Brook House we had a lock-in for many of the hours. I can't tell you about
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	object in his hand and threatened me that if I stepped forward he would hit me up with it. I think it was a plastic knife."  He has summarised in paragraph 75(d) as follows.  D2033 said he did not have anything of his own in the room, which was destroyed, as he was brought to Brook House in just the clothes he was wearing, although he may have had some documents.  Paragraph 26:	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	It was a small room.  "I do not remember exactly the timetable when I was at Brook House. During the night we had to stay in our rooms and during the day there were certain hours when we were allowed to go outside. Sometimes we were allowed to go to the corridors or kitchen and there were some times when we were able to walk to other wings.  "Every day when I was at Brook House we had a lock-in for many of the hours. I can't tell you about when exactly in the day that happened. There were times
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	object in his hand and threatened me that if I stepped forward he would hit me up with it. I think it was a plastic knife."  He has summarised in paragraph 75(d) as follows.  D2033 said he did not have anything of his own in the room, which was destroyed, as he was brought to Brook House in just the clothes he was wearing, although he may have had some documents.  Paragraph 26:  "After this, I reported [the] incident to the	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	It was a small room.  "I do not remember exactly the timetable when I was at Brook House. During the night we had to stay in our rooms and during the day there were certain hours when we were allowed to go outside. Sometimes we were allowed to go to the corridors or kitchen and there were some times when we were able to walk to other wings.  "Every day when I was at Brook House we had a lock-in for many of the hours. I can't tell you about when exactly in the day that happened. There were times when we were ordered to return to our rooms and [we]
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	object in his hand and threatened me that if I stepped forward he would hit me up with it. I think it was a plastic knife."  He has summarised in paragraph 75(d) as follows.  D2033 said he did not have anything of his own in the room, which was destroyed, as he was brought to Brook House in just the clothes he was wearing, although he may have had some documents.  Paragraph 26:  "After this, I reported [the] incident to the security guards, who swapped that roommate with someone	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	It was a small room.  "I do not remember exactly the timetable when I was at Brook House. During the night we had to stay in our rooms and during the day there were certain hours when we were allowed to go outside. Sometimes we were allowed to go to the corridors or kitchen and there were some times when we were able to walk to other wings.  "Every day when I was at Brook House we had a lock-in for many of the hours. I can't tell you about when exactly in the day that happened. There were times when we were ordered to return to our rooms and [we] were then locked in there. On the first day when an
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	object in his hand and threatened me that if I stepped forward he would hit me up with it. I think it was a plastic knife."  He has summarised in paragraph 75(d) as follows.  D2033 said he did not have anything of his own in the room, which was destroyed, as he was brought to Brook House in just the clothes he was wearing, although he may have had some documents.  Paragraph 26:  "After this, I reported [the] incident to the security guards, who swapped that roommate with someone else. Then the next day I again went to the officers	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	It was a small room.  "I do not remember exactly the timetable when I was at Brook House. During the night we had to stay in our rooms and during the day there were certain hours when we were allowed to go outside. Sometimes we were allowed to go to the corridors or kitchen and there were some times when we were able to walk to other wings.  "Every day when I was at Brook House we had a lock-in for many of the hours. I can't tell you about when exactly in the day that happened. There were times when we were ordered to return to our rooms and [we] were then locked in there. On the first day when an officer told me to go back to my room I had a bad
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	object in his hand and threatened me that if I stepped forward he would hit me up with it. I think it was a plastic knife."  He has summarised in paragraph 75(d) as follows.  D2033 said he did not have anything of his own in the room, which was destroyed, as he was brought to Brook House in just the clothes he was wearing, although he may have had some documents.  Paragraph 26:  "After this, I reported [the] incident to the security guards, who swapped that roommate with someone else. Then the next day I again went to the officers saying I'm not happy to share a room with an adult,	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	It was a small room.  "I do not remember exactly the timetable when I was at Brook House. During the night we had to stay in our rooms and during the day there were certain hours when we were allowed to go outside. Sometimes we were allowed to go to the corridors or kitchen and there were some times when we were able to walk to other wings.  "Every day when I was at Brook House we had a lock-in for many of the hours. I can't tell you about when exactly in the day that happened. There were times when we were ordered to return to our rooms and [we] were then locked in there. On the first day when an officer told me to go back to my room I had a bad feeling but thought that at least when I was in my room
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	object in his hand and threatened me that if I stepped forward he would hit me up with it. I think it was a plastic knife."  He has summarised in paragraph 75(d) as follows.  D2033 said he did not have anything of his own in the room, which was destroyed, as he was brought to Brook House in just the clothes he was wearing, although he may have had some documents.  Paragraph 26:  "After this, I reported [the] incident to the security guards, who swapped that roommate with someone else. Then the next day I again went to the officers saying I'm not happy to share a room with an adult, please put me somewhere safe and they moved me back to	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	It was a small room.  "I do not remember exactly the timetable when I was at Brook House. During the night we had to stay in our rooms and during the day there were certain hours when we were allowed to go outside. Sometimes we were allowed to go to the corridors or kitchen and there were some times when we were able to walk to other wings.  "Every day when I was at Brook House we had a lock-in for many of the hours. I can't tell you about when exactly in the day that happened. There were times when we were ordered to return to our rooms and [we] were then locked in there. On the first day when an officer told me to go back to my room I had a bad feeling but thought that at least when I was in my room I would be safe. Although the door to my room was
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	object in his hand and threatened me that if I stepped forward he would hit me up with it. I think it was a plastic knife."  He has summarised in paragraph 75(d) as follows.  D2033 said he did not have anything of his own in the room, which was destroyed, as he was brought to Brook House in just the clothes he was wearing, although he may have had some documents.  Paragraph 26:  "After this, I reported [the] incident to the security guards, who swapped that roommate with someone else. Then the next day I again went to the officers saying I'm not happy to share a room with an adult, please put me somewhere safe and they moved me back to the isolation wing.	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	It was a small room.  "I do not remember exactly the timetable when I was at Brook House. During the night we had to stay in our rooms and during the day there were certain hours when we were allowed to go outside. Sometimes we were allowed to go to the corridors or kitchen and there were some times when we were able to walk to other wings.  "Every day when I was at Brook House we had a lock-in for many of the hours. I can't tell you about when exactly in the day that happened. There were times when we were ordered to return to our rooms and [we] were then locked in there. On the first day when an officer told me to go back to my room I had a bad feeling but thought that at least when I was in my room I would be safe. Although the door to my room was locked, I could hear a lot angry people around me
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	object in his hand and threatened me that if I stepped forward he would hit me up with it. I think it was a plastic knife."  He has summarised in paragraph 75(d) as follows.  D2033 said he did not have anything of his own in the room, which was destroyed, as he was brought to Brook House in just the clothes he was wearing, although he may have had some documents.  Paragraph 26:  "After this, I reported [the] incident to the security guards, who swapped that roommate with someone else. Then the next day I again went to the officers saying I'm not happy to share a room with an adult, please put me somewhere safe and they moved me back to the isolation wing.  "When I was in the isolation wing, I saw a man in	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	It was a small room.  "I do not remember exactly the timetable when I was at Brook House. During the night we had to stay in our rooms and during the day there were certain hours when we were allowed to go outside. Sometimes we were allowed to go to the corridors or kitchen and there were some times when we were able to walk to other wings.  "Every day when I was at Brook House we had a lock-in for many of the hours. I can't tell you about when exactly in the day that happened. There were times when we were ordered to return to our rooms and [we] were then locked in there. On the first day when an officer told me to go back to my room I had a bad feeling but thought that at least when I was in my room I would be safe. Although the door to my room was locked, I could hear a lot angry people around me banging on their cells and shouting, which was very
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	object in his hand and threatened me that if I stepped forward he would hit me up with it. I think it was a plastic knife."  He has summarised in paragraph 75(d) as follows.  D2033 said he did not have anything of his own in the room, which was destroyed, as he was brought to Brook House in just the clothes he was wearing, although he may have had some documents.  Paragraph 26:  "After this, I reported [the] incident to the security guards, who swapped that roommate with someone else. Then the next day I again went to the officers saying I'm not happy to share a room with an adult, please put me somewhere safe and they moved me back to the isolation wing.  "When I was in the isolation wing, I saw a man in a very bad condition. He had stitched his lips together	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	It was a small room.  "I do not remember exactly the timetable when I was at Brook House. During the night we had to stay in our rooms and during the day there were certain hours when we were allowed to go outside. Sometimes we were allowed to go to the corridors or kitchen and there were some times when we were able to walk to other wings.  "Every day when I was at Brook House we had a lock-in for many of the hours. I can't tell you about when exactly in the day that happened. There were times when we were ordered to return to our rooms and [we] were then locked in there. On the first day when an officer told me to go back to my room I had a bad feeling but thought that at least when I was in my room I would be safe. Although the door to my room was locked, I could hear a lot angry people around me banging on their cells and shouting, which was very scary. Naturally nobody likes to be locked in against
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	object in his hand and threatened me that if I stepped forward he would hit me up with it. I think it was a plastic knife."  He has summarised in paragraph 75(d) as follows.  D2033 said he did not have anything of his own in the room, which was destroyed, as he was brought to Brook House in just the clothes he was wearing, although he may have had some documents.  Paragraph 26:  "After this, I reported [the] incident to the security guards, who swapped that roommate with someone else. Then the next day I again went to the officers saying I'm not happy to share a room with an adult, please put me somewhere safe and they moved me back to the isolation wing.  "When I was in the isolation wing, I saw a man in a very bad condition. He had stitched his lips together as a protest and his lips were bloody. He was an	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	It was a small room.  "I do not remember exactly the timetable when I was at Brook House. During the night we had to stay in our rooms and during the day there were certain hours when we were allowed to go outside. Sometimes we were allowed to go to the corridors or kitchen and there were some times when we were able to walk to other wings.  "Every day when I was at Brook House we had a lock-in for many of the hours. I can't tell you about when exactly in the day that happened. There were times when we were ordered to return to our rooms and [we] were then locked in there. On the first day when an officer told me to go back to my room I had a bad feeling but thought that at least when I was in my room I would be safe. Although the door to my room was locked, I could hear a lot angry people around me banging on their cells and shouting, which was very scary. Naturally nobody likes to be locked in against their will, but that was what it was. As humans, we
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	object in his hand and threatened me that if I stepped forward he would hit me up with it. I think it was a plastic knife."  He has summarised in paragraph 75(d) as follows.  D2033 said he did not have anything of his own in the room, which was destroyed, as he was brought to Brook House in just the clothes he was wearing, although he may have had some documents.  Paragraph 26:  "After this, I reported [the] incident to the security guards, who swapped that roommate with someone else. Then the next day I again went to the officers saying I'm not happy to share a room with an adult, please put me somewhere safe and they moved me back to the isolation wing.  "When I was in the isolation wing, I saw a man in a very bad condition. He had stitched his lips together as a protest and his lips were bloody. He was an Iranian and was on hunger strike as he was going to be	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	It was a small room.  "I do not remember exactly the timetable when I was at Brook House. During the night we had to stay in our rooms and during the day there were certain hours when we were allowed to go outside. Sometimes we were allowed to go to the corridors or kitchen and there were some times when we were able to walk to other wings.  "Every day when I was at Brook House we had a lock-in for many of the hours. I can't tell you about when exactly in the day that happened. There were times when we were ordered to return to our rooms and [we] were then locked in there. On the first day when an officer told me to go back to my room I had a bad feeling but thought that at least when I was in my room I would be safe. Although the door to my room was locked, I could hear a lot angry people around me banging on their cells and shouting, which was very scary. Naturally nobody likes to be locked in against their will, but that was what it was. As humans, we like to be free, but they had imposed these conditions
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	object in his hand and threatened me that if I stepped forward he would hit me up with it. I think it was a plastic knife."  He has summarised in paragraph 75(d) as follows.  D2033 said he did not have anything of his own in the room, which was destroyed, as he was brought to Brook House in just the clothes he was wearing, although he may have had some documents.  Paragraph 26:  "After this, I reported [the] incident to the security guards, who swapped that roommate with someone else. Then the next day I again went to the officers saying I'm not happy to share a room with an adult, please put me somewhere safe and they moved me back to the isolation wing.  "When I was in the isolation wing, I saw a man in a very bad condition. He had stitched his lips together as a protest and his lips were bloody. He was an Iranian and was on hunger strike as he was going to be returned to Germany. He was in a terrible, dangerous	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	It was a small room.  "I do not remember exactly the timetable when I was at Brook House. During the night we had to stay in our rooms and during the day there were certain hours when we were allowed to go outside. Sometimes we were allowed to go to the corridors or kitchen and there were some times when we were able to walk to other wings.  "Every day when I was at Brook House we had a lock-in for many of the hours. I can't tell you about when exactly in the day that happened. There were times when we were ordered to return to our rooms and [we] were then locked in there. On the first day when an officer told me to go back to my room I had a bad feeling but thought that at least when I was in my room I would be safe. Although the door to my room was locked, I could hear a lot angry people around me banging on their cells and shouting, which was very scary. Naturally nobody likes to be locked in against their will, but that was what it was. As humans, we like to be free, but they had imposed these conditions against me and there was nothing I could do about it.
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	object in his hand and threatened me that if I stepped forward he would hit me up with it. I think it was a plastic knife."  He has summarised in paragraph 75(d) as follows.  D2033 said he did not have anything of his own in the room, which was destroyed, as he was brought to Brook House in just the clothes he was wearing, although he may have had some documents.  Paragraph 26:  "After this, I reported [the] incident to the security guards, who swapped that roommate with someone else. Then the next day I again went to the officers saying I'm not happy to share a room with an adult, please put me somewhere safe and they moved me back to the isolation wing.  "When I was in the isolation wing, I saw a man in a very bad condition. He had stitched his lips together as a protest and his lips were bloody. He was an Iranian and was on hunger strike as he was going to be	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	It was a small room.  "I do not remember exactly the timetable when I was at Brook House. During the night we had to stay in our rooms and during the day there were certain hours when we were allowed to go outside. Sometimes we were allowed to go to the corridors or kitchen and there were some times when we were able to walk to other wings.  "Every day when I was at Brook House we had a lock-in for many of the hours. I can't tell you about when exactly in the day that happened. There were times when we were ordered to return to our rooms and [we] were then locked in there. On the first day when an officer told me to go back to my room I had a bad feeling but thought that at least when I was in my room I would be safe. Although the door to my room was locked, I could hear a lot angry people around me banging on their cells and shouting, which was very scary. Naturally nobody likes to be locked in against their will, but that was what it was. As humans, we like to be free, but they had imposed these conditions

Page 114

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

q

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

the wing, but I felt particularly bad when the security personnel ordered me to return to my room and locked the door on me.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

g

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

Q

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

25

"In terms of activities to do, there was a billiard table and TV in the corridor and sometimes the officers gave me a pen and paper and then I had an opportunity to draw something. I'm not sure if there were education opportunities available. If there were then nobody told me about them. There was also a gym but I didn't go there. It was a very stressful time for me and I wasn't in a position to go to the gym and have fun. I was always scared of the others around me.

"Shortly after I arrived at Brook House, I went to the healthcare department to ask for my antidepressant medication and the doctor sent me out of the room. I do not remember the name of the doctor. The way he forced me to leave the room felt very inhumane when I was seeking help. On this occasion, I had gone to the healthcare department to ask for my medication for my mental health. I didn't have a prescription with me, but I told the staff that I had been taking the medication before I was detained. The doctor began to speak on the phone and then he told me to leave the room in a very rude and bad manner. I didn't expect that from a doctor.

Page 117

"As far as I can recall, there was no interpreter

available for me at all when I was at Brook House.

I had to just make do as best I could. My English was not so good at the time, and so it was difficult for me,

but I had no choice. At one point, when the Home Office wanted to remove me to Germany the officer had an

interpreter over the phone and that was when I was told I was going to be removed to Germany. I believe that

this was one or two days before my removal. I was taken to an office and told that I would be removed to

Germany. As far as I can remember, this was the only

time that I was provided with an interpreter at Brook House. I never had an interpreter when I visited

the healthcare department.

"When I saw the immigration officers at the detention centre, they said to me, 'We are going to remove a group of people back to Germany but you are not among them'. The day after this they came and took me and I found out I was going to be removed. Being told this made me feel like I had been tricked and deceived. They gave me false hope and I thought that I had

a chance to be released from the detention centre and back to my uncle. My solicitors at the time had told me

24 that they were trying to get me released on bail. When

the officers came in the middle of the night and

Page 118

forcibly removed me I felt very betrayed and deceived.

"I do not remember about the regime of accessing the telephone inside the detention centre but I remember when my maternal uncle came to visit me he gave me an old phone as we were not allowed a smartphone. Before my uncle provided me a telephone I had to use the detention centre phone. The extension centre staff never offered me a mobile phone to use when I was detained; I just had to make do with ... the public phone. I can't remember exactly how long it was before my uncle brought me a phone. I think they put me in detention on Monday and I think it was Friday when my uncle came to visit. So from around Monday until ... Friday I did not have a personal telephone.

"As far as I recall, the only visit I had was from my uncle. I think it was a Friday when he came to visit, but I am not sure. It was quite a short amount of time. The security guards were present and told us when we had to finish. I'd never been detained before in the past apart from the incident when I was kidnapped in Afghanistan and so when I met with my maternal uncle he was trying to encourage me to be brave and patient. It was very hard for me to [be] strong.

"Access to legal advice.

"At the time that I was detained, I was represented

### Page 119

by a different solicitor's firm. It was my maternal uncle who was in contact with my solicitor. As far as I knew they were trying to stop my removal and bail me out of detention. I had two conversations with my legal representatives when I was in detention. The first time when I contacted him, I was at the reporting centre and had been told that I would be detained. I told my legal representative that I had not been allowed to leave the reporting centre and my solicitor told me not to worry, that he was going to sort things out. The second time was when I was on the bus on the way to the plane. This was the last time that I spoke to him. I never had a meeting with my legal representative inside detention.

"Treatment.

"When I was detained at Brook House IRC, I was still a young person ... It was mentally very hard for me being detained, and the way that I was treated was beyond my worst expectations. As I have explained above, during the induction the immigration officers spoke in a degrading and insulting way towards me. However, throughout my time in detention the staff did not behave in a good way towards me. There were many security guards working at Brook House. Some were good, some gave me the impression they did not like immigrants at all and behaved in an unwelcoming manner towards me

1

2

3

4 5

6

8

10

11 12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21 22

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

a

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

25

1	and some were in the middle. The guards were always
2	being verbally abusive towards me, but they were never
3	physically abusive. I never witnessed the guards being
4	physically abusive to the other detainees, but from what
5	I can remember, staff were often behaving in a verbally
6	abusive and degrading way to other detainees. For
7	example, when we were told to return to our cells for
8	lock-in, the detention centre staff would tell us very
9	rudely and aggressively to get to our cells. They would
10	act like our bosses rather than requesting politely that
11	we do this. Another example is when I wanted my
12	medicine and pressed the bell, a female officer would
13	come and from behind the door would ask rudely what
14	I was pressing the bell for. On another occasion,
15	a guard came to my room and asked me to go with them to
16	another room where I was asked a number of questions.
17	I was alone with him in the room without an interpreter
18	and he asked me a number of questions regarding what
19	I had done in Afghanistan and how I had come to [be in]
20	the UK. I can remember this man clearly even now. He
21	was around 35 years old, balding and carrying a bit of
22	extra weight. I did not want to ask [the] questions as
23	I felt that he was not from the Home Office and so I did
24	not see why he needed to ask me these questions. His
25	behaviour made me feel like he did not like foreigners
	Page 121

welfare team who would regularly check on me at night to see how I was doing."

I'm just going to interpolate a summary of paragraph 76 here.

D2033 emphasises that he was constantly telling the detention centre staff that he was a minor. He says that most of the time he told them this they didn't seem to care or to be concerned for his welfare. Meaning he had to plead and keep requesting that he was a minor and that it was not safe for him to be detained or to share with adults before anyone took any notice.

Paragraph 42. "Use of Force":

"When I was removed to Germany, I was physically assaulted during the removal process. I was restrained with handcuffs and I sustained an injury to my wrists. Initially, about four to six Brook House security staff came to the room in the early hours of the morning and said, 'You will be taken to Germany'. The officers were wearing full riot gear with batons and shields and so I felt that I could not resist them. They handed me to other officers who fitted a waist restraint belt which was connected to handcuffs around me. I remained in this waist restraint belt and handcuffs until I reached Germany. I think that the handcuffs were made of plastic but I cannot remember exactly. These officers

and I found his manner of questioning to be offensive.

"During the induction, when I told the staff that I was [a minor], they just began laughing at me. When I asked them to at least put me in a separate room because of my age, they just laughed at me. I was crying and begging the guards that I didn't want to be kept in the a room with adults. In the end, they gave me my own room for a night or two and then I shared with someone else.

"One day I was walking down a corridor and saw a woman walking the other way. I asked her if I could speak to her. I later visited her in the welfare department and told her that I am [a minor]. But the officers are not listening to me. I told her that I have my Taskera to prove it. A Taskera is an Afghan photographic identity document stating a person's name and age. I asked my maternal uncle to get my Taskera to me, which he did. I told her about my situation and she was helpful and listened. She said that if I can prove that I am under 18 years old, the Home Office won't be allowed to send me to Germany. This gave me hope but later I brought my Taskera in to the Home Office at the detention centre, but they disregarded it and still sent me to Germany. The lady at the welfare department then shared what I had told her with a colleague in the

Page 122

## Page 123

were not in full riot gear but they were wearing their normal uniform which I think was black and had the name of their company on it.

"I do not remember the name of the company they were working for. My solicitors told me that the second group of officers worked for a different company to the officers who were at Brook House but to me they were all connected to Brook House and part of the same experience.

"I screamed and tried as much as I could to stop them taking me to the airport, but it was no use I was clinging onto the handrails in order to resist being taken with the officers.

"The officer deliberately placed himself in a comfortable position, kneeling on the chair with one leg and standing with the other so that he could drag me with ease. He fitted another pair of handcuffs around one of my wrists and he held the other handcuff in his hand so that he could pull me out of the bus when I resisted.

"When he was unable to forcibly remove me from the bus, he called several of his colleagues over. The officers were so aggressive in forcing me to come with them that they pulled my trousers off. My trousers came off when the four or five officers were trying to force

Page 124

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

a

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

25

1	me off the bus. They were pulling my legs and arms and	1	I returned to the isolation wing from the public wing,
2	using all of the force that they could to pull me out of	2	that guy was still there. We were all treated badly and
3	the bus. It was in this struggle that my trousers came	3	without respect, but apart from the incident where the
4	off. When the officers were pulling my arms and wrists	4	officers taunted me during the induction, which I think
5	using the handcuffs it felt like my arm was coming off.	5	may have been due to me being from Afghanistan and the
6	One end of the handcuff was around my wrist and the	6	stereotype they had about people from Afghanistan being
7	other was in his hand and he pulled me along using the	7	connected to the Taliban or the army, I do not believe
8	handcuffs. I still have scars on my wrists from the	8	that I was specifically singled out to be treated badly
9	handcuffs from when they dug into my skin leaving deep	9	because of my ethnicity, nationality or religion, but
10	bloody cuts on my wrists. My whole body was hurting.	10	this may have been why they treated us all badly.
11	It felt like I had been beaten up for the next few days.	11	"Use of Force.
12	They then put us onto the plane and then we were	12	"I have described how force was used on me to remove
13	deported to Germany. It was not until I got onto the	13	me and when I was in the plane. I was assaulted and
14	plane that I was able to pull my trousers up. Before,	14	physically restrained and put in waist restraints and
15	they had been around my ankles, since the officers	15	handcuffs. They did this even though I was a young
16	pulled them off and I was so focused on resisting	16	person and had mental health problems. When I was
17	removal that I wasn't interested in pulling them up	17	detained in the isolation wing, there was another Afghan
18	until I knew I had no hope of resisting removal anymore.	18	boy detained near to me. He was making a lot of noise
19	Throughout the whole of the journey to Germany on the	19	and banging the doors. I remember that on one occasion
20	plane I was restrained. One officer was sitting to one	20	a member of staff did restrain this Afghan boy in
21	side of me holding my arms and legs, and another officer	21	another room because he was causing so much fuss. I can
22	on the other side holding my arms and legs. There was	22	remember hearing him shouting and kicking and punching
23	another officer behind me forcibly holding my head.	23	the door. I think this happened when I was brought back
24	I could not move at all. I told the officers that the	24	to the isolation wing at the end of my detention.
25	handcuffs and belt were very tight and causing me a lot	25	"Rule 35.
20	indicates and continued for figure and causing inclusion	-	
	Page 125		Page 127
1		1	
1 2	of pain. But they told me that I would need to wait	1 2	"I did not have a rule 35 report prepared for me by
2	of pain. But they told me that I would need to wait until I arrived in Germany until they could remove my	2	"I did not have a rule 35 report prepared for me by the healthcare department whilst I was in detention.
2 3	of pain. But they told me that I would need to wait until I arrived in Germany until they could remove my handcuffs. It is very distressing for me to think about	2 3	"I did not have a rule 35 report prepared for me by the healthcare department whilst I was in detention. I am not aware of what a rule 35 report is and no-one
2 3 4	of pain. But they told me that I would need to wait until I arrived in Germany until they could remove my handcuffs. It is very distressing for me to think about or talk about this incident. The way that I was	2 3 4	"I did not have a rule 35 report prepared for me by the healthcare department whilst I was in detention.  I am not aware of what a rule 35 report is and no-one explained to me what a rule 35 report is or its purpose
2 3 4 5	of pain. But they told me that I would need to wait until I arrived in Germany until they could remove my handcuffs. It is very distressing for me to think about or talk about this incident. The way that I was forcibly removed, handcuffed and dragged like an animal	2 3 4 5	"I did not have a rule 35 report prepared for me by the healthcare department whilst I was in detention.  I am not aware of what a rule 35 report is and no-one explained to me what a rule 35 report is or its purpose while I was at Brook House. I cannot remember whether
2 3 4	of pain. But they told me that I would need to wait until I arrived in Germany until they could remove my handcuffs. It is very distressing for me to think about or talk about this incident. The way that I was forcibly removed, handcuffed and dragged like an animal onto the plane was very inhumane and dealt	2 3 4 5 6	"I did not have a rule 35 report prepared for me by the healthcare department whilst I was in detention.  I am not aware of what a rule 35 report is and no-one explained to me what a rule 35 report is or its purpose while I was at Brook House. I cannot remember whether or not I was asked and told a doctor at the detention
2 3 4 5 6 7	of pain. But they told me that I would need to wait until I arrived in Germany until they could remove my handcuffs. It is very distressing for me to think about or talk about this incident. The way that I was forcibly removed, handcuffed and dragged like an animal onto the plane was very inhumane and dealt a psychological blow to me and is not something I will	2 3 4 5 6 7	"I did not have a rule 35 report prepared for me by the healthcare department whilst I was in detention.  I am not aware of what a rule 35 report is and no-one explained to me what a rule 35 report is or its purpose while I was at Brook House. I cannot remember whether or not I was asked and told a doctor at the detention centre about the torture I sustained in Afghanistan, but
2 3 4 5 6	of pain. But they told me that I would need to wait until I arrived in Germany until they could remove my handcuffs. It is very distressing for me to think about or talk about this incident. The way that I was forcibly removed, handcuffed and dragged like an animal onto the plane was very inhumane and dealt a psychological blow to me and is not something I will forget."	2 3 4 5 6	"I did not have a rule 35 report prepared for me by the healthcare department whilst I was in detention.  I am not aware of what a rule 35 report is and no-one explained to me what a rule 35 report is or its purpose while I was at Brook House. I cannot remember whether or not I was asked and told a doctor at the detention centre about the torture I sustained in Afghanistan, but my solicitors have confirmed to me that, according to my
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	of pain. But they told me that I would need to wait until I arrived in Germany until they could remove my handcuffs. It is very distressing for me to think about or talk about this incident. The way that I was forcibly removed, handcuffed and dragged like an animal onto the plane was very inhumane and dealt a psychological blow to me and is not something I will forget."  I summarise paragraph 78 here. D2033 goes on in	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	"I did not have a rule 35 report prepared for me by the healthcare department whilst I was in detention.  I am not aware of what a rule 35 report is and no-one explained to me what a rule 35 report is or its purpose while I was at Brook House. I cannot remember whether or not I was asked and told a doctor at the detention centre about the torture I sustained in Afghanistan, but my solicitors have confirmed to me that, according to my medical records, I did inform a nurse when I first
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	of pain. But they told me that I would need to wait until I arrived in Germany until they could remove my handcuffs. It is very distressing for me to think about or talk about this incident. The way that I was forcibly removed, handcuffed and dragged like an animal onto the plane was very inhumane and dealt a psychological blow to me and is not something I will forget."  I summarise paragraph 78 here. D2033 goes on in more detail in his statement about the impact removal to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	"I did not have a rule 35 report prepared for me by the healthcare department whilst I was in detention.  I am not aware of what a rule 35 report is and no-one explained to me what a rule 35 report is or its purpose while I was at Brook House. I cannot remember whether or not I was asked and told a doctor at the detention centre about the torture I sustained in Afghanistan, but my solicitors have confirmed to me that, according to my medical records, I did inform a nurse when I first arrived and I was to discuss it with a doctor. However,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	of pain. But they told me that I would need to wait until I arrived in Germany until they could remove my handcuffs. It is very distressing for me to think about or talk about this incident. The way that I was forcibly removed, handcuffed and dragged like an animal onto the plane was very inhumane and dealt a psychological blow to me and is not something I will forget."  I summarise paragraph 78 here. D2033 goes on in more detail in his statement about the impact removal to Germany had on him, in particular on his mental health.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	"I did not have a rule 35 report prepared for me by the healthcare department whilst I was in detention.  I am not aware of what a rule 35 report is and no-one explained to me what a rule 35 report is or its purpose while I was at Brook House. I cannot remember whether or not I was asked and told a doctor at the detention centre about the torture I sustained in Afghanistan, but my solicitors have confirmed to me that, according to my medical records, I did inform a nurse when I first arrived and I was to discuss it with a doctor. However, I was not offered an appointment for a doctor at the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	of pain. But they told me that I would need to wait until I arrived in Germany until they could remove my handcuffs. It is very distressing for me to think about or talk about this incident. The way that I was forcibly removed, handcuffed and dragged like an animal onto the plane was very inhumane and dealt a psychological blow to me and is not something I will forget."  I summarise paragraph 78 here. D2033 goes on in more detail in his statement about the impact removal to Germany had on him, in particular on his mental health. He says he was in physical pain following the removal	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	"I did not have a rule 35 report prepared for me by the healthcare department whilst I was in detention.  I am not aware of what a rule 35 report is and no-one explained to me what a rule 35 report is or its purpose while I was at Brook House. I cannot remember whether or not I was asked and told a doctor at the detention centre about the torture I sustained in Afghanistan, but my solicitors have confirmed to me that, according to my medical records, I did inform a nurse when I first arrived and I was to discuss it with a doctor. However, I was not offered an appointment for a doctor at the detention centre to examine my scars.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	of pain. But they told me that I would need to wait until I arrived in Germany until they could remove my handcuffs. It is very distressing for me to think about or talk about this incident. The way that I was forcibly removed, handcuffed and dragged like an animal onto the plane was very inhumane and dealt a psychological blow to me and is not something I will forget."  I summarise paragraph 78 here. D2033 goes on in more detail in his statement about the impact removal to Germany had on him, in particular on his mental health. He says he was in physical pain following the removal but, moreover, in psychological pain and in despair.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	"I did not have a rule 35 report prepared for me by the healthcare department whilst I was in detention.  I am not aware of what a rule 35 report is and no-one explained to me what a rule 35 report is or its purpose while I was at Brook House. I cannot remember whether or not I was asked and told a doctor at the detention centre about the torture I sustained in Afghanistan, but my solicitors have confirmed to me that, according to my medical records, I did inform a nurse when I first arrived and I was to discuss it with a doctor. However, I was not offered an appointment for a doctor at the detention centre to examine my scars.  "If I had had the opportunity, I would do everything
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	of pain. But they told me that I would need to wait until I arrived in Germany until they could remove my handcuffs. It is very distressing for me to think about or talk about this incident. The way that I was forcibly removed, handcuffed and dragged like an animal onto the plane was very inhumane and dealt a psychological blow to me and is not something I will forget."  I summarise paragraph 78 here. D2033 goes on in more detail in his statement about the impact removal to Germany had on him, in particular on his mental health. He says he was in physical pain following the removal	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	"I did not have a rule 35 report prepared for me by the healthcare department whilst I was in detention.  I am not aware of what a rule 35 report is and no-one explained to me what a rule 35 report is or its purpose while I was at Brook House. I cannot remember whether or not I was asked and told a doctor at the detention centre about the torture I sustained in Afghanistan, but my solicitors have confirmed to me that, according to my medical records, I did inform a nurse when I first arrived and I was to discuss it with a doctor. However, I was not offered an appointment for a doctor at the detention centre to examine my scars.  "If I had had the opportunity, I would do everything not to be separated from my family, including requesting
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	of pain. But they told me that I would need to wait until I arrived in Germany until they could remove my handcuffs. It is very distressing for me to think about or talk about this incident. The way that I was forcibly removed, handcuffed and dragged like an animal onto the plane was very inhumane and dealt a psychological blow to me and is not something I will forget."  I summarise paragraph 78 here. D2033 goes on in more detail in his statement about the impact removal to Germany had on him, in particular on his mental health. He says he was in physical pain following the removal but, moreover, in psychological pain and in despair.  Returning to paragraph 43:  "I remember on another occasion a detainee cut his	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	"I did not have a rule 35 report prepared for me by the healthcare department whilst I was in detention.  I am not aware of what a rule 35 report is and no-one explained to me what a rule 35 report is or its purpose while I was at Brook House. I cannot remember whether or not I was asked and told a doctor at the detention centre about the torture I sustained in Afghanistan, but my solicitors have confirmed to me that, according to my medical records, I did inform a nurse when I first arrived and I was to discuss it with a doctor. However, I was not offered an appointment for a doctor at the detention centre to examine my scars.  "If I had had the opportunity, I would do everything not to be separated from my family, including requesting a rule 35 report. But I unfortunately did not have this
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	of pain. But they told me that I would need to wait until I arrived in Germany until they could remove my handcuffs. It is very distressing for me to think about or talk about this incident. The way that I was forcibly removed, handcuffed and dragged like an animal onto the plane was very inhumane and dealt a psychological blow to me and is not something I will forget."  I summarise paragraph 78 here. D2033 goes on in more detail in his statement about the impact removal to Germany had on him, in particular on his mental health. He says he was in physical pain following the removal but, moreover, in psychological pain and in despair.  Returning to paragraph 43:	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	"I did not have a rule 35 report prepared for me by the healthcare department whilst I was in detention.  I am not aware of what a rule 35 report is and no-one explained to me what a rule 35 report is or its purpose while I was at Brook House. I cannot remember whether or not I was asked and told a doctor at the detention centre about the torture I sustained in Afghanistan, but my solicitors have confirmed to me that, according to my medical records, I did inform a nurse when I first arrived and I was to discuss it with a doctor. However, I was not offered an appointment for a doctor at the detention centre to examine my scars.  "If I had had the opportunity, I would do everything not to be separated from my family, including requesting a rule 35 report. But I unfortunately did not have this opportunity.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	of pain. But they told me that I would need to wait until I arrived in Germany until they could remove my handcuffs. It is very distressing for me to think about or talk about this incident. The way that I was forcibly removed, handcuffed and dragged like an animal onto the plane was very inhumane and dealt a psychological blow to me and is not something I will forget."  I summarise paragraph 78 here. D2033 goes on in more detail in his statement about the impact removal to Germany had on him, in particular on his mental health. He says he was in physical pain following the removal but, moreover, in psychological pain and in despair.  Returning to paragraph 43:  "I remember on another occasion a detainee cut his wrist and it was very bloody and the detention centre staff called an ambulance. This was another incident	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	"I did not have a rule 35 report prepared for me by the healthcare department whilst I was in detention.  I am not aware of what a rule 35 report is and no-one explained to me what a rule 35 report is or its purpose while I was at Brook House. I cannot remember whether or not I was asked and told a doctor at the detention centre about the torture I sustained in Afghanistan, but my solicitors have confirmed to me that, according to my medical records, I did inform a nurse when I first arrived and I was to discuss it with a doctor. However, I was not offered an appointment for a doctor at the detention centre to examine my scars.  "If I had had the opportunity, I would do everything not to be separated from my family, including requesting a rule 35 report. But I unfortunately did not have this opportunity.  "I had an appointment with Freedom from Torture when
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	of pain. But they told me that I would need to wait until I arrived in Germany until they could remove my handcuffs. It is very distressing for me to think about or talk about this incident. The way that I was forcibly removed, handcuffed and dragged like an animal onto the plane was very inhumane and dealt a psychological blow to me and is not something I will forget."  I summarise paragraph 78 here. D2033 goes on in more detail in his statement about the impact removal to Germany had on him, in particular on his mental health. He says he was in physical pain following the removal but, moreover, in psychological pain and in despair.  Returning to paragraph 43:  "I remember on another occasion a detainee cut his wrist and it was very bloody and the detention centre staff called an ambulance. This was another incident I will never forget. That was a very horrible moment	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	"I did not have a rule 35 report prepared for me by the healthcare department whilst I was in detention.  I am not aware of what a rule 35 report is and no-one explained to me what a rule 35 report is or its purpose while I was at Brook House. I cannot remember whether or not I was asked and told a doctor at the detention centre about the torture I sustained in Afghanistan, but my solicitors have confirmed to me that, according to my medical records, I did inform a nurse when I first arrived and I was to discuss it with a doctor. However, I was not offered an appointment for a doctor at the detention centre to examine my scars.  "If I had had the opportunity, I would do everything not to be separated from my family, including requesting a rule 35 report. But I unfortunately did not have this opportunity.  "I had an appointment with Freedom from Torture when I was detained but I missed this appointment. Then,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	of pain. But they told me that I would need to wait until I arrived in Germany until they could remove my handcuffs. It is very distressing for me to think about or talk about this incident. The way that I was forcibly removed, handcuffed and dragged like an animal onto the plane was very inhumane and dealt a psychological blow to me and is not something I will forget."  I summarise paragraph 78 here. D2033 goes on in more detail in his statement about the impact removal to Germany had on him, in particular on his mental health. He says he was in physical pain following the removal but, moreover, in psychological pain and in despair.  Returning to paragraph 43:  "I remember on another occasion a detainee cut his wrist and it was very bloody and the detention centre staff called an ambulance. This was another incident I will never forget. That was a very horrible moment for me. I think they took him to the hospital. I think	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	"I did not have a rule 35 report prepared for me by the healthcare department whilst I was in detention.  I am not aware of what a rule 35 report is and no-one explained to me what a rule 35 report is or its purpose while I was at Brook House. I cannot remember whether or not I was asked and told a doctor at the detention centre about the torture I sustained in Afghanistan, but my solicitors have confirmed to me that, according to my medical records, I did inform a nurse when I first arrived and I was to discuss it with a doctor. However, I was not offered an appointment for a doctor at the detention centre to examine my scars.  "If I had had the opportunity, I would do everything not to be separated from my family, including requesting a rule 35 report. But I unfortunately did not have this opportunity.  "I had an appointment with Freedom from Torture when I was detained but I missed this appointment. Then, when I was in detention, Freedom from Torture called me
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	of pain. But they told me that I would need to wait until I arrived in Germany until they could remove my handcuffs. It is very distressing for me to think about or talk about this incident. The way that I was forcibly removed, handcuffed and dragged like an animal onto the plane was very inhumane and dealt a psychological blow to me and is not something I will forget."  I summarise paragraph 78 here. D2033 goes on in more detail in his statement about the impact removal to Germany had on him, in particular on his mental health. He says he was in physical pain following the removal but, moreover, in psychological pain and in despair.  Returning to paragraph 43:  "I remember on another occasion a detainee cut his wrist and it was very bloody and the detention centre staff called an ambulance. This was another incident I will never forget. That was a very horrible moment for me. I think they took him to the hospital. I think this happened when I was in the public wing.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	"I did not have a rule 35 report prepared for me by the healthcare department whilst I was in detention.  I am not aware of what a rule 35 report is and no-one explained to me what a rule 35 report is or its purpose while I was at Brook House. I cannot remember whether or not I was asked and told a doctor at the detention centre about the torture I sustained in Afghanistan, but my solicitors have confirmed to me that, according to my medical records, I did inform a nurse when I first arrived and I was to discuss it with a doctor. However, I was not offered an appointment for a doctor at the detention centre to examine my scars.  "If I had had the opportunity, I would do everything not to be separated from my family, including requesting a rule 35 report. But I unfortunately did not have this opportunity.  "I had an appointment with Freedom from Torture when I was detained but I missed this appointment. Then, when I was in detention, Freedom from Torture called me and asked why I did not attend this appointment and
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	of pain. But they told me that I would need to wait until I arrived in Germany until they could remove my handcuffs. It is very distressing for me to think about or talk about this incident. The way that I was forcibly removed, handcuffed and dragged like an animal onto the plane was very inhumane and dealt a psychological blow to me and is not something I will forget."  I summarise paragraph 78 here. D2033 goes on in more detail in his statement about the impact removal to Germany had on him, in particular on his mental health. He says he was in physical pain following the removal but, moreover, in psychological pain and in despair.  Returning to paragraph 43:  "I remember on another occasion a detainee cut his wrist and it was very bloody and the detention centre staff called an ambulance. This was another incident I will never forget. That was a very horrible moment for me. I think they took him to the hospital. I think this happened when I was in the public wing.  "When I was in the isolation wing, in the next room	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	"I did not have a rule 35 report prepared for me by the healthcare department whilst I was in detention. I am not aware of what a rule 35 report is and no-one explained to me what a rule 35 report is or its purpose while I was at Brook House. I cannot remember whether or not I was asked and told a doctor at the detention centre about the torture I sustained in Afghanistan, but my solicitors have confirmed to me that, according to my medical records, I did inform a nurse when I first arrived and I was to discuss it with a doctor. However, I was not offered an appointment for a doctor at the detention centre to examine my scars.  "If I had had the opportunity, I would do everything not to be separated from my family, including requesting a rule 35 report. But I unfortunately did not have this opportunity.  "I had an appointment with Freedom from Torture when I was detained but I missed this appointment. Then, when I was in detention, Freedom from Torture called me and asked why I did not attend this appointment and I said that I was in detention and they said, sorry, and
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	of pain. But they told me that I would need to wait until I arrived in Germany until they could remove my handcuffs. It is very distressing for me to think about or talk about this incident. The way that I was forcibly removed, handcuffed and dragged like an animal onto the plane was very inhumane and dealt a psychological blow to me and is not something I will forget."  I summarise paragraph 78 here. D2033 goes on in more detail in his statement about the impact removal to Germany had on him, in particular on his mental health. He says he was in physical pain following the removal but, moreover, in psychological pain and in despair.  Returning to paragraph 43:  "I remember on another occasion a detainee cut his wrist and it was very bloody and the detention centre staff called an ambulance. This was another incident I will never forget. That was a very horrible moment for me. I think they took him to the hospital. I think this happened when I was in the public wing.  "When I was in the isolation wing, in the next room to me there was a guy who was constantly beating and	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	"I did not have a rule 35 report prepared for me by the healthcare department whilst I was in detention. I am not aware of what a rule 35 report is and no-one explained to me what a rule 35 report is or its purpose while I was at Brook House. I cannot remember whether or not I was asked and told a doctor at the detention centre about the torture I sustained in Afghanistan, but my solicitors have confirmed to me that, according to my medical records, I did inform a nurse when I first arrived and I was to discuss it with a doctor. However, I was not offered an appointment for a doctor at the detention centre to examine my scars.  "If I had had the opportunity, I would do everything not to be separated from my family, including requesting a rule 35 report. But I unfortunately did not have this opportunity.  "I had an appointment with Freedom from Torture when I was detained but I missed this appointment. Then, when I was in detention, Freedom from Torture called me and asked why I did not attend this appointment and I said that I was in detention and they said, sorry, and that they wished they could help.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	of pain. But they told me that I would need to wait until I arrived in Germany until they could remove my handcuffs. It is very distressing for me to think about or talk about this incident. The way that I was forcibly removed, handcuffed and dragged like an animal onto the plane was very inhumane and dealt a psychological blow to me and is not something I will forget."  I summarise paragraph 78 here. D2033 goes on in more detail in his statement about the impact removal to Germany had on him, in particular on his mental health. He says he was in physical pain following the removal but, moreover, in psychological pain and in despair.  Returning to paragraph 43:  "I remember on another occasion a detainee cut his wrist and it was very bloody and the detention centre staff called an ambulance. This was another incident I will never forget. That was a very horrible moment for me. I think they took him to the hospital. I think this happened when I was in the public wing.  "When I was in the isolation wing, in the next room	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	"I did not have a rule 35 report prepared for me by the healthcare department whilst I was in detention. I am not aware of what a rule 35 report is and no-one explained to me what a rule 35 report is or its purpose while I was at Brook House. I cannot remember whether or not I was asked and told a doctor at the detention centre about the torture I sustained in Afghanistan, but my solicitors have confirmed to me that, according to my medical records, I did inform a nurse when I first arrived and I was to discuss it with a doctor. However, I was not offered an appointment for a doctor at the detention centre to examine my scars.  "If I had had the opportunity, I would do everything not to be separated from my family, including requesting a rule 35 report. But I unfortunately did not have this opportunity.  "I had an appointment with Freedom from Torture when I was detained but I missed this appointment. Then, when I was in detention, Freedom from Torture called me and asked why I did not attend this appointment and I said that I was in detention and they said, sorry, and

locked to my room and it was very noisy. When

Page 126

25

25

health was very poor. Even before I was detained, I had

1	considered ending my life and I had even made an attempt	1	"Clinical care issues.
2	to do so by walking in front of incoming traffic. Being	2	"As I have explained above, when I was detained at
3	detained just made my suicidal feelings worse. Because	3	Brook House, I was mentally unwell and psychologically
4	of my suicidal thoughts, I was placed under constant	4	under pressure and I suffered more than I ever imagined
5	watch and supervision. The level of supervision was	5	myself due to being in a place like that. I saw people
6	particularly strong when I was detained on the isolation	6	with knife wounds and I was kept in a room by myself.
7	wing which my solicitors say was called E wing. I think	7	I always felt stressed, worried, concerned, scared
8	it might have been because I was seen to be a danger to	8	someone would assault me, including sexual assault, from
9	myself. I was under immense psychological pressure when	9	the day they took me there to when I was released.
10	I was detained at Brook House. I wanted to self-harm	10	"When I was at Brook House I couldn't sleep at night
11	but couldn't find anything to harm myself with, such as	11	due to the concerns I had about my future. When they
12	a knife, as they gave us plastic cutlery. I could not	12	were doing the registration process at Brook House,
13	believe that, despite the past problems I had been	13	I told them I am taking medication. That night, they
14	through, the Home Office just took me and detained me in	14	didn't give me medication and the same the following
15	a place that I never imagined myself in. This made me	15	night. There was a two- to three-day gap between when
16	feel hopeless.	16	I arrived at the detention centre and when I began
17	"Being observed all day felt intrusive and	17	receiving the medication.
18	uncomfortable. At all times I felt like someone was	18	"During the time that I wasn't receiving medication,
19	watching me or following me, like someone was filming	19	I used to push the emergency button to ask for my
20	me. Being watched all of the time actually made my	20	medication and the officers came to me and I told them
21	mental health and suicidality worse. I felt restricted	21	I needed my medication or else I would not be able to
22	all of the time."	22	sleep. I would often have to wait for someone to answer
23	Here I just summarise paragraph 84 of the witness	23	the buzzer and, even then, they did not provide me with
24	statement. D2033 cannot be sure why he was under	24	my medication and did not seem to care about the impact
25	supervision but believes it might be due to his age or	25	of me stopping taking my medication on me. When they
	Page 129		Page 131
1	due to his disclosures about his mental health, and	1	didn't provide the medication, I would go myself to
2	notes that, when he arrived, he was scared, crying and	2	healthcare to get the medication."
3	pleading to be put somewhere safe. He says no-one	3	I now summarise paragraphs 77 to 79 and then 80 to
4	explained to him what an ACDT was. He said he felt	4	83.
5	under enormous pressure and stress and being locked in	5	D2033 recalls that when his uncle came to visit, he
6	and monitored did not help at all.	6	brought him his medication, but can't remember if he was
7	Returning to paragraph 51 of the statement:	7	able to take this to his room or whether he could only
8	"Food refusals.	8	take medications supplied by healthcare. As far as he
9	"Although I didn't have the appetite to eat or drink	9	can recall, he did tell staff he had been prescribed
10	when I was at Brook House, I never refused food and	10	medication but cannot be sure if he was able to tell
11	fluids in protest at the way I was being treated. When	11	them the dose. This was prescribed before his detention
12	I was hungry, I ate and drunk, but often, because of how	12	by a psychiatrist in the community. He does not know if
13	distressed I was, I didn't feel like it.	13	the Home Office knew of his diagnosis at the time they
14	"Drugs.	14	were made and prior to his being detained.
15	"I never used drugs when I was detained at	15	80 and 83 are summarised as follows.
16	Brook House. At one point, another detainee told me it	16	D2033's medical records contain an entry from
17	was possible to get illegal drugs, but I did not witness	17	7 April 2017 where he was asked if he had thoughts of
18	anyone taking or using drugs or illegal highs.	18	self-harm or suicide and "I don't know" is recorded.
19	"Protests.	19	D2033 notes in his statement that he doesn't remember
20	"I did not participate in any protests while I was	20	the conversation as it was so long ago, but as far as he
21	at Brook House. I didn't see any mass protests. But	21	can recall, he did not have a Dari interpreter so it is
22	I did see individual detainees doing things like banging	22	possible he did not understand the question. He
23	doors, sewing their lips together and cutting their	23	reiterates that he was feeling suicidal throughout his
24	arteries, which I think might have been a protest	24	detention. He cannot recall each specific event, but he
25	against being detained.	25	thinks he told officers on a number of occasions that he
	Page 130		Page 132

1	was feeling suicidal and hopeless about his life.	1	medication and give me recommendations on what should
2	Turning to paragraph 56:	2	and shouldn't do, like when I go to my GP now. But he
3	"When I was unable to access my medication when	3	didn't seem to be concerned for my welfare. Although
4	I was detained, I suffered from tiredness and body	4	I wasn't happy with the medical treatment I received at
5	aches. I also lost my balance and control of my body.	5	Brook House, I didn't make a complaint about it as
6	I didn't know what I was doing. It felt like I had lost	6	I didn't think there was anyone there to listen to my
7	an important part of myself because I hadn't taken my	7	concerns.
8	medication and I was so stressed. As I have explained	8	"Complaints and oversight.
9	above, when I tried to approach a doctor at the	9	"As far as I can recall, I think that there was
10	healthcare department to tell him that I needed my	10	a complaints box at Brook House but I can't remember
11	medication, he reacted very rudely towards me. After	11	where it was. Although making a complaint about being
12	this, I repeatedly asked the officers for my medication,	12	detained crossed my mind while I was at Brook House, as
13	but it took two to three days before they realised that	13	far as I can recall I did not make a complaint. I do
14	I was being serious when I said that I needed the	14	not feel that I was given the opportunity to raise my
15	medication.	15	concerns with anyone when I was in detention. I was
16	"There was a bell in my room that I could ring at	16	only a minor and didn't know what to do and was too
17	night and an officer who was on duty who would come to	17	scared and nervous to complain to anyone. As far as
18	me. It was only when this happened repeatedly that they	18	I can recall, I did not make any complaints about the
19	realised how much I needed the medication."	19	way other detainees were treated when I was at
20	I summarise 82(a) and 82(c). D2033 cannot recall	20	Brook House. I did not go to the police with my
21	a doctor seeing him as part of his induction or on his	21	concerns or anyone else. In reality, no-one informed me
22	first day. He adds that the doctor who was rude to him	22	there was a complaints procedure. When I went to the
23	was aged 50 to 60 with glasses and a greying beard and	23	welfare department, I informed them that I was under
24	he doesn't recall anyone else being present during this	24	18 years old and that I shouldn't be in detention.
25	incident.	25	However, as far as I can recall, they never informed me
20			,,
	Page 133		Page 135
1	Then from 82(b):	1	of the complaints procedure.
2	"I did not feel that the officers appreciated the	2	"I do not know what the Professional Standards Unit
3	seriousness of me not receiving my prescribed	3	is or the Independent Monitoring Board or the Prisons
4	medication. The staff were very dismissive, rude and	4	and Probations Ombudsman. As far as I can recall, I was
5	harsh, saying things like "It's not in our hands" and	5	not told that I could complain to these bodies or about
6	'You must wait'. This demonstrated that they did not	6	the complaints procedure.
7	care what I was going through. Because I had been	7	"The day after I arrived at Brook House, the
8	taking the medication regularly and then I was forced to	8	officers brought an imam to me, who gave me reassurance
9	stop taking the medication, the consequences were	9	and said 'We pray on Fridays here'. I had no other
10	fatigue, body aches, anxiety, bad feelings and thoughts	10	contact with him. I did go to Friday prayers but
11	of self-harm. I was in shock not only because I did not	11	I don't know if it was the same imam who conducted the
12	have access to my medication, but also because I had	12	prayers. I was not able to pray inside my room as there
13	been placed in a position which reminded me of my past	13	was no space to do so. As a Muslim, I have to pray five
14	experiences. These acts of detaining me made me feel as	14	times a day, but I wasn't aware that the place where the
15	though I was reliving the experiences of my past."	15	Friday prayers were held was open for praying five times
16	Returning to paragraph 58 of the statement:	16	a day and I was unable to pray inside my room due to
17	"At Brook House, all the healthcare department did	17	lack of space. I was unable to practise my religion
18	was to eventually give me my medication. This is very	18	
19	different to when I see my doctor now and I explain all	19	properly whilst I was detained at Brook House.
20	my problems to them and they help me. At Brook House,	20	"Because of the emotional and mental pressure I was
21	the healthcare department just didn't care. All I did	20 21	under whilst in Brook House, I was not able to think
22	was go to the pharmacy and took my medication and that	22	straight in order to ensure that everything was in place
23	was it. I felt like I didn't have the right kind of		for me to practise my religion there. All I was
24	medical support at Brook House. The doctor should have	23	concerned about at the time was about getting out of
∠¬		24	Brook House, and so it was not possible for me to think
25	sat down with me when I got there and prescribed	25	about anything also such as when I wooded to marries
25	sat down with me when I got there and prescribed	25	about anything else, such as when I needed to pray or
25	sat down with me when I got there and prescribed  Page 134	25	about anything else, such as when I needed to pray or  Page 136

1	the fact that I could not do so properly.	1	that's at the end of the statement, chair. It was
2	"I did not try to find the imam to see if he could	2	countersigned on behalf of a Dari interpreter on
3	help me as, to be honest, I was too scared to leave my	3	19 November 2021. Chair, thank you very much for that
4	room as I was afraid somebody might harm me. I also	4	opportunity.
5	didn't think the imam was able to help me with the	5	THE CHAIR: Thank you, Mr Goodman for that, and also to
6	practical problems. I thought he was there just for	6	D2033. Thank you.
7	religious support.	7	MS MOORE: Chair, just a quick note on timings. You will
8	"The imam never told me he would be able to help me	8	see it is about 1.25 pm. In order to ensure that we
9	with any of the concerns I had with being in detention.	9	hear all of the outstanding read evidence today, we may
10	He said a few words to me but I don't remember what he	10	need to sit a little later than planned, so probably
11	said.	11	just after 2.00 pm, if that suits.
12	"The welfare department at Brook House seemed	12	Chair, D1713 has also provided a statement to the
13	helpful to me and they provided me with some support,	13	inquiry. This is at <bhm000018>. I would ask for this,</bhm000018>
14	but I'm not clear what information they gave to the	14	too, to be adduced in full. As with D2033, counsel to
15	Home Office regarding my age or whether they gave the	15	the inquiry has produced a summary of this evidence.
16	Home Office a copy of my Taskera and, ultimately, the	16	You received a request from D1713 via his
17	Home Office removed me on the basis they claimed I was	17	representatives that Ms Profumo be permitted to read out
18	an adult.	18	this summary. As you agreed to that request, we will
19	"I do not know whether the people I met with were	19	now be hearing from Ms Profumo.
20	members of Gatwick Detainees Welfare Group but I think	20	Reading in Evidence re D1713
21	this is likely.	21	MS PROFUMO: Chair, as indicated, I now read in the evidence
22	"I was not in contact with any other detainees or	22	of and on behalf of D1713:
23	visitors when I was at Brook House and I wasn't aware	23	"I, D1713, make this statement to assist the
24	about any other support organisations. Although making	24	Brook House Inquiry. Although I will concentrate on the
25	a complaint about being in detained crossed my mind	25	time that I was detained at Brook House, I also cover in
	Page 137		Page 139
			2.00
1	whilst I was at Brook House, as far as I can recall,	1	this statement other events which are relevant to the
2	I did not make a complaint while I was at Brook House.	2	circumstances in which I was detained there and to my
3	I do not feel that I was given the opportunity to raise	3	experience in Brook House. Because of the COVID-19
4	my concerns with anyone when I was in detention. I was	4	pandemic restrictions, I prepared this statement with my
5	only a child and didn't know what to do and was too	5	solicitor over the course of several conferences which
6	scared and nervous to speak to anyone.	6	have taken place via Zoom and telephone.
7	"As far as I can recall, I did not make any	7	"I was detained at Brook House more than four years
8	complaints about the way that other detainees were being	8	ago, between 31 March and 17 April 2017, and 20 April
9	treated when I was at Brook House. I did not go to the	9	and 22 April 2017 for a total of 19 days. It felt like
10	police with my concerns or to anyone else. In reality,	10	I was there for a lot longer and I found my time in
11	no-one informed me there was a complaints procedure.	11	detention very difficult. I find it painful and at
12	When I went to the welfare department, I informed them	12	times difficult to remember the events there because of
13	I was under 18 years old and I should not be in	13	it. Since being released from detention, I have been
14	detention. However, as far as I can recall, they never	14	diagnosed with depression and PTSD and I continue to
15	informed me of a complaints procedure."	15	suffer from mental health symptoms.
16	I'm going to read a summary of paragraph 73 as	16	I sometimes become too distressed to continue to
17	follows.	17	speak or reflect on the events I witnessed and
18	Following a judicial review brought by D2033, it was	18	experienced in detention. For the same reason, I am
19	determined that his removal to Germany had been	19	also not always able to date these events. I have,
20	unlawful. He has received no apology about his	20	however, tried to describe these and my overall
21	detention or removal and says, "That makes me feel that	21	experience of Brook House to the best of my knowledge to
22	I don't count for anything and they don't care that	22	assist the inquiry.
23	I suffered these things".	23	My solicitors have told me that they have submitted
24	D2033 then provides a statement of truth and the	24	the inquiry bundle of documents related to my detention
25	statement is signed and dated 18 November 2021, and	25	together with a chronology of events they have prepared
23			
23	Page 138		Page 140

1	and a list of key issues arising from my time at	1	questions about my mental health during this appointment
2	Brook House in particular. I would ask that this	2	or how I was feeling at the time. I have considered
3	statement be considered together with these documents	3	document <cjs007130> as requested by the inquiry. The</cjs007130>
4	which I hope will help the inquiry to understand my	4	document indicates that between 03:35 am and 03:56 am on
5	experience at Brook House."	5	1 April 2017, I was held in room 4A in the CSU, which
6	Chair, I then summarise paragraphs 3 through to 16	6	I understand to be the segregation unit. I am not sure
7	as follows.	7	where in the centre I was, but in the early hours of
8	D1713 provides some detail about his background. He	8	1 April 2017, I remained in what I would describe as
9	says that, as a child growing up in Nigeria, he was	9	a waiting area with other detainees and staff rather
10	sexually abused, physically mistreated and forced into	10	than a room or cell with beds until I was seen by the
11	labour exploitation. He says that he was also violently	11	nurse. I do not remember ever staying in the CSU at
12	attacked in Nigeria because of his sexuality. He goes	12	Brook House.
13	on to explain the circumstances of his arrival in the	13	"After the assessment by the nurse, I was taken to
14	UK, his arrest by the police on 31 March 2017 and his	14	a room or cell. It felt more like a cell. There was
15	detention at Brook House later that night.	15	a bunk bed and another bed on the side. The toilet was
16	He says he felt depressed and suicidal on his	16	inside the room separated by a partition or wall but
17	transfer to Brook House.	17	with no door or curtain to protect the person in the
18	Chair, returning, then, to paragraph 17 of his	18	toilet from view. I cannot remember which wing I was
19	statement:	19	placed on, but I recall that the room was on the ground
20	"I arrived at Brook House late at night. I just	20	floor. I have since seen an entry in my medical
21	felt scared. I was led by officers to a waiting room	21	records, dated 7 April 2017 at 19:28, which suggests
22	area. As I was waiting there, I saw a young man whom	22	that I was on C wing. I also cannot remember the room
23	I believe was of Indian origin, and had been sitting	23	number, but I have now seen document <cjs007130> which</cjs007130>
24	quietly in the waiting area when I arrived, being	24	indicates that I stayed in room number 19 on C wing from
25	approached by several detention officers. I do not	25	1 to 17 April 2017. There were two other people sharing
	D 144		D 142
	Page 141		Page 143
1	remember how many officers there were, but it was more	1	my cell. I believe one was a Ghanaian man [and the name
2	than two.	2	is redacted]. I think he was a little bit older than
3	"I heard the officers telling the man that he would	3	I was at the time, in his late 20s or early 30s. My
4	be taken away and then proceeding to hold his arms and	4	other roommate was a man from Grenada who called himself
5	handcuff them behind his back, despite the fact that he	5	[and again the name is redacted].
6	had not been posing any resistance to the officers.	6	"I was not provided with an induction at
7	Witnessing this made me feel even more scared and	7	Brook House. I was not interviewed by any officer upon
8	I feared that I could be handcuffed and taken away at	8	arrival or given a tour of the detention centre
9	any time to be removed to Nigeria.	9	building. I also did not have contact with the detainee
10	"I remained seated in the waiting area for what felt	10	welfare officer while I was at Brook House and was not
11	like hours. I was then seen by a nurse. My medical	11	informed of my rights as a detainee. I was not aware
12	records from Brook House, which I have since seen,	12	that an induction process was, or should have been, in
13	suggest that my examination took place at around 5.23 in	13	place at Brook House or that there was a welfare office
14	the morning of 1 April 2017. I cannot recall exactly	14	there.
15	when the appointment took place, but I remember it being	15	"After I was taken to the cell on 1 April 2017, the
16	very late and in the early hours of the morning. I felt	16	door was locked. I felt desperate and petrified.
17	tired and confused. The nurse asked me some general	17	I could not sleep or eat and I remember sitting on the
18	questions about my health and history. She did not ask	18	floor of the room not knowing what to do. It was dark.
19	me whether I was a victim of torture or had been	19	I started having hot flashes and flashbacks to events in
20	tortured in the past. I have now seen that the nurse's	20	my childhood and mistreatment I had suffered, including
21	entry in my medical records states that I declined an	21	being attacked and physically abused. I felt really low
22	appointment with a doctor. I was not asked whether	22	and started to have thoughts about hurting myself, which
23	I wanted to see a doctor. If I had been asked if	23	scared me.
24	I wanted to see a doctor, I would have said that I did.	24	I felt claustrophobic being locked in a cell. It
25	"I also do not recall being asked any specific	25	also felt humiliating that we would be locked up all
	Page 142		Page 144
	1 age 142	I	Page 144

1	night until someone came to release us in the morning,	1	me or ask how I was.
2	like animals. When the cell door was unlocked later in	2	"I have now seen documents relating to the level of
3	the morning on 1 April 2017, I came out of the cell and	3	ACDT observations that I was on in April 2017. These
4	sat on the floor in the corridor. I remained there for	4	records appear to be extracts of shift handover notes
5	what felt like a long time. Eventually, I asked another	5	for the staff. I have not yet seen my full ACDT
6	-		records, although I understand that my current
7	I would need to go to healthcare. I then went to	7	solicitors have asked for these to be disclosed. The
8	healthcare and I asked a nurse if I could see a doctor	8	ACDT references that I have seen in the handover notes
9	because I was feeling really unwell and continued to	9	do not reflect the level of observations that I actually
10	have hot flashes and flashbacks.	10	received. Document <cjs0072752> states that, on</cjs0072752>
11	"Later that morning, I was seen by a doctor, whom	11	5 April 2017, I was supposed to be observed hourly, and
12	I now know to be Dr Saeed Chaudhary from the medical	12	that staff should have at least two conversations with
13	records that I have since been shown. I told	13	me per day. Document <cjs0072752> suggests that, on</cjs0072752>
14	Dr Chaudhary that I was having flashbacks and that I had	14	6 April 2017, I was to be observed every two hours
15	scars on my face and on my back and that I had been	15	during the night and again to have 'two good quality
16	mistreated in the past. I also told him that I could	16	cons a day' with staff.
17	not eat. I said that I was scared and I would harm	17	"I remember the checks being far less frequent than
18	myself. I felt, throughout the appointment, that	18	these recorded levels. The staff at Brook House never
19	Dr Chaudhary was not fully paying attention to me or at	19	approached me to ask me any questions about my problems
20	least he did not ask me many questions about my physical	20	or my mental health unless I was attending an
21	or mental health. He did not ask me whether I had been	21	appointment with the mental health nurse. When they
22	tortured or ask to see my scars or to explain how I had	22	came to observe me, they just checked that I was in the
23	sustained them. He prescribed me sertraline, which	23	cell.
24	I understand is an antidepressant, and I felt in part	24	Sometimes, when a member of staff came to check,
25	that that was just a way to deal with me quickly.	25	I would try and have a conversation with them. I tried
	Page 145		Page 147
1	"That same day, I was then seen by a mental health	1	to open up and discuss my problems with them. But I did
2	nurse. I do not remember exactly what happened during	2	not feel listened to or supported when I did so.
3	the appointment, as I had several ones during my time at	3	"Early on in my detention, I spoke to my roommate
4	Brook House, and I find it difficult not to confuse some	4	[whose name is redacted], and told him that I was scared
5	of the things that happened during each of them.	5	I would be sent back to Nigeria and killed. He told me
6	"However, I remember that in this first appointment	6	that there was something called asylum that I could make
7	I told the nurse that I had been abused and attacked in	7	a claim for. That was the first time I learned about
8	Nigeria. From the medical records that I have since	8	the asylum process. I also remember a nurse telling me
9	read, I can see that I also showed the nurse the scars	9	what asylum was on the same day.
10	I sustained and told her that I was suffering from	10	"I believe [and, again, this is a reference to the
11	flashbacks. I do not recall the nurse asking me	11	roommate whose name is redacted] then explained what
12	questions about my scars or whether I was a victim of	12	I needed to do to submit my claim to the Home Office.
13	torture. I continued to have thoughts of harming	13	I cannot remember exactly what I did, but after speaking
	torture. I continued to have thoughts of harming	1 13	
14	myself. I also have not been able to eat since I had	14	to him, I sent a letter to the Home Office explaining
14 15			
	myself. I also have not been able to eat since I had	14	to him, I sent a letter to the Home Office explaining
15	myself. I also have not been able to eat since I had entered Brook House because I felt so scared and unwell.	14 15	to him, I sent a letter to the Home Office explaining that I wanted to claim asylum. I did not have legal
15 16	myself. I also have not been able to eat since I had entered Brook House because I felt so scared and unwell.  I now know, having viewed the documents with the help of	14 15 16	to him, I sent a letter to the Home Office explaining that I wanted to claim asylum. I did not have legal representation at the time. I did not send a copy of
15 16 17	myself. I also have not been able to eat since I had entered Brook House because I felt so scared and unwell. I now know, having viewed the documents with the help of my solicitors, that later that day I was put on an ACDT	14 15 16 17	to him, I sent a letter to the Home Office explaining that I wanted to claim asylum. I did not have legal representation at the time. I did not send a copy of the letter to anyone else. I have now had sight of that
15 16 17 18	myself. I also have not been able to eat since I had entered Brook House because I felt so scared and unwell. I now know, having viewed the documents with the help of my solicitors, that later that day I was put on an ACDT document with hourly observations. I did not know what	14 15 16 17 18	to him, I sent a letter to the Home Office explaining that I wanted to claim asylum. I did not have legal representation at the time. I did not send a copy of the letter to anyone else. I have now had sight of that letter dated 1 April 2017. In that letter, I also
15 16 17 18 19	myself. I also have not been able to eat since I had entered Brook House because I felt so scared and unwell. I now know, having viewed the documents with the help of my solicitors, that later that day I was put on an ACDT document with hourly observations. I did not know what an ACDT was at the time, but I understood that someone	14 15 16 17 18 19	to him, I sent a letter to the Home Office explaining that I wanted to claim asylum. I did not have legal representation at the time. I did not send a copy of the letter to anyone else. I have now had sight of that letter dated 1 April 2017. In that letter, I also stated that I felt depressed and suicidal, that I had
15 16 17 18 19 20	myself. I also have not been able to eat since I had entered Brook House because I felt so scared and unwell. I now know, having viewed the documents with the help of my solicitors, that later that day I was put on an ACDT document with hourly observations. I did not know what an ACDT was at the time, but I understood that someone was supposed to come to check regularly that I had not	14 15 16 17 18 19 20	to him, I sent a letter to the Home Office explaining that I wanted to claim asylum. I did not have legal representation at the time. I did not send a copy of the letter to anyone else. I have now had sight of that letter dated 1 April 2017. In that letter, I also stated that I felt depressed and suicidal, that I had lost my appetite and was suffering from flashbacks.
15 16 17 18 19 20 21	myself. I also have not been able to eat since I had entered Brook House because I felt so scared and unwell. I now know, having viewed the documents with the help of my solicitors, that later that day I was put on an ACDT document with hourly observations. I did not know what an ACDT was at the time, but I understood that someone was supposed to come to check regularly that I had not harmed myself. The people who came to do the checks	14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	to him, I sent a letter to the Home Office explaining that I wanted to claim asylum. I did not have legal representation at the time. I did not send a copy of the letter to anyone else. I have now had sight of that letter dated 1 April 2017. In that letter, I also stated that I felt depressed and suicidal, that I had lost my appetite and was suffering from flashbacks.  "During the first few days in detention, I saw
15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	myself. I also have not been able to eat since I had entered Brook House because I felt so scared and unwell. I now know, having viewed the documents with the help of my solicitors, that later that day I was put on an ACDT document with hourly observations. I did not know what an ACDT was at the time, but I understood that someone was supposed to come to check regularly that I had not harmed myself. The people who came to do the checks were G4S officers and not healthcare staff. They just	14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	to him, I sent a letter to the Home Office explaining that I wanted to claim asylum. I did not have legal representation at the time. I did not send a copy of the letter to anyone else. I have now had sight of that letter dated 1 April 2017. In that letter, I also stated that I felt depressed and suicidal, that I had lost my appetite and was suffering from flashbacks.  "During the first few days in detention, I saw a mental health nurse on several occasions. The medical
15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	myself. I also have not been able to eat since I had entered Brook House because I felt so scared and unwell. I now know, having viewed the documents with the help of my solicitors, that later that day I was put on an ACDT document with hourly observations. I did not know what an ACDT was at the time, but I understood that someone was supposed to come to check regularly that I had not harmed myself. The people who came to do the checks were G4S officers and not healthcare staff. They just knocked on my cell door and looked through the	14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	to him, I sent a letter to the Home Office explaining that I wanted to claim asylum. I did not have legal representation at the time. I did not send a copy of the letter to anyone else. I have now had sight of that letter dated 1 April 2017. In that letter, I also stated that I felt depressed and suicidal, that I had lost my appetite and was suffering from flashbacks.  "During the first few days in detention, I saw a mental health nurse on several occasions. The medical records indicate that I saw this nurse for review on
15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	myself. I also have not been able to eat since I had entered Brook House because I felt so scared and unwell. I now know, having viewed the documents with the help of my solicitors, that later that day I was put on an ACDT document with hourly observations. I did not know what an ACDT was at the time, but I understood that someone was supposed to come to check regularly that I had not harmed myself. The people who came to do the checks were G4S officers and not healthcare staff. They just knocked on my cell door and looked through the observation panel instead of entering the room. They	14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	to him, I sent a letter to the Home Office explaining that I wanted to claim asylum. I did not have legal representation at the time. I did not send a copy of the letter to anyone else. I have now had sight of that letter dated 1 April 2017. In that letter, I also stated that I felt depressed and suicidal, that I had lost my appetite and was suffering from flashbacks.  "During the first few days in detention, I saw a mental health nurse on several occasions. The medical records indicate that I saw this nurse for review on 2 and 3 April 2017. I remember that I told her that

1 1 The first day in detention I could not eat at all. "I have read the entry in my medical records dated 2 2 I then kept having difficulties eating for several days. 10 April 2017 at 14:46 referring to a further review 3 Sometimes I did not go to collect my meal at all and 3 which I had with a mental health nurse. I note that the 4 other times I went to collect it but then I was not able 4 nurse recorded that I appeared 'cheerful and talkative' 5 to eat much of it. The food tasted horrible and I felt 5 and that she recorded that I was finding comfort in the 6 so depressed that I had no appetite to eat. 6 church. In the days preceding this appointment, I had 7 "No-one came to check whether or not I had eaten. 7 claimed asylum and that had given me a small hope that 8 8 I have not seen any records of my food refusal or not I would not be removed to Nigeria. 9 9 collecting a meal, although I understand my solicitors "I had also met [again, the name is redacted] the 10 have requested disclosure of any records of this. 10 detainee who was involved in running the prayer services 11 "I started suffering from migraines and crying 11 at Brook House who helped me to concentrate on that 12 12 small hope. Attending the prayer services had given me a lot. The mornings were always the worst part of 13 the day. I also developed diarrhoea. I saw a doctor 13 some slight comfort. Despite this, however, I was still 14 14 feeling mentally very unwell. Every time I returned to and was given some medication for it. Around this time, 15 during one of the reviews with the mental health nurse, 15 my cell, I felt claustrophobic and continued to have 16 flashbacks. I had flashbacks throughout my time in I told her that I struggled with being locked up in my 16 17 room. I remember that I felt claustrophobic and 17 detention. This last mental health review on 18 suffered from flashbacks, particularly of the abuse in 18 10 April 2017 was brief, and I did not feel I was given 19 my childhood. The cell was always dark and I felt 19 the time and space to explain how I actually felt. 20 depressed. At the same time, I felt so unwell that 20 After the review, I was not given any further 21 21 I was unable to spend much time outside of the cell and appointments with the mental health team. Some days 22 off the wing corridor. I think I spent on average 22 later, I asked a G4S officer whether I could be seen 23 approximately 21 hours in the cell and three hours 23 again by a mental health nurse. I cannot remember what 24 outside the cell on any given day. I was practically 24 the officer told me, but it was not a concrete answer 25 25 always in my cell as I felt there was nothing to leave and I did not receive a further appointment. I did not Page 149 Page 151 it for and I was too unwell to be around other people. 1 1 have any further contact with anyone from the 2 I did not go to the library or take part in any 2 Brook House mental health team after this point, even 3 3 educational courses. Many of the spaces that detainees though I continued to feel unwell and suffered from 4 were allowed in felt very confined. I only left my cell 4 flashbacks and nightmares. 5 to watch the other detainees play football or to attend 5 "Following the mental health review on 6 evening prayers. The evening prayers were organised by 6 10 April 2017, staff stopped coming to check on me when 7 7 another detainee -- a Nigerian man known to me as D3704, I was in my cell. Nobody explained to me that I was 8 organised a multi-faith service every evening before 8 being taken off observations at that point. I never 9 lock-up. He was Christian and preached from the Bible 9 signed a form or was asked to provide any comments on 10 10 the closing of my ACDT plan. Having since seen the but detainees of all religions were welcome to attend. 11 I felt safe at evening prayer, it was the only time of 11 observation records in the handover notes from that 12 day at Brook House that I felt okay and ever felt any 12 time, I understand that my ACDT plan was closed on 13 13 11 April 2017. This was not communicated to me at the 14 "I remember being asked by the mental health nurse 14 time 15 whether I had been sexually abused in the past. I could 15 "When I next went to collect my anti-depressant 16 not explain what I had gone through and still find it 16 medication, a nurse told me it was finished and that 17 17 extremely difficult to talk about it. From the medical I did not have a further prescription. I have now seen 18 records I have now seen, it looks like this discussion 18 an entry in my medical records, dated 15 April 2017 at 19 19 took place during an appointment on 8 April 2017. I was 19:50, which states that I had finished my sertraline 20 still on ACDT observations at the time, but they were 20 tablets. The entry states that I refused to make 21 less frequent and happened only after I had been locked 2.1 another appointment with the doctor to renew my

up at night. When I had observations, it was still the

just checked whether I was in the room. I felt that

Page 150

no-one cared how I was.

same as before. They were carried out by an officer who

22

23

24

25

22

23

24

25

subscription as the tablets were making me sleepy. I do

not recall being offered an appointment with the doctor

to renew my prescription. If I had been offered an

Page 152

appointment, I believe I would have accepted. I still

2.1

felt unwell and depressed at the time, particularly when I was in my cell, and I felt that the medication was at least helping me to sleep.

"Whilst I was at Brook House, I was threatened by staff and treated in a way that was often degrading and at times outright abusive and offensive. One night,

at times outright abusive and offensive. One night, a female officer came to lock my cell. I was struggling mentally and, as I have explained, I found the time when the cell was locked at night really difficult and triggering of my flashbacks. I asked her whether she would lock up a dog like she was locking myself and other detainees up every night. She responded with words to the effect of, 'I would never lock up my dog, but I would lock you up'. I was shocked. I did not know who to report the incident to or how to make a complaint.

"I felt humiliated and scared. I felt like I was not being seen or treated as a human being. I do not remember the officer's name but I believe she was a white or mixed-race woman. She was of large build with dark hair and looked like she was in her 20s. I believed that what I was told by the officer had racial undertones. While the way all detainees at Brook House were treated was inhumane, I often felt that the way officers spoke to and acted around detainees of

Page 153

black, African and Middle Eastern origin, including myself, was often even ruder and more aggressive than with others.

"I remember that one day there was a protest which many of the detainees at Brook House took part in because of our conditions of detention. It was getting close to the evening lock-up time and some of us, including myself, had not gone into our rooms. I think almost every detainee on my wing, C wing, took part in the protest. It was a form of protest against how we were being treated every day, both in terms of the conditions in the centre and the way many detainees were mistreated and manhandled by officers.

"We just stood outside our rooms peacefully.

Eventually, a man whom I believe to have been a G4S senior manager, came to the wing and told us that if we didn't go back to our rooms by 9.00 pm and allow the lock-up to take place, we would be taken to the block, which we knew to be the segregation unit. This man was white, of average height and had grey spiky hair. He was wearing a G4S uniform. He looked as though he was in his mid 40s at the time. I had seen him around Brook House prior to the protest. I believe he was a senior manager because whenever a serious incident occurred, he was called up by other staff members to

Page 154

attend the scene.

"He seemed to have authority and carried himself in a commanding manner. The other detainees and I were all scared and did not know what to do. We ended up returning to our rooms and being locked up like every other night. There was no follow-up after the protest and we did not really get a chance to discuss what had happened, even amongst ourselves, because we were locked up immediately.

"I was never physically abused at Brook House but I saw other people, who were vulnerable and often self-harming, being physically mistreated and manhandled. On one occasion, I was standing outside my room door on the ground floor when I saw an Iranian detainee on my wing -- which as mentioned above I understand to have been C wing -- walking towards the door opening onto a corridor which led to the outdoor yard. As he walked towards the door, I heard him mumbling words to the effect of, 'I want to go, I want to get a ticket'. He looked distressed. When he reached the door, he started banging his head on the glass panel that formed part of it. I was quite far from him, so I am not sure whether the glass smashed, but the banging was loud and I could see that he was hitting the door with force. Officers then came out of

## Page 155

the office, which was near the door, and took the detainee away by force. I believe it was four or five of them who surrounded him.

"The officers shouted at him and other detainees to move back and it was difficult for me to properly see how they were holding the detainee who had banged his head on the glass, but they were clearly using force to take him away. I heard from others that he was taken to the block after the incident. We were always scared of being taken there. If there was an incident, even if it involved a detainee causing harm to themselves, you were just taken there. It never happened to me, but I heard it did to others.

"On another occasion, I saw a young detainee,
I believe he was white European, entering the wing
holding his mattress and a duvet. He placed the bedding
on the floor of the corridor across from my room. I was
standing just outside my room. The detainee looked
unkempt and distressed. I heard him say words to the
effect of, 'Kill me. I am going to die'. Soon after,
several officers approached him and surrounded him.
I cannot remember how many officers were there, but it
was more than two and they took the detainee away from
the wing by force. They surrounded the detainee so,
again, it was difficult to see, but from the way they

Page 156

39 (Pages 153 to 156)

1	were moving, it was clear that they were using force on	1	I could report this to anyone as I was scared of what
2	him. As far as I was able to see, the detainee was not	2	could happen to me or him if I reported it. We were
3	resisting.	3	scared to call the officers when someone was under the
4	"I also witnessed a third incident when a detainee	4	influence of spice because we did not know what would
5	self-harmed by cutting his hand or wrist with a sharp	5	happen and people thought they would not provide medical
6	object while many of us were queuing in the canteen	6	help but would instead punish the detainee who was under
7	area. I was about 2 metres away from him, to his side.	7	the influence.
8	There was an officer in charge of distributing the food	8	"I never saw this happening directly myself, but
9	and one standing behind the canteen queue. I heard the	9	I heard from others that it did and that sometimes
10	detainee repeatedly asking the officer in charge of	10	people were taken to the block when found under the
11	distributing the food to take him to healthcare because	11	influence. For someone to be under the influence of
12	he felt unwell and needed his antidepressants, but the	12	spice was, of course, dangerous, but I did not fully
13	officer just ignored him and did not attend to him.	13	understand what it could do to you at the time. And we
14	"The detainee repeated several times that he needed	14	were more scared of the treatment we may be subjected to
15	his antidepressant medication but the officer did not	15	by the officers if we reported the incidents.
16	reply to him. The detainee then cut himself with	16	"I never saw any rehabilitative support being given
17	something sharp that he was holding in one of his hands.	17	or available to the detainees who used drugs at
18	I'm not sure what it was, but there was a lot of blood.	18	Brook House.
19	It was only once he'd cut himself and started bleeding	19	"I witnessed other detainees under the influence of
20	heavily that a number of officers attended and took him	20	drugs. There was a Moroccan man I played football with
21	away.	21	sometimes in the yard, whom I once saw sleeping on the
22	"I think the officers came out of their office on	22	floor of his room. I was walking past his room to do my
23	the wing. There were more than two of them. I do not	23	laundry. I believe he was under the influence of drugs
24	know where he was taken, but I remember him coming back	24	at the time as that type of behaviour was completely out
25	to the wing later that day with his hand bandaged.	25	of character for him. Again, I did not report this, as
	Page 157		Page 159
1	I never complained of or reported these incidents.	1	I was scared and I did not know what would happen if
2	I did not know who to complain to and I was scared that	2	I did. I also once witnessed a young Somali man,
2 3	I did not know who to complain to and I was scared that officers may target me if I did complain and that I may	2 3	I did. I also once witnessed a young Somali man, I think he was 19 or 20 years old, sitting on a chair in
2 3 4	I did not know who to complain to and I was scared that officers may target me if I did complain and that I may be taken to the block. I asked my roommates how to make	2 3 4	I did. I also once witnessed a young Somali man, I think he was 19 or 20 years old, sitting on a chair in his room with saliva coming out of his mouth. He was
2 3 4 5	I did not know who to complain to and I was scared that officers may target me if I did complain and that I may be taken to the block. I asked my roommates how to make a complaint. They told me that there was no system of	2 3 4 5	I did. I also once witnessed a young Somali man, I think he was 19 or 20 years old, sitting on a chair in his room with saliva coming out of his mouth. He was dribbling and clearly unwell. I only stopped briefly in
2 3 4 5 6	I did not know who to complain to and I was scared that officers may target me if I did complain and that I may be taken to the block. I asked my roommates how to make a complaint. They told me that there was no system of oversight at Brook House and no safe place in which to	2 3 4 5 6	I did. I also once witnessed a young Somali man, I think he was 19 or 20 years old, sitting on a chair in his room with saliva coming out of his mouth. He was dribbling and clearly unwell. I only stopped briefly in front of his door. There were other detainees there.
2 3 4 5 6 7	I did not know who to complain to and I was scared that officers may target me if I did complain and that I may be taken to the block. I asked my roommates how to make a complaint. They told me that there was no system of oversight at Brook House and no safe place in which to report a member of staff who had crossed the line.	2 3 4 5 6 7	I did. I also once witnessed a young Somali man, I think he was 19 or 20 years old, sitting on a chair in his room with saliva coming out of his mouth. He was dribbling and clearly unwell. I only stopped briefly in front of his door. There were other detainees there. I then walked on, for the same reason I described above.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	I did not know who to complain to and I was scared that officers may target me if I did complain and that I may be taken to the block. I asked my roommates how to make a complaint. They told me that there was no system of oversight at Brook House and no safe place in which to report a member of staff who had crossed the line. I did not see any other detainee making a complaint nor	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	I did. I also once witnessed a young Somali man, I think he was 19 or 20 years old, sitting on a chair in his room with saliva coming out of his mouth. He was dribbling and clearly unwell. I only stopped briefly in front of his door. There were other detainees there. I then walked on, for the same reason I described above. "At times, I felt I was at risk of being harmed by
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	I did not know who to complain to and I was scared that officers may target me if I did complain and that I may be taken to the block. I asked my roommates how to make a complaint. They told me that there was no system of oversight at Brook House and no safe place in which to report a member of staff who had crossed the line. I did not see any other detainee making a complaint nor did I hear any specific accounts of someone who had	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	I did. I also once witnessed a young Somali man, I think he was 19 or 20 years old, sitting on a chair in his room with saliva coming out of his mouth. He was dribbling and clearly unwell. I only stopped briefly in front of his door. There were other detainees there. I then walked on, for the same reason I described above. "At times, I felt I was at risk of being harmed by other detainees because of my sexuality whilst I was at
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	I did not know who to complain to and I was scared that officers may target me if I did complain and that I may be taken to the block. I asked my roommates how to make a complaint. They told me that there was no system of oversight at Brook House and no safe place in which to report a member of staff who had crossed the line. I did not see any other detainee making a complaint nor did I hear any specific accounts of someone who had complained. We were all scared of the consequences of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	I did. I also once witnessed a young Somali man, I think he was 19 or 20 years old, sitting on a chair in his room with saliva coming out of his mouth. He was dribbling and clearly unwell. I only stopped briefly in front of his door. There were other detainees there. I then walked on, for the same reason I described above.  "At times, I felt I was at risk of being harmed by other detainees because of my sexuality whilst I was at Brook House. Towards the beginning of my detention, in
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	I did not know who to complain to and I was scared that officers may target me if I did complain and that I may be taken to the block. I asked my roommates how to make a complaint. They told me that there was no system of oversight at Brook House and no safe place in which to report a member of staff who had crossed the line. I did not see any other detainee making a complaint nor did I hear any specific accounts of someone who had complained. We were all scared of the consequences of speaking out in that environment. We were living in	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	I did. I also once witnessed a young Somali man, I think he was 19 or 20 years old, sitting on a chair in his room with saliva coming out of his mouth. He was dribbling and clearly unwell. I only stopped briefly in front of his door. There were other detainees there. I then walked on, for the same reason I described above. "At times, I felt I was at risk of being harmed by other detainees because of my sexuality whilst I was at Brook House. Towards the beginning of my detention, in the first week or so, other men in the centre started
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	I did not know who to complain to and I was scared that officers may target me if I did complain and that I may be taken to the block. I asked my roommates how to make a complaint. They told me that there was no system of oversight at Brook House and no safe place in which to report a member of staff who had crossed the line. I did not see any other detainee making a complaint nor did I hear any specific accounts of someone who had complained. We were all scared of the consequences of speaking out in that environment. We were living in fear. Brook House was like hell.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	I did. I also once witnessed a young Somali man, I think he was 19 or 20 years old, sitting on a chair in his room with saliva coming out of his mouth. He was dribbling and clearly unwell. I only stopped briefly in front of his door. There were other detainees there. I then walked on, for the same reason I described above. "At times, I felt I was at risk of being harmed by other detainees because of my sexuality whilst I was at Brook House. Towards the beginning of my detention, in the first week or so, other men in the centre started making sexual advances towards me. I believe some of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	I did not know who to complain to and I was scared that officers may target me if I did complain and that I may be taken to the block. I asked my roommates how to make a complaint. They told me that there was no system of oversight at Brook House and no safe place in which to report a member of staff who had crossed the line. I did not see any other detainee making a complaint nor did I hear any specific accounts of someone who had complained. We were all scared of the consequences of speaking out in that environment. We were living in fear. Brook House was like hell.  "I also did not think that anyone would listen to me	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	I did. I also once witnessed a young Somali man, I think he was 19 or 20 years old, sitting on a chair in his room with saliva coming out of his mouth. He was dribbling and clearly unwell. I only stopped briefly in front of his door. There were other detainees there. I then walked on, for the same reason I described above.  "At times, I felt I was at risk of being harmed by other detainees because of my sexuality whilst I was at Brook House. Towards the beginning of my detention, in the first week or so, other men in the centre started making sexual advances towards me. I believe some of them knew I was bisexual. I felt that the advances
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	I did not know who to complain to and I was scared that officers may target me if I did complain and that I may be taken to the block. I asked my roommates how to make a complaint. They told me that there was no system of oversight at Brook House and no safe place in which to report a member of staff who had crossed the line. I did not see any other detainee making a complaint nor did I hear any specific accounts of someone who had complained. We were all scared of the consequences of speaking out in that environment. We were living in fear. Brook House was like hell.  "I also did not think that anyone would listen to me if I reported these incidents or that anything would	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	I did. I also once witnessed a young Somali man, I think he was 19 or 20 years old, sitting on a chair in his room with saliva coming out of his mouth. He was dribbling and clearly unwell. I only stopped briefly in front of his door. There were other detainees there. I then walked on, for the same reason I described above.  "At times, I felt I was at risk of being harmed by other detainees because of my sexuality whilst I was at Brook House. Towards the beginning of my detention, in the first week or so, other men in the centre started making sexual advances towards me. I believe some of them knew I was bisexual. I felt that the advances were, in fact, a kind of mockery as well as a threat.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	I did not know who to complain to and I was scared that officers may target me if I did complain and that I may be taken to the block. I asked my roommates how to make a complaint. They told me that there was no system of oversight at Brook House and no safe place in which to report a member of staff who had crossed the line. I did not see any other detainee making a complaint nor did I hear any specific accounts of someone who had complained. We were all scared of the consequences of speaking out in that environment. We were living in fear. Brook House was like hell.  "I also did not think that anyone would listen to me if I reported these incidents or that anything would change because they happened so often and so many	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	I did. I also once witnessed a young Somali man, I think he was 19 or 20 years old, sitting on a chair in his room with saliva coming out of his mouth. He was dribbling and clearly unwell. I only stopped briefly in front of his door. There were other detainees there. I then walked on, for the same reason I described above. "At times, I felt I was at risk of being harmed by other detainees because of my sexuality whilst I was at Brook House. Towards the beginning of my detention, in the first week or so, other men in the centre started making sexual advances towards me. I believe some of them knew I was bisexual. I felt that the advances were, in fact, a kind of mockery as well as a threat. I was scared that they would harm me. I did not want
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	I did not know who to complain to and I was scared that officers may target me if I did complain and that I may be taken to the block. I asked my roommates how to make a complaint. They told me that there was no system of oversight at Brook House and no safe place in which to report a member of staff who had crossed the line. I did not see any other detainee making a complaint nor did I hear any specific accounts of someone who had complained. We were all scared of the consequences of speaking out in that environment. We were living in fear. Brook House was like hell.  "I also did not think that anyone would listen to me if I reported these incidents or that anything would change because they happened so often and so many officers were involved.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	I did. I also once witnessed a young Somali man, I think he was 19 or 20 years old, sitting on a chair in his room with saliva coming out of his mouth. He was dribbling and clearly unwell. I only stopped briefly in front of his door. There were other detainees there. I then walked on, for the same reason I described above. "At times, I felt I was at risk of being harmed by other detainees because of my sexuality whilst I was at Brook House. Towards the beginning of my detention, in the first week or so, other men in the centre started making sexual advances towards me. I believe some of them knew I was bisexual. I felt that the advances were, in fact, a kind of mockery as well as a threat. I was scared that they would harm me. I did not want anyone else to find out about my sexuality because I was
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	I did not know who to complain to and I was scared that officers may target me if I did complain and that I may be taken to the block. I asked my roommates how to make a complaint. They told me that there was no system of oversight at Brook House and no safe place in which to report a member of staff who had crossed the line. I did not see any other detainee making a complaint nor did I hear any specific accounts of someone who had complained. We were all scared of the consequences of speaking out in that environment. We were living in fear. Brook House was like hell.  "I also did not think that anyone would listen to me if I reported these incidents or that anything would change because they happened so often and so many officers were involved.  "I witnessed other detainees under the influence of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	I did. I also once witnessed a young Somali man, I think he was 19 or 20 years old, sitting on a chair in his room with saliva coming out of his mouth. He was dribbling and clearly unwell. I only stopped briefly in front of his door. There were other detainees there. I then walked on, for the same reason I described above. "At times, I felt I was at risk of being harmed by other detainees because of my sexuality whilst I was at Brook House. Towards the beginning of my detention, in the first week or so, other men in the centre started making sexual advances towards me. I believe some of them knew I was bisexual. I felt that the advances were, in fact, a kind of mockery as well as a threat. I was scared that they would harm me. I did not want anyone else to find out about my sexuality because I was scared of being mistreated or attacked.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	I did not know who to complain to and I was scared that officers may target me if I did complain and that I may be taken to the block. I asked my roommates how to make a complaint. They told me that there was no system of oversight at Brook House and no safe place in which to report a member of staff who had crossed the line.  I did not see any other detainee making a complaint nor did I hear any specific accounts of someone who had complained. We were all scared of the consequences of speaking out in that environment. We were living in fear. Brook House was like hell.  "I also did not think that anyone would listen to me if I reported these incidents or that anything would change because they happened so often and so many officers were involved.  "I witnessed other detainees under the influence of drugs whilst I was at Brook House. I do not know where	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	I did. I also once witnessed a young Somali man, I think he was 19 or 20 years old, sitting on a chair in his room with saliva coming out of his mouth. He was dribbling and clearly unwell. I only stopped briefly in front of his door. There were other detainees there. I then walked on, for the same reason I described above.  "At times, I felt I was at risk of being harmed by other detainees because of my sexuality whilst I was at Brook House. Towards the beginning of my detention, in the first week or so, other men in the centre started making sexual advances towards me. I believe some of them knew I was bisexual. I felt that the advances were, in fact, a kind of mockery as well as a threat. I was scared that they would harm me. I did not want anyone else to find out about my sexuality because I was scared of being mistreated or attacked.  "I told a mental health nurse during one of my
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	I did not know who to complain to and I was scared that officers may target me if I did complain and that I may be taken to the block. I asked my roommates how to make a complaint. They told me that there was no system of oversight at Brook House and no safe place in which to report a member of staff who had crossed the line.  I did not see any other detainee making a complaint nor did I hear any specific accounts of someone who had complained. We were all scared of the consequences of speaking out in that environment. We were living in fear. Brook House was like hell.  "I also did not think that anyone would listen to me if I reported these incidents or that anything would change because they happened so often and so many officers were involved.  "I witnessed other detainees under the influence of drugs whilst I was at Brook House. I do not know where these detainees got the drugs from. One of my roommates	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	I did. I also once witnessed a young Somali man, I think he was 19 or 20 years old, sitting on a chair in his room with saliva coming out of his mouth. He was dribbling and clearly unwell. I only stopped briefly in front of his door. There were other detainees there. I then walked on, for the same reason I described above.  "At times, I felt I was at risk of being harmed by other detainees because of my sexuality whilst I was at Brook House. Towards the beginning of my detention, in the first week or so, other men in the centre started making sexual advances towards me. I believe some of them knew I was bisexual. I felt that the advances were, in fact, a kind of mockery as well as a threat. I was scared that they would harm me. I did not want anyone else to find out about my sexuality because I was scared of being mistreated or attacked.  "I told a mental health nurse during one of my appointments, which I know to have been the review which
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	I did not know who to complain to and I was scared that officers may target me if I did complain and that I may be taken to the block. I asked my roommates how to make a complaint. They told me that there was no system of oversight at Brook House and no safe place in which to report a member of staff who had crossed the line.  I did not see any other detainee making a complaint nor did I hear any specific accounts of someone who had complained. We were all scared of the consequences of speaking out in that environment. We were living in fear. Brook House was like hell.  "I also did not think that anyone would listen to me if I reported these incidents or that anything would change because they happened so often and so many officers were involved.  "I witnessed other detainees under the influence of drugs whilst I was at Brook House. I do not know where these detainees got the drugs from. One of my roommates was addicted to spice and smoked it in the room.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	I did. I also once witnessed a young Somali man, I think he was 19 or 20 years old, sitting on a chair in his room with saliva coming out of his mouth. He was dribbling and clearly unwell. I only stopped briefly in front of his door. There were other detainees there. I then walked on, for the same reason I described above. "At times, I felt I was at risk of being harmed by other detainees because of my sexuality whilst I was at Brook House. Towards the beginning of my detention, in the first week or so, other men in the centre started making sexual advances towards me. I believe some of them knew I was bisexual. I felt that the advances were, in fact, a kind of mockery as well as a threat. I was scared that they would harm me. I did not want anyone else to find out about my sexuality because I was scared of being mistreated or attacked.  "I told a mental health nurse during one of my appointments, which I know to have been the review which took place on 8 April 2017, on the basis of the records
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	I did not know who to complain to and I was scared that officers may target me if I did complain and that I may be taken to the block. I asked my roommates how to make a complaint. They told me that there was no system of oversight at Brook House and no safe place in which to report a member of staff who had crossed the line. I did not see any other detainee making a complaint nor did I hear any specific accounts of someone who had complained. We were all scared of the consequences of speaking out in that environment. We were living in fear. Brook House was like hell.  "I also did not think that anyone would listen to me if I reported these incidents or that anything would change because they happened so often and so many officers were involved.  "I witnessed other detainees under the influence of drugs whilst I was at Brook House. I do not know where these detainees got the drugs from. One of my roommates was addicted to spice and smoked it in the room.  I never smoked this myself but I was scared of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	I did. I also once witnessed a young Somali man, I think he was 19 or 20 years old, sitting on a chair in his room with saliva coming out of his mouth. He was dribbling and clearly unwell. I only stopped briefly in front of his door. There were other detainees there. I then walked on, for the same reason I described above.  "At times, I felt I was at risk of being harmed by other detainees because of my sexuality whilst I was at Brook House. Towards the beginning of my detention, in the first week or so, other men in the centre started making sexual advances towards me. I believe some of them knew I was bisexual. I felt that the advances were, in fact, a kind of mockery as well as a threat. I was scared that they would harm me. I did not want anyone else to find out about my sexuality because I was scared of being mistreated or attacked.  "I told a mental health nurse during one of my appointments, which I know to have been the review which took place on 8 April 2017, on the basis of the records I have seen, that other detainees were making sexual
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	I did not know who to complain to and I was scared that officers may target me if I did complain and that I may be taken to the block. I asked my roommates how to make a complaint. They told me that there was no system of oversight at Brook House and no safe place in which to report a member of staff who had crossed the line. I did not see any other detainee making a complaint nor did I hear any specific accounts of someone who had complained. We were all scared of the consequences of speaking out in that environment. We were living in fear. Brook House was like hell.  "I also did not think that anyone would listen to me if I reported these incidents or that anything would change because they happened so often and so many officers were involved.  "I witnessed other detainees under the influence of drugs whilst I was at Brook House. I do not know where these detainees got the drugs from. One of my roommates was addicted to spice and smoked it in the room.  I never smoked this myself but I was scared of the secondary effect that the smoke would have on me.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	I did. I also once witnessed a young Somali man, I think he was 19 or 20 years old, sitting on a chair in his room with saliva coming out of his mouth. He was dribbling and clearly unwell. I only stopped briefly in front of his door. There were other detainees there. I then walked on, for the same reason I described above.  "At times, I felt I was at risk of being harmed by other detainees because of my sexuality whilst I was at Brook House. Towards the beginning of my detention, in the first week or so, other men in the centre started making sexual advances towards me. I believe some of them knew I was bisexual. I felt that the advances were, in fact, a kind of mockery as well as a threat. I was scared that they would harm me. I did not want anyone else to find out about my sexuality because I was scared of being mistreated or attacked.  "I told a mental health nurse during one of my appointments, which I know to have been the review which took place on 8 April 2017, on the basis of the records I have seen, that other detainees were making sexual advances towards me and that I was not comfortable with
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	I did not know who to complain to and I was scared that officers may target me if I did complain and that I may be taken to the block. I asked my roommates how to make a complaint. They told me that there was no system of oversight at Brook House and no safe place in which to report a member of staff who had crossed the line.  I did not see any other detainee making a complaint nor did I hear any specific accounts of someone who had complained. We were all scared of the consequences of speaking out in that environment. We were living in fear. Brook House was like hell.  "I also did not think that anyone would listen to me if I reported these incidents or that anything would change because they happened so often and so many officers were involved.  "I witnessed other detainees under the influence of drugs whilst I was at Brook House. I do not know where these detainees got the drugs from. One of my roommates was addicted to spice and smoked it in the room.  I never smoked this myself but I was scared of the secondary effect that the smoke would have on me.  I worried about my roommate, as he often looked	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	I did. I also once witnessed a young Somali man, I think he was 19 or 20 years old, sitting on a chair in his room with saliva coming out of his mouth. He was dribbling and clearly unwell. I only stopped briefly in front of his door. There were other detainees there. I then walked on, for the same reason I described above.  "At times, I felt I was at risk of being harmed by other detainees because of my sexuality whilst I was at Brook House. Towards the beginning of my detention, in the first week or so, other men in the centre started making sexual advances towards me. I believe some of them knew I was bisexual. I felt that the advances were, in fact, a kind of mockery as well as a threat. I was scared that they would harm me. I did not want anyone else to find out about my sexuality because I was scared of being mistreated or attacked.  "I told a mental health nurse during one of my appointments, which I know to have been the review which took place on 8 April 2017, on the basis of the records I have seen, that other detainees were making sexual advances towards me and that I was not comfortable with it. The nurse also recorded that I said that this was
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	I did not know who to complain to and I was scared that officers may target me if I did complain and that I may be taken to the block. I asked my roommates how to make a complaint. They told me that there was no system of oversight at Brook House and no safe place in which to report a member of staff who had crossed the line.  I did not see any other detainee making a complaint nor did I hear any specific accounts of someone who had complained. We were all scared of the consequences of speaking out in that environment. We were living in fear. Brook House was like hell.  "I also did not think that anyone would listen to me if I reported these incidents or that anything would change because they happened so often and so many officers were involved.  "I witnessed other detainees under the influence of drugs whilst I was at Brook House. I do not know where these detainees got the drugs from. One of my roommates was addicted to spice and smoked it in the room.  I never smoked this myself but I was scared of the secondary effect that the smoke would have on me.  I worried about my roommate, as he often looked unwell as if he was coming in and out of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	I did. I also once witnessed a young Somali man, I think he was 19 or 20 years old, sitting on a chair in his room with saliva coming out of his mouth. He was dribbling and clearly unwell. I only stopped briefly in front of his door. There were other detainees there. I then walked on, for the same reason I described above. "At times, I felt I was at risk of being harmed by other detainees because of my sexuality whilst I was at Brook House. Towards the beginning of my detention, in the first week or so, other men in the centre started making sexual advances towards me. I believe some of them knew I was bisexual. I felt that the advances were, in fact, a kind of mockery as well as a threat. I was scared that they would harm me. I did not want anyone else to find out about my sexuality because I was scared of being mistreated or attacked.  "I told a mental health nurse during one of my appointments, which I know to have been the review which took place on 8 April 2017, on the basis of the records I have seen, that other detainees were making sexual advances towards me and that I was not comfortable with it. The nurse also recorded that I said that this was because I was not gay. I do not remember saying this.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	I did not know who to complain to and I was scared that officers may target me if I did complain and that I may be taken to the block. I asked my roommates how to make a complaint. They told me that there was no system of oversight at Brook House and no safe place in which to report a member of staff who had crossed the line.  I did not see any other detainee making a complaint nor did I hear any specific accounts of someone who had complained. We were all scared of the consequences of speaking out in that environment. We were living in fear. Brook House was like hell.  "I also did not think that anyone would listen to me if I reported these incidents or that anything would change because they happened so often and so many officers were involved.  "I witnessed other detainees under the influence of drugs whilst I was at Brook House. I do not know where these detainees got the drugs from. One of my roommates was addicted to spice and smoked it in the room.  I never smoked this myself but I was scared of the secondary effect that the smoke would have on me.  I worried about my roommate, as he often looked	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	I did. I also once witnessed a young Somali man, I think he was 19 or 20 years old, sitting on a chair in his room with saliva coming out of his mouth. He was dribbling and clearly unwell. I only stopped briefly in front of his door. There were other detainees there. I then walked on, for the same reason I described above.  "At times, I felt I was at risk of being harmed by other detainees because of my sexuality whilst I was at Brook House. Towards the beginning of my detention, in the first week or so, other men in the centre started making sexual advances towards me. I believe some of them knew I was bisexual. I felt that the advances were, in fact, a kind of mockery as well as a threat. I was scared that they would harm me. I did not want anyone else to find out about my sexuality because I was scared of being mistreated or attacked.  "I told a mental health nurse during one of my appointments, which I know to have been the review which took place on 8 April 2017, on the basis of the records I have seen, that other detainees were making sexual advances towards me and that I was not comfortable with it. The nurse also recorded that I said that this was

1	time. I did not trust anyone. I felt that I needed to	1	else to wear. I was cold and felt humiliated. I was
2	protect myself. I did not know what else to do about	2	transferred to Harmondsworth not long after in a van
3	the detainees making advances towards me. I just	3	with other detainees and escort officers."
4	started to ignore them and eventually they stopped.	4	Chair, I then summarise paragraphs 48 through to 49
5	"I did not speak to the detention officers or	5	as follows.
6	healthcare staff about this again. I did not feel that	6	D1713 then gives an account of a screening
7	anyone would help, and I was scared that some members of	7	appointment with a nurse at Harmondsworth in which he
8	staff may be homophobic and that I would not be safe	8	says that he reported he had been attacked in Nigeria
9	because of the way we were being treated generally at	9	and showed the nurse his scars. He says he does not
10	Brook House and on the basis of my past experiences in	10	recall being asked if he was a victim of torture or if
11	Nigeria.	11	he wanted to see a doctor for an initial assessment. He
12	"During my period of detention at Brook House, I did	12	also states that, having reviewed the medical records,
13	not visit the welfare office. I was not told that such	13	the nurse incorrectly recorded that he had not received
14	an office existed at the detention centre. I was not	14	any medication for mental health problems, despite
15	aware of what the PSU, IMB or PPO were, although my	15	having been prescribed antidepressant medication at
16	solicitor has now explained these acronyms to me. I was	16	Brook House. He does not recall being asked any
17	not in contact with any charities whilst at Brook House	17	questions about his mental health during this
18	and at that stage had not heard of GDWG or	18	appointment, though he continued to feel unwell and
19	Medical Justice.	19	suffered from ongoing flashbacks and nightmares.
20	"I only received support from Medical Justice after	20	D1713 goes on to describe a nightmare he had during
21	I left Brook House and was transferred to Harmondsworth.	21	his first night at Harmondsworth about his experiences
22	I was not aware of any support services that I could	22	in Nigeria, which he informed the Home Office of.
23	access at Brook House, other than the evening prayer	23	Returning, chair, to paragraph 50 of his witness
24	I attended which, as I mentioned, was organised by	24	statement:
25	a fellow detainee. External pastors did come to	25	"A few days after, on or around 20 April 2017,
	Page 161		Page 163
	- 186 - 101		- 184 - 184
1	Brook House on Sundays, but I preferred to attend the	1	officers came to see me I think I was in my room in
2	detainee-run prayers.	2	the induction wing at the time and told me that I was
3	"While at Brook House, I had access to a basic cell	3	being sent back to Brook House. They told me that I was
4	phone on which calls could be made. However, I did not	4	being sent back there for my bail hearing. I felt
5	have credit on this phone for a long time and,	5	confused and scared to be returned to Brook House
6	therefore, could not use it to contact anyone. Nobody	6	because of how I had been treated there and what I had
7	told me that I could have visitors at Brook House or	7	witnessed, but felt that I had no choice but to comply
8	explained to me how I could send a letter to my friends	8	with the officers' orders.
9	or family."	9	"After I arrived back at Brook House, I had
10	Turning now to D1713's transfer between Brook House	10	a further screening appointment with a nurse. My
11	and Harmondsworth.	11	memories of the screening appointments I had upon
12	"On 17 April 2017, I was in the laundry room washing	12	transfer to and from Harmondsworth sometimes overlap.
13	my clothes. I was just wearing tracksuit bottoms and no	13	However, I remember feeling like the nurse was not
14	top, as I had taken off my T-shirt to wash it. An	14	listening to me. I don't remember being asked at the
15	officer entered the room and approached me. He told me	15	second screening appointment at Brook House whether
16	that I was being transferred to Harmondsworth detention	16	I was a victim of torture or whether I wished to have an
17	centre and that I had to get ready immediately. I did	17	appointment with the doctor.
18	not understand why I was being transferred and the	18	"I have seen the entry in my IRC medical records
19	officer did not explain this to me. I explained to them	19	dated 20 April 2017 which states that I had 'no medical
20	that my clothes were all in the laundry and I had	20	or mental health issues'. I consider this assessment to
21	nothing dry to wear. The officer said that he did not	21	be plainly inaccurate. By that date, I had attended
22	care. His tone of voice was dismissive, and I felt that	22	multiple mental health reviews at Brook House and had
23	I had no choice. I took my clothes out of the laundry	23	repeatedly told the doctors, nurses and detention centre
24	and returned to my room to pack them wet into my	24	staff that I felt depressed and was suffering from
25	suitcase. I put on a wet T-shirt because I had nothing	25	flashbacks from my previous mistreatment in Nigeria.
	Page 162		Page 164
	1 450 102		1 450 101

1	I do not know why my mental health issues were not	1	events in Nigeria and nightmares. I told the doctor
2	recorded in my medical records on that date.	2	that I was distressed and that my mental health was not
3	"I was at Brook House during this second period for	3	in the right place, but he did not ask me to elaborate
4	only two days. I cannot remember what the number of my	4	on this. I did not feel that anyone cared or that
5	cell was during that time, but I remember that the cell	5	I would get any support. The doctor did not explain to
6	was on the first floor. I have since considered	6	me the purpose of the appointment.
7	document <cjs007130>, which suggests that I was on</cjs007130>	7	"I know now from the documents provided to me by my
8	C wing in room number 2. The room had a similar layout	8	solicitors that the above appointment on 6 May 2017
9	to my first cell at Brook House and the toilet was only	9	resulted in a rule 35(3) report being prepared for me.
10	partially separated from the rest of the room. I shared	10	I have now seen a copy of the report in which the
11	that room with one other person. I do not remember my	11	document summarises my account of torture and states
12	roommate's name, as I only stayed there for two nights.	12	that the scars he observed on my body may be due to the
13	"The Home Office records I have seen now confirm	13	attack that I was subjected to in Nigeria.
14	that on 21 April 2017 my bail application was withdrawn.	14	"Although I agree with what the doctor recorded in
15	I do not know the reason for this. I did not ask for	15	relation to my scars being due to the attack that
16	the application to be withdrawn and it was not explained	16	I suffered, I am surprised and upset that he did not
17	to me why the bail hearing didn't go ahead.	17	record anything about my mental health and the impact
18	"I did not have any contact with the mental health	18	that detention was having on me.
19	team during this second period at Brook House, even	19	"I have also since learnt that the Home Office
20	though I continued to feel unwell and suffer from	20	responded to this report, accepting that my account met
21	flashbacks. I was not reviewed or asked any questions	21	the definition of torture, but deciding that I was to
22	about my history of torture, which I had reported to	22	remain in detention. I do not remember being provided
23	healthcare during my first period of detention at	23	with this response at the time or having it explained to
24	Brook House."	24	me.
25	Chair, I then summarise paragraphs 54 through to 55	25	"I have reviewed a Home Office detention review
	D 165		D 167
	Page 165		Page 167
1	as follows.	1	dated 10 May 2017 which states that there was no
2	D1713 was then transferred back to Harmondsworth on	2	evidence from healthcare that detention was having
3	22 4 12017 11 4 4 4 4 1 1		
	22 April 2017. He states that the medical records	3	a detrimental impact on me. This document appears to
4	incorrectly record he declined his screening	3 4	
4 5	-		a detrimental impact on me. This document appears to
	incorrectly record he declined his screening	4	a detrimental impact on me. This document appears to have been drafted on 10 May 2017, four days after my
5	incorrectly record he declined his screening appointment. He says he did not decline this	4 5	a detrimental impact on me. This document appears to have been drafted on 10 May 2017, four days after my rule 35(3) appointment. I do not understand how such
5 6	incorrectly record he declined his screening appointment. He says he did not decline this appointment; he simply struggled to understand why he	4 5 6	a detrimental impact on me. This document appears to have been drafted on 10 May 2017, four days after my rule 35(3) appointment. I do not understand how such a conclusion could have been reached, given that I was still suffering from serious mental ill-health and I had
5 6 7	incorrectly record he declined his screening appointment. He says he did not decline this appointment; he simply struggled to understand why he was being asked the same questions he had been asked	4 5 6 7	a detrimental impact on me. This document appears to have been drafted on 10 May 2017, four days after my rule 35(3) appointment. I do not understand how such a conclusion could have been reached, given that I was
5 6 7 8	incorrectly record he declined his screening appointment. He says he did not decline this appointment; he simply struggled to understand why he was being asked the same questions he had been asked only a matter of days before, following his first	4 5 6 7 8	a detrimental impact on me. This document appears to have been drafted on 10 May 2017, four days after my rule 35(3) appointment. I do not understand how such a conclusion could have been reached, given that I was still suffering from serious mental ill-health and I had explained my symptoms to healthcare on many occasions."
5 6 7 8 9	incorrectly record he declined his screening appointment. He says he did not decline this appointment; he simply struggled to understand why he was being asked the same questions he had been asked only a matter of days before, following his first transfer to Harmondsworth, when nothing had changed in	4 5 6 7 8 9	a detrimental impact on me. This document appears to have been drafted on 10 May 2017, four days after my rule 35(3) appointment. I do not understand how such a conclusion could have been reached, given that I was still suffering from serious mental ill-health and I had explained my symptoms to healthcare on many occasions."  Chair, I then summarise paragraphs 59 through to 64
5 6 7 8 9 10	incorrectly record he declined his screening appointment. He says he did not decline this appointment; he simply struggled to understand why he was being asked the same questions he had been asked only a matter of days before, following his first transfer to Harmondsworth, when nothing had changed in his circumstances.	4 5 6 7 8 9	a detrimental impact on me. This document appears to have been drafted on 10 May 2017, four days after my rule 35(3) appointment. I do not understand how such a conclusion could have been reached, given that I was still suffering from serious mental ill-health and I had explained my symptoms to healthcare on many occasions."  Chair, I then summarise paragraphs 59 through to 64 as follows.
5 6 7 8 9 10 11	incorrectly record he declined his screening appointment. He says he did not decline this appointment; he simply struggled to understand why he was being asked the same questions he had been asked only a matter of days before, following his first transfer to Harmondsworth, when nothing had changed in his circumstances.  Resuming then, chair, at paragraph 56 of D1713's	4 5 6 7 8 9 10	a detrimental impact on me. This document appears to have been drafted on 10 May 2017, four days after my rule 35(3) appointment. I do not understand how such a conclusion could have been reached, given that I was still suffering from serious mental ill-health and I had explained my symptoms to healthcare on many occasions."  Chair, I then summarise paragraphs 59 through to 64 as follows.  D1713 then gives an account of his substantive
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	incorrectly record he declined his screening appointment. He says he did not decline this appointment; he simply struggled to understand why he was being asked the same questions he had been asked only a matter of days before, following his first transfer to Harmondsworth, when nothing had changed in his circumstances.  Resuming then, chair, at paragraph 56 of D1713's statement:	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	a detrimental impact on me. This document appears to have been drafted on 10 May 2017, four days after my rule 35(3) appointment. I do not understand how such a conclusion could have been reached, given that I was still suffering from serious mental ill-health and I had explained my symptoms to healthcare on many occasions."  Chair, I then summarise paragraphs 59 through to 64 as follows.  D1713 then gives an account of his substantive asylum interview in which he provided a detailed account
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	incorrectly record he declined his screening appointment. He says he did not decline this appointment; he simply struggled to understand why he was being asked the same questions he had been asked only a matter of days before, following his first transfer to Harmondsworth, when nothing had changed in his circumstances.  Resuming then, chair, at paragraph 56 of D1713's statement:  "It was not until around five weeks after I was	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	a detrimental impact on me. This document appears to have been drafted on 10 May 2017, four days after my rule 35(3) appointment. I do not understand how such a conclusion could have been reached, given that I was still suffering from serious mental ill-health and I had explained my symptoms to healthcare on many occasions."  Chair, I then summarise paragraphs 59 through to 64 as follows.  D1713 then gives an account of his substantive asylum interview in which he provided a detailed account of his torture and past abuse. He says this led to him
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	incorrectly record he declined his screening appointment. He says he did not decline this appointment; he simply struggled to understand why he was being asked the same questions he had been asked only a matter of days before, following his first transfer to Harmondsworth, when nothing had changed in his circumstances.  Resuming then, chair, at paragraph 56 of D1713's statement:  "It was not until around five weeks after I was first detained, on 6 May 2017 I know the precise date	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	a detrimental impact on me. This document appears to have been drafted on 10 May 2017, four days after my rule 35(3) appointment. I do not understand how such a conclusion could have been reached, given that I was still suffering from serious mental ill-health and I had explained my symptoms to healthcare on many occasions."  Chair, I then summarise paragraphs 59 through to 64 as follows.  D1713 then gives an account of his substantive asylum interview in which he provided a detailed account of his torture and past abuse. He says this led to him being referred by the Home Office as a potential victim
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	incorrectly record he declined his screening appointment. He says he did not decline this appointment; he simply struggled to understand why he was being asked the same questions he had been asked only a matter of days before, following his first transfer to Harmondsworth, when nothing had changed in his circumstances.  Resuming then, chair, at paragraph 56 of D1713's statement:  "It was not until around five weeks after I was first detained, on 6 May 2017 I know the precise date from the records that I have seen that I had an	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	a detrimental impact on me. This document appears to have been drafted on 10 May 2017, four days after my rule 35(3) appointment. I do not understand how such a conclusion could have been reached, given that I was still suffering from serious mental ill-health and I had explained my symptoms to healthcare on many occasions."  Chair, I then summarise paragraphs 59 through to 64 as follows.  D1713 then gives an account of his substantive asylum interview in which he provided a detailed account of his torture and past abuse. He says this led to him being referred by the Home Office as a potential victim of trafficking. He states that his asylum claim was
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	incorrectly record he declined his screening appointment. He says he did not decline this appointment; he simply struggled to understand why he was being asked the same questions he had been asked only a matter of days before, following his first transfer to Harmondsworth, when nothing had changed in his circumstances.  Resuming then, chair, at paragraph 56 of D1713's statement:  "It was not until around five weeks after I was first detained, on 6 May 2017 I know the precise date from the records that I have seen that I had an appointment with a doctor at Harmondsworth, where I was	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	a detrimental impact on me. This document appears to have been drafted on 10 May 2017, four days after my rule 35(3) appointment. I do not understand how such a conclusion could have been reached, given that I was still suffering from serious mental ill-health and I had explained my symptoms to healthcare on many occasions."  Chair, I then summarise paragraphs 59 through to 64 as follows.  D1713 then gives an account of his substantive asylum interview in which he provided a detailed account of his torture and past abuse. He says this led to him being referred by the Home Office as a potential victim of trafficking. He states that his asylum claim was refused by the Home Office, though he appealed against
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	incorrectly record he declined his screening appointment. He says he did not decline this appointment; he simply struggled to understand why he was being asked the same questions he had been asked only a matter of days before, following his first transfer to Harmondsworth, when nothing had changed in his circumstances.  Resuming then, chair, at paragraph 56 of D1713's statement:  "It was not until around five weeks after I was first detained, on 6 May 2017 I know the precise date from the records that I have seen that I had an appointment with a doctor at Harmondsworth, where I was asked questions for the first time about the torture	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	a detrimental impact on me. This document appears to have been drafted on 10 May 2017, four days after my rule 35(3) appointment. I do not understand how such a conclusion could have been reached, given that I was still suffering from serious mental ill-health and I had explained my symptoms to healthcare on many occasions."  Chair, I then summarise paragraphs 59 through to 64 as follows.  D1713 then gives an account of his substantive asylum interview in which he provided a detailed account of his torture and past abuse. He says this led to him being referred by the Home Office as a potential victim of trafficking. He states that his asylum claim was refused by the Home Office, though he appealed against this decision.
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	incorrectly record he declined his screening appointment. He says he did not decline this appointment; he simply struggled to understand why he was being asked the same questions he had been asked only a matter of days before, following his first transfer to Harmondsworth, when nothing had changed in his circumstances.  Resuming then, chair, at paragraph 56 of D1713's statement:  "It was not until around five weeks after I was first detained, on 6 May 2017 I know the precise date from the records that I have seen that I had an appointment with a doctor at Harmondsworth, where I was asked questions for the first time about the torture I had suffered in Nigeria. The appointment was brief,	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	a detrimental impact on me. This document appears to have been drafted on 10 May 2017, four days after my rule 35(3) appointment. I do not understand how such a conclusion could have been reached, given that I was still suffering from serious mental ill-health and I had explained my symptoms to healthcare on many occasions."  Chair, I then summarise paragraphs 59 through to 64 as follows.  D1713 then gives an account of his substantive asylum interview in which he provided a detailed account of his torture and past abuse. He says this led to him being referred by the Home Office as a potential victim of trafficking. He states that his asylum claim was refused by the Home Office, though he appealed against this decision.  D1713 states that he continued to struggle mentally
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	incorrectly record he declined his screening appointment. He says he did not decline this appointment; he simply struggled to understand why he was being asked the same questions he had been asked only a matter of days before, following his first transfer to Harmondsworth, when nothing had changed in his circumstances.  Resuming then, chair, at paragraph 56 of D1713's statement:  "It was not until around five weeks after I was first detained, on 6 May 2017 I know the precise date from the records that I have seen that I had an appointment with a doctor at Harmondsworth, where I was asked questions for the first time about the torture I had suffered in Nigeria. The appointment was brief, and I did not feel I had enough time to properly explain	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	a detrimental impact on me. This document appears to have been drafted on 10 May 2017, four days after my rule 35(3) appointment. I do not understand how such a conclusion could have been reached, given that I was still suffering from serious mental ill-health and I had explained my symptoms to healthcare on many occasions."  Chair, I then summarise paragraphs 59 through to 64 as follows.  D1713 then gives an account of his substantive asylum interview in which he provided a detailed account of his torture and past abuse. He says this led to him being referred by the Home Office as a potential victim of trafficking. He states that his asylum claim was refused by the Home Office, though he appealed against this decision.  D1713 states that he continued to struggle mentally whilst at Harmondsworth. However, he did not receive
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	incorrectly record he declined his screening appointment. He says he did not decline this appointment; he simply struggled to understand why he was being asked the same questions he had been asked only a matter of days before, following his first transfer to Harmondsworth, when nothing had changed in his circumstances.  Resuming then, chair, at paragraph 56 of D1713's statement:  "It was not until around five weeks after I was first detained, on 6 May 2017 I know the precise date from the records that I have seen that I had an appointment with a doctor at Harmondsworth, where I was asked questions for the first time about the torture I had suffered in Nigeria. The appointment was brief, and I did not feel I had enough time to properly explain to the doctor what had happened to me. I showed him my	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	a detrimental impact on me. This document appears to have been drafted on 10 May 2017, four days after my rule 35(3) appointment. I do not understand how such a conclusion could have been reached, given that I was still suffering from serious mental ill-health and I had explained my symptoms to healthcare on many occasions."  Chair, I then summarise paragraphs 59 through to 64 as follows.  D1713 then gives an account of his substantive asylum interview in which he provided a detailed account of his torture and past abuse. He says this led to him being referred by the Home Office as a potential victim of trafficking. He states that his asylum claim was refused by the Home Office, though he appealed against this decision.  D1713 states that he continued to struggle mentally whilst at Harmondsworth. However, he did not receive any mental health support during his several months'
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	incorrectly record he declined his screening appointment. He says he did not decline this appointment; he simply struggled to understand why he was being asked the same questions he had been asked only a matter of days before, following his first transfer to Harmondsworth, when nothing had changed in his circumstances.  Resuming then, chair, at paragraph 56 of D1713's statement:  "It was not until around five weeks after I was first detained, on 6 May 2017 I know the precise date from the records that I have seen that I had an appointment with a doctor at Harmondsworth, where I was asked questions for the first time about the torture I had suffered in Nigeria. The appointment was brief, and I did not feel I had enough time to properly explain to the doctor what had happened to me. I showed him my scars. He did not ask me whether I had any related	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	a detrimental impact on me. This document appears to have been drafted on 10 May 2017, four days after my rule 35(3) appointment. I do not understand how such a conclusion could have been reached, given that I was still suffering from serious mental ill-health and I had explained my symptoms to healthcare on many occasions."  Chair, I then summarise paragraphs 59 through to 64 as follows.  D1713 then gives an account of his substantive asylum interview in which he provided a detailed account of his torture and past abuse. He says this led to him being referred by the Home Office as a potential victim of trafficking. He states that his asylum claim was refused by the Home Office, though he appealed against this decision.  D1713 states that he continued to struggle mentally whilst at Harmondsworth. However, he did not receive any mental health support during his several months' detention there, nor was he prescribed any further
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	incorrectly record he declined his screening appointment. He says he did not decline this appointment; he simply struggled to understand why he was being asked the same questions he had been asked only a matter of days before, following his first transfer to Harmondsworth, when nothing had changed in his circumstances.  Resuming then, chair, at paragraph 56 of D1713's statement:  "It was not until around five weeks after I was first detained, on 6 May 2017 I know the precise date from the records that I have seen that I had an appointment with a doctor at Harmondsworth, where I was asked questions for the first time about the torture I had suffered in Nigeria. The appointment was brief, and I did not feel I had enough time to properly explain to the doctor what had happened to me. I showed him my scars. He did not ask me whether I had any related psychological symptoms or how I felt mentally whilst in	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	a detrimental impact on me. This document appears to have been drafted on 10 May 2017, four days after my rule 35(3) appointment. I do not understand how such a conclusion could have been reached, given that I was still suffering from serious mental ill-health and I had explained my symptoms to healthcare on many occasions."  Chair, I then summarise paragraphs 59 through to 64 as follows.  D1713 then gives an account of his substantive asylum interview in which he provided a detailed account of his torture and past abuse. He says this led to him being referred by the Home Office as a potential victim of trafficking. He states that his asylum claim was refused by the Home Office, though he appealed against this decision.  D1713 states that he continued to struggle mentally whilst at Harmondsworth. However, he did not receive any mental health support during his several months' detention there, nor was he prescribed any further medication for his mental health issues. He explains he
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	incorrectly record he declined his screening appointment. He says he did not decline this appointment; he simply struggled to understand why he was being asked the same questions he had been asked only a matter of days before, following his first transfer to Harmondsworth, when nothing had changed in his circumstances.  Resuming then, chair, at paragraph 56 of D1713's statement:  "It was not until around five weeks after I was first detained, on 6 May 2017 I know the precise date from the records that I have seen that I had an appointment with a doctor at Harmondsworth, where I was asked questions for the first time about the torture I had suffered in Nigeria. The appointment was brief, and I did not feel I had enough time to properly explain to the doctor what had happened to me. I showed him my scars. He did not ask me whether I had any related psychological symptoms or how I felt mentally whilst in detention.	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	a detrimental impact on me. This document appears to have been drafted on 10 May 2017, four days after my rule 35(3) appointment. I do not understand how such a conclusion could have been reached, given that I was still suffering from serious mental ill-health and I had explained my symptoms to healthcare on many occasions."  Chair, I then summarise paragraphs 59 through to 64 as follows.  D1713 then gives an account of his substantive asylum interview in which he provided a detailed account of his torture and past abuse. He says this led to him being referred by the Home Office as a potential victim of trafficking. He states that his asylum claim was refused by the Home Office, though he appealed against this decision.  D1713 states that he continued to struggle mentally whilst at Harmondsworth. However, he did not receive any mental health support during his several months' detention there, nor was he prescribed any further medication for his mental health issues. He explains he contacted Medical Justice in around late June 2017, who
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	incorrectly record he declined his screening appointment. He says he did not decline this appointment; he simply struggled to understand why he was being asked the same questions he had been asked only a matter of days before, following his first transfer to Harmondsworth, when nothing had changed in his circumstances.  Resuming then, chair, at paragraph 56 of D1713's statement:  "It was not until around five weeks after I was first detained, on 6 May 2017 I know the precise date from the records that I have seen that I had an appointment with a doctor at Harmondsworth, where I was asked questions for the first time about the torture I had suffered in Nigeria. The appointment was brief, and I did not feel I had enough time to properly explain to the doctor what had happened to me. I showed him my scars. He did not ask me whether I had any related psychological symptoms or how I felt mentally whilst in detention.  "I was still feeling really unwell. I felt	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	a detrimental impact on me. This document appears to have been drafted on 10 May 2017, four days after my rule 35(3) appointment. I do not understand how such a conclusion could have been reached, given that I was still suffering from serious mental ill-health and I had explained my symptoms to healthcare on many occasions."  Chair, I then summarise paragraphs 59 through to 64 as follows.  D1713 then gives an account of his substantive asylum interview in which he provided a detailed account of his torture and past abuse. He says this led to him being referred by the Home Office as a potential victim of trafficking. He states that his asylum claim was refused by the Home Office, though he appealed against this decision.  D1713 states that he continued to struggle mentally whilst at Harmondsworth. However, he did not receive any mental health support during his several months' detention there, nor was he prescribed any further medication for his mental health issues. He explains he contacted Medical Justice in around late June 2017, who referred him to the Helen Bamber Foundation for

		ı	
1	D1713 was transferred to Colnbrook detention centre	1	a two- or three-minute comfort break and then return
2	on 2 July 2017 and released the following day on bail.	2	shortly and finish off.
3	Following his release, he was diagnosed with PTSD in two	3	THE CHAIR: That sounds like a good idea. Thank you. We
4	separate medico-legal reports prepared by the	4	will return in two or three minutes.
5	Helen Bamber Foundation in 2018. In July 2019, his	5	(2.10 pm)
6	appeal against the Home Office's refusal of his asylum	6	(A short break)
7	claim was allowed and he was granted refugee status.	7	(2.15 pm)
8	Returning finally, chair, to paragraph 65 of his	8	MS MOORE: The last piece of read evidence this afternoon
9	witness statement:	9	relates to D1234.
10	"I still struggle to remember my time in detention,	10	Reading in Evidence re D1234
11	and particularly at Brook House, but I am willing to	11	MS MOORE: D1234 was detained at Brook House in March
12	assist the inquiry, to the extent that I am able, so	12	and April 2017.
13	that what happened to me and others does not happen	13	He has not given an account of his experiences to
14	again. I would, however, prefer to provide any further	14	the inquiry directly. However, on 25 April 2017, he
15	evidence in writing via my solicitors.	15	made a written complaint to the Home Office about
16	"Detention has had a long-lasting effect on me and	16	excessive force used by officers during his removal from
17	my mental health. I have struggled with symptoms of	17	Brook House to Stansted Airport on 28 March 2017. This
18	PTSD and depression since being released. I have	18	complaint was copied to Harriet Harman QC MP, D1234's
19	frequent nightmares related to my time at Brook House	19	local MP. The Professional Standards Unit investigated
20	and often feel very low. I easily feel scared if, for	20	the incident and produced a report dated 4 October 2017
21	example, I hear a door banging, as it brings my mind	21	which we have at <hom002750>. In terms of D1234's</hom002750>
22	back to the time I was in detention. I also suffer from	22	perspective, the investigation relied solely on the
23	flashbacks, which are both about my traumatic	23	information in his written complaint as no contact
24	experiences in Nigeria and my time at Brook House.	24	information was available for him following his removal.
25	"I was recently assessed by a psychiatrist,	25	In that written account, he explained what had
	Page 169		Page 171
1	Dr Galappathie, who has prepared a report which	1	happened to him. He said that eight officers came into
2	I understand has been submitted to the inquiry by my	2	his cell on 28 March 2017. He said that two officers
3	solicitors. I also understand, from speaking to my	3	held his head and turned it violently to turn him around
4	solicitors, that Dr Galappathie is concerned about the	4	and that he felt a crack in his neck. He said he told
5	deterioration in my mental health caused by my	5	officers this, but they took no notice. He said that
6	detention, including the development of my PTSD and	6	then he was pushed and he hit his head on the floor. He
7	depression, and that he considers that I should not give	7	said one officer held his throat and one officer stamped
8	evidence to the inquiry other than in the form of	8	violently on his toes. He said that both of his wrists
9	a witness statement, as it would be too distressing for	9	were handcuffed and the cuffs were cutting into his
10	me. As I mentioned, I find it very difficult and	10	wrists. He said that his legs were grabbed, pushed
11	triggering to talk about the events that I have	11	upward from the feet and that this caused pain to his
12	described."	12	knees. D1234 said that both his legs were tied and a
13	D1713 then provides a statement of truth, chair, and	13	strap was applied over his stomach to strap him up, and
14	that statement is then signed and dated 9 December 2021.	14	this was applied over a lump in his stomach for which he
15	Chair, that concludes the evidence to be read on	15	was awaiting surgery.
16	behalf of D1713, and it just remains for me to thank	16	D1234 then said that he was thrown into a security
17	both you and your team for allowing me the opportunity	17	van and driven naked to Stansted airport. D1234 said
18	to read it on his behalf, which I know he is also	18	that he was screaming in pain, asking officers to stop
19	grateful for.	19	and help him, but they refused and ignored him. He then
20	THE CHAIR: Thank you, Ms Profumo, and thank you to your	20	said that he sustained injuries all over his body,
21	client D1713 for providing the statement.	21 22	bruises to his wrists, stomach and several other parts
22	MS MOORE: Chair, we have one last piece of read evidence	22 23	of his body. He said that he was returned to  Brook House in a wheelchair, denied access to a doctor
23	this afternoon in relation to D1234. In total, with the	24	and only allowed to see a nurse.
24 25	video, it will be about 20 minutes. Before we hear that	25	Enclosed within a letter to the Home Office from
23	short summary and see the video, I suggest we might have	23	Enclosed within a letter to the Hollic Office Holli
	Page 170		Page 172

1 Harriet	Harman QC MP concerning D1234's complaint about	1	restraint techniques. They also said that D1234's
	ment in Brook House was a handwritten statement	2	dignity was protected throughout by a sheet.
3 made by	D1234 dated 12 May 2017. He provides therein	3	In their investigation report of 4 October 2017, the
1	unt of what happened, which is consistent with	4	PSU found the allegations unsubstantiated although
	er written complaint of 25 April 2017. I will	5	recommendations were made regarding training on control
	how he says he felt during this incident using	6	and restraint techniques: on the use of handcuffs in
	words. I quote:	7	a supine position; head support; and the use of
	s in extreme pain. I was screaming and asking	8	controlling locks.
	. I was ignored and completely helpless and	9	You will hear more, chair, about the accounts of
_	nised. I thought I was going to die. I was	10	the officers and the PSU investigation in phase 2 of
	into a security van and driven to Stansted	11	the inquiry.
	naked. I was brought back to Brook House in	12	You will also hear, in phase 2, evidence from
_	chair and thrown into a cell and locked up. The	13	Mr Jon Collier, who is the use of force expert
	so cold that I was shivering. There was no	14	instructed by the inquiry, in relation specifically to
	I was extremely terrified. I thought that	15	this incident.
_	oing to die. I kept screaming that I was in	16	Footage from this incident from a detention centre
	t I was denied access to see a doctor. I was	17	officer's body-worn camera was retained and has been
	I should go and treat myself when I get to	18	provided to Jon Collier and to the inquiry, and a clip
	I am an innocent man and not a criminal, and	19	of this incident can be played now. If we can play
Č	we been subjected to the most extreme form of	20	disk 23 S1940003.
1	and dehumanisation. My humanity, dignity and	21	(Video played)
	Self-worth was stripped off. I am still having	22	MR ALTMAN: Chair, that concludes all of the evidence in
	d flashbacks. I can't sleep, and any time	23	this phase of the inquiry. Thank you.
1	e jingle of keys or the steps of officers	24	THE CHAIR: Thank you, Mr Altman.
	ared and unwell. I cannot walk properly, as	25	THE CIPAIR. Thank you, IN Thunds
1100130	area and an entra 1 cannot want property, as	20	
	Page 173		Page 175
1 I drag o	ne of my legs. I have pains and aches all over	1	Closing remarks by THE CHAIR
2 my bod	y."	2	THE CHAIR: So that concludes phase 1 of the inquiry
3 That	was from <hom002492>.</hom002492>	3	hearing. I would just like to say that I'm very
4 His n	nedical notes for that period, which are at	4	grateful to all the witnesses who have given evidence
5 <hom< td=""><td>002492&gt;, demonstrate that on the day of the incident</td><th>5</th><td>before the inquiry over the past three weeks, and I am</td></hom<>	002492>, demonstrate that on the day of the incident	5	before the inquiry over the past three weeks, and I am
6 and for	two days afterwards he complained to several	6	especially grateful to those formerly detained persons
7 nurses,	and then the following day, of pain all over his	7	who have been able to give their evidence in person or
8 body ar	d difficulty breathing. When seen by Dr Hussein	8	who have had their evidence read in. I, personally, am
9 Oozeer	ally, the doctor diagnosed him with a soft tissue	9	very conscious of how challenging and difficult that has
10 injury.		10	been, and I acknowledge their courage in doing so
11 On 5	September 2017, a transfer of crime report was	11	publicly.
12 sent to	Sussex Police by the PSU via the Home Office,	12	I would also like to thank all of the core
	s at <hom003398>, requesting that they be</hom003398>	13	participants and their legal representatives, as well as
	if the police intend to begin a criminal	14	the inquiry staff. I wish to thank the IDRC for hosting
	ation. Sussex Police awaited the PSU's	15	us and RTS for their technical assistance, and of course
	ation report, which we see from <sxp000030>.</sxp000030>	16	to Epiq and the transcribers. Thank you.
1	PSU considered the use of force forms completed	17	So the inquiry intends to resume phase 2 of
	officers, and we have those at <hom002496>, and</hom002496>	18	the hearing in the week commencing 21 February 2022. We
1	rviews conducted by the PSU with DCOs named Dix,	19	currently expect for those hearings to last up to
	Murray, Olayie, as well as SDCOs Owen, Lawson,	20	six weeks. The solicitor to the inquiry, I know, is
	, Jones and Hayes. The PSU also considered video	21	endeavouring to provide further information about
	and an expert report from the National Tactical	22	phase 2 as soon as possible. Having said that, I'm sure
	se Group which was commissioned by the PSU.	23	you will all understand that we obviously will need to
•	ort, the officers deny that they used excessive	24	be mindful of further Covid guidance or restrictions.
	d say they were using approved control and	25	I remain very grateful for the high levels of
		1	
	Page 174		Page 176

```
1
         engagement that there have been before and during the
 2
         inquiry hearings, and I very much hope that that
 3
         continues.
 4
           I am expecting the inquiry to hear from a large
 5
         number of witnesses in phase 2, and they are going to
 6
         include several other formerly detained persons at
 7
         Brook House, staff members, doctors, senior G4S managers
 8
         and senior executives, Home Office officials, oversight
 q
         bodies such as HMIP and the IMB, as well as corporate
10
         witnesses from the Home Office and from G4S. The
11
         inquiry will also be hearing from the three experts that
12
         I have instructed.
13
           I do recognise that there is a great deal of work to
         do between now and phase 2, and so I would like to thank
14
15
         you all in anticipation of that work.
16
           The only thing that remains for me to do is to wish
17
         you a healthy and relaxing, restful break when it comes.
18
         Thank you very much.
19
       (2.43 pm)
20
               (The inquiry was adjourned to
21
             the week commencing 21 February 2022)
22
23
24
                     I\ N\ D\ E\ X
25
                          Page 177
 1
        MR JAMES WILSON (affirmed) ......1
 2
 3
             Examination by MR LIVINGSTON .....1
 4
 5
        Reading in Evidence re D2033 ......106
 6
 7
        Reading in Evidence re D1713 ......139
 8
 9
        Reading in Evidence re D1234 .....171
10
11
        Closing remarks by THE CHAIR .....176
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
                          Page 178
```

				Page 179
	124.12.161.22	41 (.14 00.11	110.2.25 111.24	100.04.165.17
A	134:12 161:23	actual 6:14 90:11	110:2,25 111:24	102:24 165:17
aback 97:17	162:3 172:23	adamant 47:9	113:19 119:21	airport 124:11
abducted 108:21	173:17	add 38:6 47:19	121:19 127:5,6	171:17 172:17
ability 116:25	accessed 108:2	49:9 72:24 80:17	128:7	173:12
<b>able</b> 7:12 12:21	accessible 6:22	106:19	afraid 29:10 41:17	alarm 20:21
13:1 18:21 23:6	accessing 119:2	addicted 158:20	92:19 108:18	alarming 111:15
27:6 28:18 38:20	accommodated	additional 45:8	109:22 110:24	alcohol 80:15
39:16 41:10 48:2	111:4	77:16 100:16	111:23 113:11,16	<b>Ali</b> 35:16,21,22
54:11 59:19 69:1	accompanied	115:15	113:23 114:3	36:6
72:20 83:19	35:15,20 36:14	<b>address</b> 9:6 12:19	137:4	aligned 17:5
90:17 95:2	accord 65:22	76:8	African 154:1	allegations 175:4
103:19 105:11	81:10	addressed 46:22	aftermath 63:18	<b>alleged</b> 70:20 84:4
111:20 116:10	accords 81:11	53:5	74:18 75:14	allegedly 67:12
125:14 131:21	account 45:25	adds 88:20 112:13	afternoon 58:24	85:17
132:7,10 136:12	47:4,22 106:19	133:22	170:23 171:8	<b>allow</b> 41:8 154:17
136:20 137:5,8	163:6 167:11,20	adduced 1:9,15,21	age 26:12 27:22	allowed 44:17
140:19 146:14	168:11,12 171:13	89:5 105:15	28:10 47:4	79:24 116:8,9
149:4 157:2	171:25 173:4	107:6 139:14	107:14 122:5,17	119:5 120:8
169:12 176:7	accounts 158:9	adjourned 177:20	129:25 137:15	122:21 150:4
absolute 59:20	175:9	adopt 57:17	age-dispute 27:21	169:7 172:24
absolutely 10:17	accurate 41:1	adult 114:17	aged 112:5 133:23	allowing 170:17
22:17 34:15	88:15	137:18	agencies 37:24	<b>alluded</b> 15:13 82:7
57:17 63:19	accurately 98:14	adults 28:12	48:21,25 55:16	alongside 5:23
66:18 75:21	accusation 9:17	111:17,20 112:4	56:8 76:13 88:24	7:19 40:8
abuse 71:11	46:2 85:19	113:15 122:7	94:1	alternative 59:8
149:18 168:13	accused 30:9 51:2	123:11	agenda 77:22	<b>Altman</b> 175:22,24
abused 107:25	<b>ACDT</b> 128:23	advance 41:8,13	aggravation 52:8	altogether 43:7
141:10 144:21	130:4 146:17,19	41:21	aggressive 45:15	ambulance 126:17
146:7 150:15	147:3,5,8 150:20	advanced 31:20	124:23 154:2	amenable 4:9
155:10	152:10,12	advances 160:12	aggressively 121:9	32:23
abusive 121:2,3,4	aches 133:5	160:13,22 161:3	agitated 60:14	amend 17:1 99:22
121:6 153:6	134:10 174:1	advantages 6:16	78:21 79:2	106:19
acceded 63:13	acknowledge 98:6	advice 9:18 36:20	<b>ago</b> 132:20 140:8	amount 7:20,23
accept 47:4 107:1	176:10	38:10 72:20 75:9	agree 22:13,15	15:8 63:3 119:17
107:3	acknowledgeme	93:24 100:5	45:18 75:15	<b>Ana</b> 26:8 27:17
acceptable 39:18	29:17	119:24	79:13 82:11,13	30:11 45:6 47:20
accepted 45:13	acronyms 161:16	advise 89:16	100:12 167:14	56:23
152:25	act 108:19 121:10	advised 89:16	<b>agreed</b> 14:19 15:4	analysis 102:19
accepting 167:20	acted 153:25	107:16	15:15 16:4,22	anchor 10:12
access 5:8 6:6	acting 46:14 48:3	advocacy 2:13	20:4,13,16,18	anecdotally 36:3
30:23 36:2,4	51:23	43:20	21:1,3,21,22	67:8
44:6 54:9,13,19	action 2:1 6:8 24:7	advocate 31:22	38:20 58:2 77:22	angles 11:16
58:4 59:8,20,24	24:20 29:13	advocated 62:6	82:1 99:2 105:21	angry 113:10,22
60:2,17 62:11	102:8	<b>affirmed</b> 1:5 178:1	139:18	116:19
63:19 64:24	active 18:7,8 19:2	<b>Afghan</b> 122:15	agreeing 22:1	animal 126:5
66:25 68:19	98:5	127:17,20	agreement 16:2,6	animals 145:2
73:22 74:9 102:5	<b>activities</b> 2:8 86:15	Afghanistan	16:22 38:21	ankles 125:15
102:17 110:11	117:4	106:24 107:25	57:20	<b>Anna</b> 15:10 30:8
119:24 133:3	acts 134:14	108:21 109:8	<b>ahead</b> 10:2 84:18	42:19 56:23
	·	•	•	

				Page 180
				l
98:17	86:4 172:13,14	132:17 140:8,8,9	132:17 133:12	155:1 157:13
anonymised	apply 70:25	142:14 143:5,8	142:17,22,23,25	162:1
102:10	appointment 20:5	143:21,25 144:15	145:5,8 147:7	attendance 36:15
answer 6:24 30:15	21:7 128:11,17	145:3 147:3,11	150:14 151:22	attended 92:11
47:19 71:9	128:18,20 142:15	147:14 148:18,24	152:9 153:10	108:8 157:20
102:22 110:15	142:22 143:1	150:19 151:2,18	158:4 163:10,16	161:24 164:21
131:22 151:24	145:18 146:3,6	152:6,13,18	164:14 165:21	attending 147:20
antagonising	147:21 150:19	160:20 162:12	166:7,7,17	151:12
63:21	151:6,25 152:21	163:25 164:19	asking 1:17,23	attention 145:19
anti-depressant	152:23,25 163:7	165:14 166:3	46:20 92:4 109:6	attitude 30:14
152:15	163:18 164:10,15	171:12,14 173:5	146:11 157:10	52:1,4,23,24
anticipation	164:17 166:5,6	area 6:6,20 8:17	172:18 173:8	audited 52:6 53:7
177:15	166:16,18 167:6	68:13 141:22,24	aspect 27:14	104:10,16
antidepressant	167:8 168:5	142:10 143:9	assault 111:22,24	audited?' 51:24
117:14 145:24	appointments 6:20	157:7	131:8,8	August 2:23 3:21
157:15 163:15	38:22 62:15	argued 107:14	assaulted 110:25	43:3,21 44:13
antidepressants	151:21 160:19	arising 141:1	123:14 127:13	46:18 61:25
157:12	164:11	arm 125:5	assertive 75:24	63:17 75:14
<b>Anton</b> 79:7,23	appreciate 58:25	arms 125:1,4,21	assess 45:21	76:10 77:14 80:9
80:20 81:7	59:6	125:22 142:4	assessed 169:25	81:2 104:2
anxiety 88:20	appreciated 5:19	army 109:7 127:7	assessment 27:23	August/Septemb
134:10	12:18,20 13:10	arrange 81:15	81:21 143:13	62:9
anxious 109:22	134:2	arrangement 6:9	163:11 164:20	authorities 113:13
anymore 125:18	approach 30:19	76:21 77:6	assign 21:8,12	authority 155:2
anyway 10:10	49:21 59:14,17	arrangements	75:17	autumn 42:5
27:14 82:24	60:5,22 65:3	6:18 27:22	assist 46:5 139:23	auxiliary 100:24
apart 57:23 77:15	71:20 95:7 133:9	arrest 141:14	140:22 169:12	available 73:25
82:10 85:18	approached	arrival 141:13	assistance 36:7	107:6 117:8
119:20 127:3	141:25 147:19	144:8	176:15	118:2 159:17
apologies 19:16	156:21 162:15	arrived 108:1	assisted 44:6	171:24
84:25	appropriate 18:14	109:17,20 110:22	Association 35:16	average 149:22
apologise 99:22	18:16 20:7 27:23	111:6 117:13	35:23	154:20
apologising 98:15	35:4,7 36:18	126:2 128:10	assume 4:16 32:16	<b>AVID</b> 35:24 36:4
apology 138:20	37:23 45:14,23	130:2 131:16	53:8	36:20
apparently 84:9	47:11,12 53:5	136:7 141:20,24	asylum 108:6	avoid 63:20
84:21	55:17 61:11 65:7	164:9	113:13 148:6,8,9	awaited 174:15
appeal 169:6	80:10 81:6 90:14	arrogant 5:10	148:15 151:7	awaiting 172:15
appealed 168:16	90:17 91:7 101:4	arteries 130:24	168:12,15 169:6	aware 6:11 30:7
appear 147:4	appropriately	aside 46:1 78:22	ate 130:12	34:17 45:1 60:9
appeared 45:7	24:13 50:24	asked 4:7 15:10	attack 111:21	66:3,19,21 67:18
47:4 151:4	appropriateness	30:12,25 33:19	113:23 167:13,15	69:7,9 70:22,22
appears 168:3	17:18	44:7 49:23 53:10	attacked 141:12	73:12 77:5 128:3
appetite 130:9	approval 22:8,14	54:21 61:2 70:4	144:21 146:7	136:14 137:23
148:20 149:6	approved 174:25 approximately	78:8 85:5 92:12 102:10,25 106:3	160:17 163:8	144:11 161:15,22 awareness 66:2
<b>application</b> 165:14 165:16	149:23	· ·	attempt 129:1	
		108:10 109:11,13	attempts 62:5 attend 19:19 92:7	68:18 73:17,17
applications 72:12 72:21	<b>April</b> 2:22 22:22 23:9 106:14	110:16 121:15,16 121:18 122:4,11	105:11 106:4	98:6
applied 69:21 71:3	107:8,9 108:9	121:18 122:4,11 122:17 128:6,20	128:20 150:5,10	B
applicu 03.21 /1.3	107.0,5 100.5	122.1/120.0,20	120.20 130.3,10	baby 56:2,18

				Page 181
				1
back 7:11 10:7	110:16 162:3	156:15 159:23	157:19	86:10 89:22
19:8 31:11 38:13	<b>basis</b> 13:24 38:11	160:12	block 154:18	93:11 95:23
42:4 58:20 59:23	40:13 61:9 85:13	believed 26:11	156:9 158:4	<b>brings</b> 169:21
62:14 63:8 64:9	96:2,4 137:17	28:22 85:21	159:10	broadcast 66:9
64:18 67:18	160:20 161:10	153:22	<b>blood</b> 157:18	74:22 93:16
68:23 69:5,11	<b>batons</b> 123:19	believes 129:25	bloody 114:22	<b>broader</b> 49:11,11
84:3 86:1 90:18	<b>BBC</b> 88:5	believing 45:24	125:10 126:16	broadly 67:2
90:24 99:7,14	beard 133:23	bell 121:12,14	blow 109:24	101:12
107:19 112:1,18	beaten 125:11	133:16	115:16 126:7	broken 114:2
114:18 115:4	beating 126:22	belongings 108:14	bluntly 26:17	<b>Brook</b> 3:20 5:23
116:16 118:17,23	becoming 38:16	belt 123:21,23	<b>blurry</b> 97:7	11:20 14:9 15:19
127:23 142:5	49:15 60:6 62:16	125:25	board 48:8,15 74:3	16:19 17:12
145:15 148:5	89:12	<b>Ben</b> 3:19 4:6 5:21	89:10 91:3 136:3	23:22 31:20,23
154:17 156:5	bed 116:1 143:15	87:8,10,12	bodies 113:10	33:2 34:1 37:7
157:24 164:3,4,9	143:15	best 50:6,8 79:25	136:5 177:9	44:21 46:18 48:9
166:2 169:22	<b>bedding</b> 156:16	93:4 99:19	body 35:24 52:11	50:6,7 51:4,22
173:12	beds 115:24	110:15 118:3	125:10 133:4,5	56:3,8 64:6
back-up 36:11,24	143:10	140:21	134:10 167:12	81:15 82:13
77:14	bedsheets 114:1	betrayed 119:1	172:20,22 174:2	83:17,23 86:16
background 31:17	befriender 39:21	better 82:8 87:18	174:8	89:15,17 91:7,19
107:23 141:8	befriending 39:24	94:18,22	body-worn 175:17	93:19 95:16
backwards 56:18	beg 54:19 59:24	beyond 29:19	<b>bold</b> 22:3 56:12	98:16 99:10
bad 45:7 114:21	began 117:22	71:23 120:18	<b>Bole</b> 79:7,23 81:7	106:14,16,25
116:16 117:1,24	122:3 131:16	BH 93:24 94:2	born 107:5	107:8,13 108:24
134:10	Begg 91:15	Bhatt 30:25 33:19	bosses 121:10	109:18 110:7,22
badly 47:21 127:2	begging 122:6	BHM000018	<b>bottom</b> 12:13 23:2	111:5 113:7,18
127:8,10	<b>beginning</b> 14:18	139:13	39:12,13 77:7	114:11 115:21
<b>baffling</b> 99:13	20:23 90:3	Bible 150:9	78:2 86:14,16	116:6,11 117:13
<b>bail</b> 49:17 72:12 72:20 118:24	160:10	<b>big</b> 63:22 86:14 <b>billiard</b> 117:4	88:3 91:4 95:24 97:1	118:2,13 120:15 120:23 123:16
120:3 164:4	<b>behalf</b> 30:12,25 31:20 33:19		<b>bottoms</b> 162:13	
165:14,17 169:2	47:10 54:7,21	<b>birth</b> 106:11,24 107:2,4	boundaries 75:12	124:7,8 128:5,24 129:10 130:10,16
balance 63:10 76:2	61:2 70:4 78:9	bisexual 160:13	bowl 115:25	130:21 131:3,10
80:12 133:5	85:5 139:2,22	bit 5:15 19:22	box 90:11 135:10	130.21 131.3,10
<b>balding</b> 121:21	170:16,18	23:19 29:7,20	boy 26:10 47:3	134:24 135:5,10
Bamber 168:24	behave 120:22	31:10,11 42:25	127:18,20	135:12,20 136:7
169:5	behaved 120:25	46:22 53:10	brave 119:22	136:18,20,24
<b>bandaged</b> 157:25	behaving 121:5	57:10 62:2 64:5	break 61:12,15,21	137:12,23 138:1
banged 78:20	behaviour 62:4	70:24 74:24	104:22,22 105:8	138:2,9 139:24
156:6	121:25 159:24	101:12 115:18	171:1,6 177:17	139:25 140:3,7
<b>banging</b> 111:12	believe 12:10	121:21 144:2	breathing 174:8	140:21 141:2,5
116:20 127:19	16:17 32:3 37:17	bits 89:4	brief 151:18	141:15,17,20
130:22 155:21,24	45:12 78:1 91:10	black 124:2 154:1	166:18	142:12 143:12
169:21	92:10 112:7	Blackwell 19:12	briefly 30:6 31:16	144:7,10,13
<b>barrier</b> 73:22	118:8 127:7	22:23 23:3 31:14	160:5	146:4,15 147:18
102:16,21	129:13 141:23	31:25 32:7 47:2	bring 12:11 26:7	150:12 151:11
based 51:6,7	144:1 148:10	56:23 79:6,20	35:19 39:10 44:7	152:2 153:4,24
102:17	152:25 153:19	84:1 89:20,25	44:17,19 55:19	154:5,23 155:10
basic 44:14 73:24	154:15,23 156:2	bleeding 115:1	58:19 74:19 77:9	158:6,12,18
~	1010,20 100.2	~100ming 110.1		120.0,12,10
	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>

				1 age 102
159:18 160:10	112:20 124:22	57:2,9 65:6	123:6 126:16	79:22 86:12
161:10,12,17,21	126:17 128:19	86:25	128:7,12 131:16	118:22 155:7
161:23 162:1,3,7	129:7 144:4	caseworker 87:5	143:7 144:8	change 64:9 76:1
162:10 163:16	148:6 154:25	caseworkers 56:22	154:12 160:11	82:12 158:15
164:3,5,9,15,22	calling 21:6	57:1	161:14 162:17	changed 24:23
165:3,9,19,24	calls 162:4	catch 12:19	164:23 169:1	64:4 166:9
169:11,19,24	camera 175:17	categorical 71:21	175:16	channel 45:14
171:11,17 172:23	candid 13:4	categories 102:18	centred 3:9	channels 69:23
173:2,12 177:7	cantula 13.4 canteen 157:6,9	categories 102.18	centred 5.9 centres 5:7 6:12,13	chaos 97:7
<b>brother</b> 107:25	canteen 137:0,9	category /1:21 cause 16:17 32:18		character 159:25
	_	caused 170:5	36:2,4 59:21 87:21 90:14	
<b>brought</b> 99:17 108:14 114:10	capacity 7:17 8:22 31:21	172:11		charge 157:8,10
	_		100:11,13	charities 6:7 101:2
119:11 122:22	captured 97:5	causing 52:8 111:9	certain 3:24 4:7,14	161:17
127:23 132:6	110:1	125:25 127:21	50:1,10 65:14	charity 8:22 49:4
136:8 138:18	captures 98:14	156:11	67:23 68:24 69:1	68:10 80:15
173:12	care 49:7,8 63:11	cautious 84:6	70:8 80:5 91:17	charity's 2:7
Brown 7:14	112:20 123:8	caveat 69:9	92:17 93:9 116:7	chase 82:21
bruises 172:21	131:1,24 134:7	cc'd 80:3	certainly 11:11	chasing 82:10
<b>build</b> 5:11 13:6	134:21 138:22	ccing 44:21	13:1 18:4 29:14	Chaudhary
62:21 153:20	162:22	cell 109:19,20	42:22 64:3 65:25	145:12,14,19
<b>building</b> 5:2 11:4	care' 112:21	111:18 143:10,14	72:17 73:20 84:2	check 13:23 46:20
144:9	cared 150:25	143:14 144:1,15	85:8,8,9 87:11	75:18,19,20 79:8
<b>built</b> 26:23	167:4	144:24 145:2,3	92:17 98:18	90:1 112:6 123:1
<b>bullet</b> 15:9,10,22	careful 46:13 51:8	146:23 147:23	102:15 103:12	146:20 147:24
16:4 20:3 88:4	69:14	149:19,21,23,24	cetera 56:2,9	149:7 152:6
96:12,20 97:1	carefully 69:14	149:25 150:4	<b>chain</b> 99:5	checked 7:11
<b>bully</b> 64:17	<b>caring</b> 45:1 88:19	151:15 152:7	<b>chair</b> 1:3,8,16	146:25 147:22
bullying 53:25	carried 150:23	153:2,7,9 162:3	12:12 55:20	150:24
60:7,23 64:12	155:2	165:5,5,9 172:2	61:11,17,19,23	<b>checking</b> 74:4 86:2
78:13	carries 74:23	173:13,14	89:4 93:12 94:11	checks 146:21
<b>bundle</b> 1:11 12:12	<b>carry</b> 9:4 44:15	cells 116:20 121:7	98:20 101:9,10	147:17
55:20 93:12	83:14	121:9	102:10,22,24	cheerful 151:4
140:24	carrying 121:21	cent 78:6,11 79:2	103:3,14,21,25	<b>child</b> 109:10 138:5
<b>bunk</b> 143:15	case 11:2 21:5 22:1	97:13	104:15,18,20,21	141:9
burn 43:22	31:17,18 33:8	centre 5:9 6:15,21	105:1,6,13,16,21	childhood 144:20
<b>burnt</b> 44:3 47:21	35:6 37:11 42:3	9:5 12:5 18:10	105:22 106:2	149:19
<b>bus</b> 120:11 124:19	47:23,23 50:15	19:4 27:7 31:8	124:15 139:1,3,5	Children's 27:18
124:22 125:1,3	57:2 67:17 70:9	44:18 49:6,19	139:7,12,21	chimes 80:6
<b>busy</b> 8:17	72:25 82:4 85:14	52:8 53:9 54:9	141:6,18 160:3	choice 118:5
<b>button</b> 131:19	102:7	54:14 60:19	163:4,23 165:25	162:23 164:7
<b>buzzer</b> 131:23	case-by-case	67:10 68:20	166:11 168:9	Christian 150:9
	101:22	70:22 73:22 74:1	169:8 170:13,15	chronologically
C	cases 17:16 18:11	87:15,16,18 92:4	170:20,22 171:3	22:18 35:11 99:9
<b>c</b> 65:13 143:22,24	27:21 28:21 33:4	98:5 101:6 108:9	175:9,22,24	chronology 140:25
154:9 155:16	50:14 69:12	108:13,13,16,16	176:1,2 178:11	<b>church</b> 151:6
165:8	70:16 72:12 78:6	108:18,19,25	challenge 29:22	circumstances
call 82:20,22 91:14	78:12 79:14 87:1	109:1 118:16,22	challenging 30:2	16:1,6 140:2
159:3	casework 25:20	119:3,7,7 120:6,9	176:9	141:13 166:10
<b>called</b> 14:16 35:15	37:8 38:1,3,7	121:8 122:23	<b>chance</b> 12:19 59:1	CJS007130 143:3
82:7 91:15,20	,-,-			
	<u> </u>	I	I	I

				Page 183
	0.5.1.5.1.1.0.0			1 40 40 70 7 00 4
143:23 165:7	85:17,24 102:9	Colnbrook 169:1	99:6	48:10 70:5 83:4
CJS0072752	103:16 170:21	combative 59:14	community 29:6,9	97:19 123:8
147:10,13	client's 45:24 46:1	59:17 78:13	29:12,15,16	131:7 135:3
claim 1:13 10:15	46:2 47:22	come 4:2 6:22	44:22 108:3	136:23 170:4
31:15,19 32:1	clients 6:23 8:19	13:18,25,25	132:12	concerning 27:14
108:5 148:7,12	21:16 24:12	14:12 16:12	<b>company</b> 124:3,4	50:13 173:1
148:15 168:15	25:21 37:20 46:5	17:19 18:2,13	124:6	<b>concerns</b> 9:3 10:4
169:7	47:24 54:13 67:9	19:8 26:2 27:21	<b>compare</b> 88:8,14	10:23 12:20 13:7
claimed 107:4	67:20,20 68:24	31:10 35:5 43:1	comparison 95:3	13:19 16:24 23:5
137:17 151:7	68:25 70:15	47:14 66:1 74:16	complain 135:17	23:20,21,23 24:2
<b>claims</b> 72:13	72:18,23 73:1,4	86:6 89:7 112:6	136:5 158:2,3	24:8 26:18 30:7
<b>clarify</b> 6:11 9:4	74:9 75:17 80:20	112:8,9 113:12	complained 37:4	40:8 41:13 45:6
19:17 39:5	102:6 103:9,9,11	121:13,19 124:23	43:20 107:18	50:9,16 51:17
104:11	103:19	133:17 146:20	158:1,10 174:6	53:4,14 54:24
clarity 8:15	<b>clients'</b> 47:13	161:25	complaint 51:19	55:5 56:7,12
classic 56:17	50:14	comes 115:4	51:22 52:12 71:5	58:6,16,25 59:6
claustrophobic	clinging 124:12	177:17	96:13,16 102:2	61:10 70:15
144:24 149:17	Clinical 131:1	<b>comfort</b> 151:5,13	103:18 135:5,11	72:10 73:13 76:9
151:15	clinics 23:13 25:1	171:1	135:13 137:25	76:16,23 77:23
<b>clear</b> 1:17,19 16:8	clip 175:18	comfortable	138:2 153:16	87:14 90:9 91:5
18:9 19:5,6,17	close 89:15 97:19	115:19,20 124:15	158:5,8 171:15	92:15,20 99:19
21:19 25:10,24	154:7	160:22	171:18,23 173:1	101:14,21,23
28:1,5,17 37:13	closed 84:8,13,21	coming 5:22 7:18	173:5	104:7 131:11
37:13 38:6,7	85:12 86:5 95:17	8:24 11:16 12:6	complaints 9:13	135:7,15,21
39:19,25 40:12	95:19 152:12	22:18 50:17	41:5 52:11,17	137:9 138:4,10
48:14,18 50:18	closeness 95:8	52:10 53:22	65:19 72:10	concludes 170:15
56:21 64:6 65:9	closing 152:10	66:13 125:5	73:14 90:11	175:22 176:2
68:19 70:21 75:6	176:1 178:11	152:6 157:24	93:21 103:5,13	conclusion 85:15
75:10,11 79:1	<b>clothes</b> 108:15	158:24 160:4	135:8,10,18,22	168:6
80:9 81:1,4	114:11 162:13,20	commanding	136:1,6 138:8,11	concrete 151:24
84:25 85:8,9,10	162:23	155:3	138:15	condition 114:21
85:24,25 86:1,3	clothing 38:5	commencing	complete 102:7	114:25 115:2
91:24 94:6 100:1	75:20,20	176:18 177:21	completed 28:19	conditions 73:2
100:6 111:9	co-operation	<b>comment</b> 52:5,6	102:7 174:17	116:23 154:6,12
137:14 157:1	94:19	71:7 78:11,22	completely 63:13	conduct 77:8
clearly 25:16	coherent 67:8	commented 44:16	75:12 159:24	conducted 136:11
54:15 93:18	Colbran 89:21	comments 95:6	173:9	174:19
97:10 100:18	94:10	152:9	complications	conduit 76:23
121:20 156:7	Colbran's 89:24	commissioned	62:21	conferences 140:5
160:5	<b>cold</b> 163:1 173:14	174:23	comply 164:7	confidence 29:11
cliche 64:16	colleague 22:23	<b>commit</b> 75:22	concentrate	98:18,23
client 21:10 24:22	79:6 122:25	<b>common</b> 3:13,14	139:24 151:11	confident 7:24
27:4,15 29:2	colleagues 41:9,22	4:12 73:10	concern 29:18	21:13 28:23 29:2
35:3 45:7 46:10	55:23 58:22	communicate	39:14 44:25	51:7 69:11 70:7
46:11 47:20 57:2	124:22	110:13	45:13 46:7 48:4	78:16,21 90:25
62:17,20 67:1,12	<b>collect</b> 149:3,4	communicated	69:20 71:1,13,14	confined 150:4
67:19 68:23 70:9	152:15	152:13	concerned 10:5	confirm 44:25
70:17,20,20	collecting 149:9	communication	17:2,3,8 27:1	79:13 165:13
71:10,18 85:16	<b>Collier</b> 175:13,18	30:18 31:5 64:2	37:7 39:3 45:5	confirmed 128:8
	ı	ı	ı	1

				Page 184
confuse 146:4	165:18 171:23	<b>copy</b> 137:16	course 5:16 13:20	<b>cut</b> 59:8 126:15
confuse 146:4 confused 63:21	contacted 4:6	148:16 167:10	15:19 16:13	157:16,19
142:17 164:5	120:6 168:23		17:20 18:22 19:9	· ·
		<b>copying</b> 19:23 23:10 74:22	36:19 106:7	cutlery 129:12 cuts 125:10
confusing 109:9 conjured 108:19	contacting 87:4 contacts 23:14	cordial 5:12	140:5 159:12	
connected 103:3	25:6 56:10	core 39:23 115:8	176:15	cutting 130:23 157:5 172:9
123:22 124:8	25:6 56:10 contain 132:16	176:12	courses 150:3	137:3 1/2:9
123:22 124:8			courses 130:3 cover 62:22	D
cons 147:16	content 22:13,15 106:20	corporate 177:9 correct 1:25 2:2,11	139:25	<b>D</b> 177:24
	contents 66:17	2:15 3:7,11 9:11	covered 25:25	<b>D1234</b> 170:23
conscious 62:12,14 176:9	contents 60:17 context 5:4 8:13	9:19 10:17,20	27:11 50:21	171:9,10,11
consciousness	18:2 23:15 25:7	14:11 17:7 24:18		172:12,16,17
			covering 53:3	173:3 178:9
158:25 consent 9:16	56:25 57:14,19 61:6 70:14,19	31:24 32:3 33:18 34:15 35:18 39:9	covers 89:3 Covid 176:24	<b>D1234's</b> 171:18,21
	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	56:24 70:3 71:25	COVID-19 140:3	173:1 175:1
consequences 28:15 62:8,23	75:13 80:17 81:22 88:11	76:20 77:12	crack 172:4	<b>D1713</b> 139:12,16
83:6,12 134:9		83:13 89:19 90:5	crack 1/2:4 credit 162:5	139:20,22,23
83:6,12 134:9 158:10	contextual 2:19 continuation 56:4	90:21	credit 162:5	141:8 163:6,20
		corrective 99:21		166:2 168:11,18
conservative 65:13	<b>continue</b> 12:22 54:20 59:24		criminal 173:19	169:1 170:13,16
consider 8:2 12:24		correctly 30:10 91:1	174:14	170:21 178:7
30:22 31:1 58:8	76:21 79:8,13	-	criminals 113:9	<b>D1713's</b> 162:10
164:20	140:14,16	correspond 23:4	critical 16:16	166:11
considered 49:6	continued 77:5	correspondence	31:13 45:14	<b>D191</b> 84:13
49:16 129:1	145:9 146:13	15:3 93:2	critically 95:5	<b>D2033</b> 105:13,14
141:3 143:2	151:15 152:3	corridor 113:3	criticism 47:2	105:18 106:1,2
165:6 174:17,21	163:18 165:20	117:5 122:10	<b>criticisms</b> 62:4 93:19	105:18 100:1,2
<b>considering</b> 43:6	166:25 168:18	145:4 149:22		107:23 108:5
56:6 110:3	continues 107:4 177:3	155:17 156:17	Cross 5:5 6:5 49:18	112:13 114:9
considers 170:7		corridors 116:9		123:5 126:9
consistent 173:4	continuing 62:11 contract 12:4 53:8	cost 44:10	crossed 135:12	129:24 132:5,19
constant 12:1 129:4		Council 27:18	137:25 158:7	133:20 138:18,24
-	95:16	28:20	crossing 40:5	139:6,14 178:5
constantly 111:14 113:17 123:5	control 133:5 174:25 175:5	counsel 105:17 106:6,7 139:14	crowded 73:3	<b>D2033's</b> 132:16
126:22		· /	Croydon 108:9	D3704 150:7
constructive 42:18	<b>controlling</b> 56:25 175:8	counselling 37:6,8	crutches 44:8,10	D852 28:9
		37:9 39:15,25 40:5,13 75:10	<b>crying</b> 122:6 130:2 149:11	damage 72:11
constructively 76:5	conversation 12:21 13:11	100:5		damaged 113:14
	39:16 40:20	counsellors 37:13	CSU 143:5,11 cuffs 172:9	Dan 3:4 4:1 7:14
<b>consulting</b> 41:9,22 <b>contact</b> 7:1 11:12	65:24 97:12	39:19	culture 99:24	12:18 14:1 19:12
14:8 23:7 25:9	132:20 147:25	count 138:22	103:12	19:23 22:22 23:9
	conversations		current 1:25 6:8	25:5 26:15 44:22
25:13,14 47:24 68:23 73:24	32:12 36:7 40:23	countersigned 139:2		58:14 87:2
76:13 79:25 81:8	42:2 120:4		12:20 20:1,11,12 147:6	danger 113:17
91:13 97:22 99:1	147:12	country 110:17 couple 22:19 41:4		129:8
	coordinator 2:13	43:3 91:4 95:24	currently 66:24 176:19	dangerous 113:9
115:1 120:2	43:21			113:14 114:24
136:10 137:22		97:24 107:17	curtain 143:17	159:12
144:9 152:1	copied 58:14 99:3	couple' 97:5	custody 91:20 92:7	Dari 132:21 139:2
161:17 162:6	171:18	courage 176:10	112:23	dark 60:18 109:17
				wai K 00.10 107.17

				Page 185
				1
144:18 149:19	dealing 83:25	134:17,21 135:23	48:21 49:25 71:3	96:7,8,22 103:4
153:21	89:23	137:12 138:12	71:10 72:6,14	104:7 113:2,4,5,8
dash 95:15 96:6	<b>dealings</b> 32:1 89:9	dependent 74:6	73:5 84:8,13,20	113:16 121:4,6
data 102:10	<b>dealt</b> 72:5 90:2	deported 125:13	85:11 88:21	130:22 135:19
database 66:25	108:17 109:23	depressed 141:16	90:10 92:16	137:20,22 138:8
102:5,17	126:6	148:19 149:6,20	100:17 101:18	143:9 150:3,5,10
date 106:11,19,24	<b>Dear</b> 12:16 79:16	153:1 164:24	103:22 105:11	153:12,23,25
107:2,3 108:10	deceived 118:20	166:25	106:14,16 107:8	154:5,12 155:3
140:19 164:21	119:1	depression 108:4	108:8,21 109:12	156:4 158:17,19
165:2 166:14	<b>December</b> 1:1 2:3	110:5 140:14	112:19 113:6,17	159:17,19 160:6
dated 19:11	170:14	169:18 170:7	117:22 119:9,19	160:9,21 161:3
138:25 143:21	decided 17:24	deputy 2:1 14:9	119:25 120:7,15	163:3
148:18 151:1	63:10 101:25	48:16 79:25	120:17 123:10	detainees' 33:4
152:18 164:19	107:3	describe 26:4	127:17,18 128:18	115:24
168:1 170:14	deciding 81:3	38:13 56:20 59:9	128:24,25 129:3	detaining 134:14
171:20 173:3	167:21	59:13 60:4 61:4	129:6,10,14	<b>detention</b> 2:1 5:7
dates 10:12	decision 63:1 80:4	62:7 101:14	130:15,25 131:2	6:8 18:11 27:17
<b>Davies</b> 3:5 4:1	108:5 168:17	140:20 143:8	132:14 133:4	27:20 28:21,25
33:1	decisions 69:14	163:20 173:6	135:12 136:18	29:21 31:23
day 44:2 58:21	101:22 116:25	described 4:18	137:25 139:25	35:25 66:12 73:2
60:18 112:19	decline 166:5	33:23 45:15 47:3	140:2,7 166:14	86:2 88:13 100:8
114:16 116:7,11	declined 7:8,10	48:1 63:16 78:18	171:11 176:6	100:9 106:25
116:13,15 118:18	142:21 166:4	94:2 104:2	177:6	108:7,12,16,18
122:10 129:17	decrease 7:22,24	127:12 160:7	<b>detainee</b> 9:15	108:19 113:14
131:9 133:22	deep 38:2 99:25	170:12	15:24 16:17	115:6 118:16,22
136:7,14,16	101:6 125:9	describing 19:2	17:22 21:8 22:10	119:3,7,12 120:4
146:1,17 147:13	defensive 86:21	description 59:2	22:24 26:22 47:3	120:5,13,21
148:9 149:1,13 149:24 150:12	88:25 95:8 98:14	59:15,16	91:5 110:21	121:8 122:23 123:6 126:16
	definitely 72:24	desk 5:23 6:13,20	113:22 114:4	
154:4,11 157:25	definition 167:21	despair 126:13	116:1 126:15	127:24 128:2,6
169:2 174:5,7 day' 147:16	<b>degrading</b> 120:20 121:6 153:5	<b>desperate</b> 18:12 73:3 144:16	130:16 144:9,11 145:6 150:7	128:12,19,21 131:16 132:11,24
day-to-day 2:7	dehumanisation	despite 84:5 107:5	151:10 154:9	135:15,24 137:9
days 12:14 22:19	173:21	129:13 142:5	155:15 156:2,6	138:4,14,21
45:4,12 66:10,15	dehumanised	151:13 163:14	156:11,14,18,23	140:11,13,18,24
107:17 118:9	173:10	destabilising 84:16	156:24 157:2,4	141:15,25 144:8
125:11 133:13	deliberate 58:7	destroyed 114:2	157:10,14,16	148:3,21 149:1
140:9 148:21	deliberately	114:10	158:8 159:6	151:17 154:6
149:2 151:6,21	124:14	detail 74:25	161:25	160:10 161:5,12
163:25 165:4	demonstrate 174:5	106:18 107:23	detainee-run	161:14 162:16
166:8 168:4	demonstrated demonstrated	126:10 141:8	162:2	164:23 165:23
174:6	134:6	detailed 29:16	detainees 2:4	166:23 167:18,22
DCMs 30:19	denied 172:23	76:4 168:12	16:16 23:14	167:25 168:2,21
DCO 29:22,25	173:17	details 67:1,16	35:17,23 39:20	169:1,10,16,22
DCOs 30:19	deny 174:24	detained 2:10	39:22 44:7 47:10	170:6 175:16
174:19	department 44:25	14:13,22 23:4	49:18 50:6,8	deteriorating
de 14:7,7	110:10 117:14,19	26:6 30:23 31:20	51:3,17 54:24	36:11 38:24
deal 46:22 145:25	118:14 122:13,24	32:2 34:19 43:21	55:6 62:7 72:9	deterioration
177:13	128:2 133:10	44:2,13,17 45:17	79:9 94:1 96:1,3	170:5
		,,,		
	I	I	I	I

				Page 186
	I	1		l
determined	159:8 171:14	distinction 24:25	34:20 38:3,3	21:7 22:8,15,16
138:19	<b>director</b> 2:1,4 3:12	25:1 39:23 55:12	50:6,7 51:1,18	22:24 23:3,13
detrimental 168:3	3:20 14:9 15:11	60:25	52:16,19 53:5	24:7 25:1 26:16
developed 26:19	32:4 35:22 48:16	distinguish 73:6	57:2 78:6,12,25	26:21 27:9 28:16
62:1 63:2 149:13	80:1 89:12	distorted 97:3	78:25 81:20	34:3 37:8,21
development 61:6	disagreed 45:20	distressed 130:13	86:23 92:24 93:6	38:22 43:6 44:2
83:16 170:6	65:3	140:16 155:20	96:19 97:20 98:9	53:12 62:16 75:1
diagnosed 108:3	disagreeing 65:5	156:19 167:2	100:4,15 101:2,3	78:19 83:18
140:14 169:3	disappointed	distressing 126:3	102:8 104:17	drop-ins 9:16
174:9	36:23 37:1	170:9	123:2 126:24	14:15,17 25:6
diagnosis 132:13	disapproval 48:7	distributing 157:8	130:22 131:12	26:18 56:4 74:11
dialogue 40:23	disclose 18:22	157:11	133:6 176:10	drug 49:4
diarrhoea 149:13	26:13 27:6 102:1	distrust 72:25	door 60:13 111:14	drugs 80:15 85:18
die 173:10,16	disclosed 18:22	distrustful 59:14	115:13 116:18	113:15 130:14,15
die' 156:20	147:7	59:17 78:14	117:3 121:13	130:17,18 158:18
difference 25:9	disclosing 27:6	<b>disturbed</b> 111:8	126:23,24 127:23	158:19 159:17,20
<b>different</b> 11:16	disclosure 106:20	Dix 174:19	143:17 144:16	159:23
21:17 64:15	149:10	DL0000149	145:2 146:23	drunk 130:12
73:25 81:23 85:4	disclosures 130:1	105:14	155:14,17,18,21	dry 162:21
120:1 124:6	discuss 22:22 26:2	doctor 117:15,16	155:25 156:1	due 16:13 17:20
134:19	35:12 36:16 40:2	117:22,25 128:6	160:6 169:21	18:22 19:8 127:5
<b>difficult</b> 10:3 24:15 30:8 32:14	42:9 43:2 56:10 59:1 79:22 80:9	128:10,11 133:9 133:21,22 134:19	doors 111:13 127:19 130:23	129:25 130:1 131:5,11 136:16
34:2 36:9 38:16	86:6 128:10	134:24 142:22,23	dose 132:11	167:12,15
38:17 42:13 46:3	148:1 155:7	142:24 145:6,8	doubt 18:10 48:4	dug 125:9
54:6 60:20 61:5	discussed 3:22	145:11 149:13	53:13	Duncan 30:12
61:5 62:16 66:23	24:25 35:1,3,9	152:21,23 163:11	<b>DPG000003</b> 1:9	61:2
71:15 73:5,6	61:24 89:3 97:17	164:17 166:16,20	59:12	duty 133:17
86:18 102:20,20	99:15,16	167:1,5,14	Dr 145:12,14,19	duvet 156:16
118:4 140:11,12	discussing 59:7,9	172:23 173:17	170:1,4 174:8	dynamic 53:23
146:4 150:17	discussion 13:22	174:9	draconian 56:14	60:8,10 64:5,9,11
153:9 156:5,25	41:7,21 93:18	doctors 164:23	56:20 57:10	64:12 76:6 77:16
170:10 176:9	150:18	177:7	draft 4:21 14:25	81:23 82:2
difficulties 149:2	discussions 37:1	<b>document</b> 15:1,7	15:5,13,15 16:25	
difficulty 174:8	50:3 100:20	16:21 19:10 22:2	32:12 35:12	E
dignity 173:21	disk 175:20	22:25 39:10	drafted 168:4	E 107:17 111:6
175:2	dismissive 134:4	69:19 79:11	drag 124:16 174:1	112:21,24 129:7
dinner 115:17	162:22	86:10 122:16	dragged 126:5	177:24
diplomatic 13:5	disorder 106:17	143:3,4,23	dramatic 97:6	ear 39:21
21:13 36:6 40:18	110:5	146:18 147:10,13	draw 55:12 102:20	earlier 80:21
59:4,21 75:6	disproportionate	165:7 167:11	117:7	97:22 107:2,5
direct 31:4 55:18	70:6	168:3	drew 51:17	173:5
62:17 99:1	dispute 3:15	documents 107:6	dribbling 160:5	early 83:17 87:13
direction 39:4	disregarded	114:12 140:24	drink 130:9	87:24 123:17
directly 4:7 25:17	122:23	141:3 146:16	driven 81:3 172:17	142:16 143:7
58:6,9,25 59:6	disrespectful	147:2 167:7	173:11	144:3 148:3
68:1 72:23 79:9	76:18	dog 153:11,13	drop-in 2:16 6:18	ease 124:17
79:10,14 80:16	dissent 65:1	doing 2:17 7:5,18	6:19,21 14:21,21	<b>easily</b> 169:20
90:10 103:5,11	distance 68:24	26:23 31:1 33:7	19:18 20:17 21:6	Eastern 154:1
				easy 80:25 112:2
	•	•		•

Brook House Inquiry

10 December 2021

				Page 18/
eat 130:9 144:17	Enclosed 172:25	17:6 25:13 63:1	71:16 72:18 85:2	120:18 128:4
145:17 146:14	encounter 11:22	85:21	85:3 103:16	130:4 131:2
148:25 149:1,5,6	encountered	et 56:2,9	<b>exception</b> 46:19	133:8 148:11
eaten 149:7	109:21	ethnicity 127:9	exception 40.19	152:7 153:8
eating 19:16 149:2	encourage 41:6,19	European 156:15	111:10,10	161:16 162:8,19
echoed 87:13	119:22	evening 108:25	excessive 101:20	165:16 167:23
Ed 86:8	-	109:1 150:6,6,8	171:16 174:24	168:8 171:25
education 117:7	<b>encouraged</b> 78:5 103:19	150:11 154:7	exchange 89:20	explaining 148:14
educational 150:3		161:23	excuse 8:5 32:18	
effect 33:6 82:22	encouraging 80:23	event 132:24	40:7,9	explains 168:22
			· /	explanation 81:9
100:16,21 153:13	endeavoured	events 140:1,12,17	executives 177:8	explicit 14:24 64:1
155:19 156:20	102:7,15	140:19,25 144:19	existed 161:14	67:25
158:22 169:16	endeavouring	167:1 170:11	expand 19:22	explicitly 33:5
effective 78:22	176:21	eventually 134:18	expect 51:3 91:2	49:10 53:15,16
effectively 82:5	ended 155:4	145:5 154:15	108:12 117:24	55:10 58:16 63:1
85:13 101:3	engagement 177:1	161:4	176:19	67:21 70:11
eight 172:1	English 110:13,14	evidence 1:21 2:12	expectation 11:22	103:17
either 32:17	118:3	14:14 15:6 33:12	expectations 51:3	exploitation
102:25	enlarge 55:21	37:12,17 40:13	51:9 120:18	141:11
elaborate 21:4	enormous 130:5	52:19 65:17 67:4	expected 11:19	explore 27:8
22:11 167:3	enquiries 24:17	81:7 83:21 84:11	16:9	exploring 37:21
email 12:14 19:10	ensure 73:23	84:22 95:8 98:17	expecting 97:23,24	exposed 116:3
19:23 22:4 26:8	96:10 136:21	101:21 104:23	98:2,11 177:4	expressed 50:4
26:25 39:11	139:8	105:3,10,12,21	experience 11:18	54:23 55:3
40:11 44:12,20	entered 109:1	106:1,4 139:9,15	24:21 30:11,17	extension 119:7
44:24 45:3,16,22	115:23 146:15	139:20,21 168:2	37:15 50:11 72:9	<b>extent</b> 169:12
45:22 46:19	162:15	169:15 170:8,15	77:13 88:5,13	External 161:25
55:21,22 57:11	entering 146:24	170:22 171:8,10	95:1 98:22 103:4	extra 24:11 121:22
58:21,22 62:10	156:15	175:12,22 176:4	103:6 109:16,21	extracts 147:4
79:12 89:20	<b>entire</b> 109:15	176:7,8 178:5,7,9	113:6 124:9	<b>extreme</b> 173:8,20
91:13	entirely 41:5 45:23	exact 18:25 78:15	140:3,21 141:5	extremely 100:18
emailed 79:6	52:18 55:17	<b>exactly</b> 8:12 78:10	experienced 57:1	150:17 173:15
emails 9:22 25:16	90:14	116:5,13 119:10	67:12 140:18	
43:20,23 76:17	entrance 109:2	123:25 142:14	experiences 110:1	$\frac{\mathbf{F}}{\mathbf{G}}$
90:23 92:15,20	entry 132:16	146:2 148:13	111:24 134:14,15	face 45:18 46:3,6,6
99:3	142:21 143:20	exaggerate 48:3	161:10 163:21	47:6 64:25 67:19
embedded 115:10	151:1 152:18,20	examination 1:6	169:24 171:13	145:15
embellishing	164:18	142:13 178:3	experiencing 85:4	facilities 92:21
46:11	environment 26:1	examine 128:12	109:25	facing 99:25
emerged 15:19	98:11 111:3	example 11:14	<b>expert</b> 28:20 36:25	fact 17:11 25:23
emergency 131:19	158:11	21:10 27:5 29:21	174:22 175:13	29:5 36:8 42:11
emotional 37:23	<b>Epiq</b> 176:16	33:23 34:12	experts 177:11	46:24 79:6 80:7
39:22,24 54:12	equivalent 83:18	51:20 62:15	explain 57:18	81:7 83:11 84:12
115:16 136:19	escalate 69:1	70:19 71:5,8	134:19 141:13	85:11 137:1
emphasise 4:9	escalated 7:8	72:19 73:23	145:22 150:16	142:5 160:14
76:12	escort 163:3	82:12 84:8,20	151:19 162:19	fact-specific 71:20
emphasises 123:5	especially 109:9	85:1 101:15	166:19 167:5	facto 14:7,7
employees 11:8	111:23 176:6	121:7,11 169:21	explained 10:21	factor 71:2
employers 6:8	essentially 16:24	examples 17:20	12:8 44:1 101:13	fair 3:15 15:7
	-			17:19 34:12 50:9
	•	•	•	•

				Page 188
63:6,24 68:16	161:6 163:18	151:15,19 153:1	<b>firstly</b> 2:19 22:4	115:22 132:15
71:19 83:3,8	165:20 166:19	153:2,17,17,24	25:12 27:1 32:9	138:17 141:7
85:21	167:4 169:20,20	157:12 160:8,13	35:20 47:12 66:2	163:5 166:1
fairly 4:8 13:24	173:25	161:1 162:22	86:8,8	168:10
	feeling 42:1 59:23	163:1 164:4,7,24	fit 81:2 88:5	<b>food</b> 44:7,15
faith 72:7,15	60:19 63:16	166:22,24 172:4	<b>fitted</b> 123:21	113:25 130:8,10
falling 44:5	116:17 132:23	173:6	124:17	149:5,8 157:8,11
fallout 64:7	133:1 143:2	female 121:12	five 124:25 136:13	foot 64:9
false 118:21	145:9 151:14	153:7	136:15 156:2	footage 88:16
familiar 40:1	164:13 166:24	fewer 64:3 77:4	166:13	174:22 175:16
1	feelings 18:8 19:3	fig 8:5	five-minute	football 150:5
128:14 162:9	109:24 129:3	fighting 111:9	104:22	159:20
far 63:4 64:3 68:23	134:10	figure 12:1	flag 18:15 28:7	force 69:21 70:5,8
, ,	feels 39:25 98:24	<b>filming</b> 129:19	flagging 101:3	70:10 71:6
,	feet 44:3 172:11	filter 57:12	flashbacks 115:5	101:19 123:12
	fellow 161:25	final 78:3 99:7	144:19 145:10,14	124:25 125:2
,	felt 4:13 7:24 10:5	finalised 20:14	146:11 148:20	127:11,12 155:25
135:13,17,25	11:1,1 17:17	finally 78:4 169:8	149:18 151:16,16	156:2,7,24 157:1
136:4 138:1,7,14	27:5 35:4 36:11	<b>find</b> 7:12,12 73:5,6	152:4 153:10	171:16 174:17,25
147:17 155:22	36:23 38:17,17	129:11 137:2	163:19 164:25	175:13
157:2	39:7 40:9 42:23	140:11 146:4	165:21 166:25	forced 28:11
father 107:25	43:11 52:7 53:1	150:16 160:16	169:23 173:23	117:16 134:8
fatigue 134:10	53:1,2,21 54:1,6	170:10	flashes 144:19	141:10
fault 50:15	54:18 55:16	finding 151:5	145:10	forcibly 119:1
fax 23:5	59:22 60:8,14	fine 25:13,14	floor 143:20	124:21 125:23
fear 158:12	62:9,11 63:25	105:1	144:18 145:4	126:5
feared 110:24	64:4,6,23 67:23 69:1 77:13 78:5	finish 39:16	155:14 156:17	forcing 124:23
142:8 fearful 72:9		119:19 171:2	159:22 165:6	forefront 54:9
feature 66:14	80:11 82:6 87:11	<b>finished</b> 152:16,19 <b>fire</b> 20:21 44:3	172:6 <b>fluff'</b> 97:8	foreigners 121:25
featured 66:5	90:14,19 92:1 95:4,7 97:3	firm 120:1	fluids 130:11	forget 126:8,18
February 5:22	98:15 99:18,20	first 2:24 3:25	focus 1:24 54:7	<b>forgot</b> 20:23 <b>form</b> 27:25 39:21
32:13 89:2	101:17,20 103:19	11:25 14:6,7	59:20 63:23	100:24 102:11
176:18 177:21	109:23 110:2	15:9 20:10 21:11	<b>focused</b> 63:19	152:9 154:10
feed 47:5	113:17 114:3	22:3 27:7 33:2	64:24 125:16	170:8 173:20
feel 9:20 10:23	115:17 114.5	37:10 58:12	follow 15:4 16:10	formalised 14:8
18:15 19:5 35:6	119:1 121:23	62:19 66:8,16,16	35:10 90:5	format 82:1,11
36:18,21 39:17	123:20 125:5,11	70:18 89:13	follow-up 15:25	formed 155:22
40:4,24 60:25	129:17,18,21	91:11 95:9	20:5 29:19 155:6	formerly 176:6
64:20 69:10	130:4 131:7	105:12 111:6	followed 90:6,22	177:6
71:12 75:3,24	133:6 134:23	112:1,19,19	91:1	forms 174:17
84:15 87:3 91:19	140:9 141:16,21	115:3 116:15	following 46:8	forthright 64:19
113:11 115:15,20	142:10,16 143:14	120:5 128:9	77:3 126:12	forward 20:8
118:20 121:25	144:16,21,24,25	133:22 146:6	129:19 131:14	48:23 49:22
129:16 130:13	145:5,18,24	148:7,21 149:1	138:18 152:5	71:22 79:7,9
134:2,14 135:14	146:15 148:19,25	160:11 163:21	166:8 169:2,3	80:8 98:19 114:6
138:3,21 142:7	149:5,17,19,20	165:6,9,23 166:8	171:24 174:7	<b>found</b> 66:13 67:4
148:2 151:18	149:25 150:4,11	166:14,17	follows 106:12,22	80:25 109:9,15
152:3 158:25	150:12,12,24	first-hand 37:23	107:22 114:8	118:19 122:1
	,,		10,,22 11,10	110.17 122.1
1			I	I

				Page 189
140 10 172 0	10600151000			117 11 101 15
140:10 153:8	106:20 151:2,20	22:21	Germany' 123:18	117:11 121:15
159:10 175:4	151:25 152:1,17	GDW000003	getting 7:25 39:1,7	132:1 134:22
Foundation 7	164:10 168:21	12:11 15:5 26:7	40:24 63:22	135:2,20 136:10
168:24 169:5	169:14 176:21,24	35:19 43:23	113:25 136:23	138:9 145:7
four 12:14 56:21	fuss 127:21	58:20 74:19	154:6	149:3 150:2
80:13 106:15	future 77:8,22	89:23	Ghanaian 144:1	154:17 155:19
123:16 124:25	131:11	GDW000008	give 7:10 24:10	165:17 173:18
140:7 156:2	G	55:19	29:20 42:11 43:7	go-to 14:4
168:4		<b>GDWG</b> 2:6 3:12	62:19 70:19	goes 57:13 71:22
framed 101:1	<b>G4S</b> 2:20 3:4,5,8	7:13 9:3,4,13	72:20 79:24 80:1	126:9 141:12
frankly 48:10	3:16 4:18 5:2 8:2	12:2 15:25 16:15	84:7 90:17 93:24	163:20
free 74:10 116:23	9:10 10:22,24	18:18 20:6 23:5	101:15 102:13	<b>going</b> 1:22 5:6
Freedom 128:17	11:6,8,15,20 12:4	25:14 30:2,14,20	105:12 106:4	15:6,7 16:12
128:19	12:23,25 14:3	31:13 32:8,24	110:6 131:14	17:1 26:9 31:10
frequent 7:1	18:24 30:22 31:1	33:23 34:5,17	134:18 135:1	31:11 42:4,25
147:17 150:21	31:7,12 40:4	37:4 41:5 44:9	170:7 176:7	43:14 49:9 56:12
169:19	42:19 46:24	45:16 46:19	<b>given</b> 4:16 7:16	57:22 58:9 63:11
frequently 24:12	55:12 56:7 58:17	49:25 51:17	20:8 26:1 33:10	66:1,9 67:18
44:5 57:25 74:7	58:18 60:23 61:3	53:25 55:23 60:5	33:11 37:17	69:4 74:2,9,24
92:17	61:25 63:6,13	62:4 65:2 66:24	48:24 49:5 50:19	75:22 83:3,15
Friday 1:1 119:12	70:4 73:7 78:9	68:8 70:1 72:2	52:18 65:25	84:18 95:1,4,23
119:14,16 136:10	83:22 84:15 85:5	73:12,13 74:25	77:16 80:6 81:8	98:2,19 102:24
136:15	86:17,18,21 87:1	76:24 78:6 79:8	87:25 88:2 98:4	112:12 114:23
Fridays 61:16	87:3,15 93:20	81:8 85:19 88:18	107:2 110:19	116:1 118:8,16
136:9	94:18,21 96:19	95:13 98:20,25	135:14 138:3	118:19 120:10
friendly 80:22	98:15 102:12	99:12 100:25	144:8 149:14,24	123:3 134:7
98:1,13	103:1 146:22	104:7 161:18	151:7,12,18,20	138:16 156:20
friends 67:20	151:22 154:15,21	GDWG's 3:17	159:16 168:6	173:10,16 177:5
162:8	174:18 177:7,10	51:20 53:12	171:13 176:4	<b>good</b> 1:3 4:24 7:2
<b>front</b> 115:23 129:2	<b>G4S's</b> 89:22	65:19	gives 163:6 168:11	7:5 12:16,22,24
160:6	<b>gain</b> 36:2	gear 123:19 124:1	<b>giving</b> 9:14,17	64:22 78:6,12
front-line 2:9	gained 89:14	general 26:22 27:2	26:8 33:9 38:4,9	88:18 110:14
frustrated 40:22	91:25	42:11 70:10	43:13 55:13,14	118:4 120:22,23
72:18	Galappathie 170:1	72:25 92:20	83:5,12 97:7	147:15 171:3
frustrations 65:12	170:4	115:6 142:17	100:5	<b>Goodman</b> 105:19
full 1:9,15,23	gap 131:15	generalised 73:9	<b>glad</b> 91:6	105:24 106:2
49:14 67:19	Gasson 3:4 4:1 9:1	generally 24:14	glass 155:22,23	139:5
81:16 89:5	9:8,9 11:25	27:15 42:11	156:7	govern 16:6
105:15 106:23	13:25 23:10 43:4	67:15 71:7 74:8	<b>glasses</b> 133:23	<b>GP</b> 135:2
123:19 124:1	43:5 47:1,8 54:4	161:9	<b>go</b> 6:10 13:20 15:5	grabbed 172:10
139:14 147:5	54:22 55:3 58:12	genuine 6:21 8:3	16:11 19:5,21	granted 169:7
full-scale 96:13,17	59:13 60:12	48:4	22:3,24 23:8	grateful 39:14
fully 145:19	74:23 87:2 88:22	genuinely 8:3 40:4	25:2 31:4 39:12	40:23 105:3
159:12	95:16,19 104:12	Germany 107:10	43:16 59:23 63:4	106:5 170:19
fun 117:11	<b>Gatwick</b> 2:4 3:20	107:21 114:24	76:7 77:7 79:15	176:4,6,25
further 6:21 15:25	36:4 66:14 87:21	118:6,8,11,17	79:17,19 87:16	great 46:18 103:12
26:2,5 35:1 40:3	100:11 137:20	122:21,24 123:13	96:25 102:24	177:13
43:2 53:14 81:15	gay 160:24	123:24 125:13,19		Grenada 144:4
95:8,23 100:23	Gayatri 29:22	126:2,11 138:19	116:8,9,16 117:9	grey 154:20
70.0,20 100.20	GDW000001 1:14	120.2,11 100.17	110.0,5,10 117.5	5-7
			<u> </u>	<u> </u>

				Page 190
. 122.22	00.10.06.10		2010670	1
greying 133:23	90:12 96:18	harsh 134:5	30:1,8 67:8	high 17:9,10 48:8
ground 68:2	159:2,5 160:1	<b>Haughton</b> 3:4 4:1	83:21 84:10	112:23 113:5
143:19 155:14	169:13	7:14 9:8,9 14:1	87:14 88:7 98:17	176:25
group 2:4 36:5	happened 4:22	19:12 22:22 23:9	103:3 142:3	highlighted 15:18
118:17 124:6	9:23 21:24 24:23	25:5 26:15 44:22	155:18 156:8,12	20:22
137:20 174:23	32:6 37:14 54:17	58:14 87:2	156:19 157:9	highly 12:22 31:13
groups 35:24 36:1	70:13,20,21	Haughton's 19:23	159:9 161:18	59:14,17 65:2
36:2	76:25 78:16 86:7	Hayes 174:21	hearing 1:3 127:22	highs 130:18
growing 141:9	88:13 96:11	head 3:6 33:1	139:19 164:4	historical 9:13
gruelling 56:3	97:22 98:4,16	54:15 125:23	165:17 176:3,18	10:8
guard 121:15	108:20 116:13	155:21 156:7	177:11	history 142:18
guards 113:4,5	126:20 127:23	172:3,6 175:7	hearings 176:19	165:22
114:15 119:18	133:18 146:2,5	health 23:6 24:3,4	177:2	hit 114:6 172:6
120:23 121:1,3	150:21 155:8	24:8,11,13 37:22	heart 87:16	hitting 72:21
122:6	156:12 158:15	108:3 113:8	heated 51:18 54:3	155:25
guess 5:9 18:4 59:7	166:20 169:13	117:20 126:11	54:5	HMIP 177:9
guidance 176:24	172:1 173:4	127:16 128:25	Heathrow 5:7 6:7	<b>HO</b> 87:4 95:16
guy 126:22 127:2	happening 6:4	129:21 130:1	6:9	HO's 26:20
<b>gym</b> 117:9,11	16:9 37:18 42:2	140:15 142:18	heating 173:15	hold 142:4
H	50:13 64:8 67:22	143:1 145:21	heavily 157:20	holding 62:14
hair 153:21 154:20	67:25 68:6 72:17	146:1 147:20,21	height 110:8	125:21,22,23
half 12:13 23:8	74:5 85:6,12	148:22 149:15	154:20	156:6,16 157:17
39:12 61:12	93:9,10 99:5	150:14 151:3,17	held 113:3 124:18	HOM002492
95:24	103:24 159:8	151:21,23 152:2	136:15 143:5	174:3,5
half-hour 61:15	happens 63:12	152:5 160:18	172:3,7	HOM002496
hall 25:23 26:1	happy 18:1 19:18	163:14,17 164:20	Helen 168:24	174:18
hand 114:5 124:19	22:7,10 76:21 86:23 114:17	164:22 165:1,18	169:5 hell 158:12	HOM002750
125:7 157:5,25	135:4	167:2,17 168:20 168:22 169:17		171:21
handcuff 124:18	hard 8:7 30:15	170:5	help 5:11 44:15	<b>HOM003398</b> 174:13
125:6 142:5	71:7 95:21 106:8		68:13,14 73:13 79:10 88:10 96:1	
handcuffed 126:5	119:23 120:16	healthcare 24:3,16 44:21,25 51:11	96:3 98:8,10,10	<b>Home</b> 2:21 3:5,16 4:18 5:3 9:2,9
142:8 172:9	harm 16:19 17:13	56:7 65:19 110:7	101:6 117:18	10:23,24 11:7,8
handcuffs 123:15	17:23 18:7 19:2	110:10 117:14,19	128:22 130:6	11:21 12:4,8,23
123:22,23,24	100:14 129:11	118:14 128:2	134:20 137:3,5,8	12:25 14:1 26:20
124:17 125:5,8,9	137:4 145:17	132:2,8 133:10	134.20 137.3,3,8	31:2,7 33:15
125:25 126:3	156:11 160:15	134:17,21 145:7	159:6 161:7	46:24 47:2 53:9
127:15 175:6	Harman 171:18	145:8 146:22	172:19 173:9	54:21,23 55:1,4,7
handed 123:20	173:1	157:11 161:6	helped 151:11	55:9,12 58:6,9
handing 94:12	harmed 146:21	165:23 168:2,8	helpful 88:23	60:23 61:3 62:1
handler 15:6	160:8	healthy 177:17	103:25 104:18	63:6,13 78:9
handover 4:16,17	harming 146:13	hear 78:5 91:6	122:19 137:13	83:24 99:11
4:19 147:4,8	Harmondsworth	103:23 105:23	helping 73:9 153:3	102:12 103:1
152:11	161:21 162:11,16	115:14 116:19	helpless 173:9	102:12 103:1
handrails 124:12	163:2,7,21	139:9 158:9	helpline 74:11	104.12 107.1,4
hands 134:5	164:12 166:2,9	169:21 170:24	helps 15:6 94:10	110:2 118:5
157:17	166:16 168:19	173:24 175:9,12	here' 136:9	121:23 122:20,22
handwritten 173:2	Harriet 171:18	173.24 173.9,12	Hi 19:25	121:23 122:20,22
happen 25:6 28:1	173:1	heard 2:12 14:14	hide 160:25	137:15,16,17
53:13 83:19	1/3.1	110414 2.12 17.17	1100.23	15/.15,10,1/
		<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>

Brook House Inquiry

				Page 191
	l	l <u></u>	l	
148:12,14 163:22	95:16 99:10	144:22	immigration 35:17	174:5 175:15,16
165:13 167:19,25	106:14,16 107:1	Hussein 174:8	35:23 49:17	175:19
168:14,16 169:6	107:8,13 108:24		72:12 118:15	incidents 43:11
171:15 172:25	109:18 110:7,22		120:19	66:4,20 88:3
174:12 177:8,10	111:5 113:7,18	idea 7:7 171:3	imminent 19:3	97:5 98:3 158:1
homophobic 161:8	114:11 115:21	identify 20:6,17	impact 32:15	158:14 159:15
honest 12:20 13:11	116:6,11 117:13	identity 122:16 IDRC 176:14	53:18 62:2,6,7,17	include 177:6
37:10 137:3	118:2,13 120:15		126:10 131:24	included 87:8,9
honestly 13:1	120:23 123:16	ignore 161:4 ignored 157:13	167:17 168:3	113:19
95:21	124:7,8 128:5,24	172:19 173:9	impeccable 106:9	including 2:9 6:8
hope 12:16 79:16	129:10 130:10,16	ill-health 168:7	implication 49:14	33:15,15 41:22
118:21 122:21	130:21 131:3,10		implied 37:5 85:19	56:7 97:5 107:24
125:18 141:4	131:12 134:17,20	illegal 130:17,18	imply 49:15 52:6	128:14 131:8
150:13 151:7,12	134:24 135:5,10	images 97:7	<b>implying</b> 39:15	144:20 154:1,8
177:2	135:12,20 136:7	imagine 95:22 114:25	50:20	170:6
hoped 38:22	136:18,20,24		importance 5:2	incoming 129:2
hopeful 13:3	137:12,23 138:1	imagined 12:6 129:15 131:4	important 36:24	incorrectly 163:13
Hopefully 1:17	138:2,9 139:24		51:25 52:3,22	166:4
hopeless 129:16	139:25 140:3,7	imam 136:8,11	133:7	increase 7:20 8:4
133:1	140:21 141:2,5	137:2,5,8 <b>IMB</b> 46:20,20 47:9	imposed 86:5	69:7
horrible 113:6	141:15,17,20	47:13,15,16 48:6	116:23	increasing 5:8
126:18 149:5	142:12 143:12	48:8,13,14 49:1,3	imposition 17:16	39:6 60:8 73:17
hospital 126:19	144:7,10,13	49:12 56:9 76:11	impression 7:25	73:17
hostile 61:4 78:18	146:4,15 147:18	87:4 89:8,9,11,14	11:4 30:15 31:6	increasingly 10:8
88:22,24 95:17	150:12 151:11	89:21 90:7 92:2	34:7,9 42:22	10:10 14:5 15:2
95:19 104:3	152:2 153:4,24	92:12,15,23 93:3	43:12 65:25	16:8 38:16 40:9
hostility 30:16	154:5,23 155:10	93:7,14,18 94:4,7	89:14 90:12 97:7	42:1 43:14 50:17
32:19 87:6,9,9	158:6,12,18	94:11,15,18,21	97:18 120:24	60:6 64:12 73:2
hosting 176:14	159:18 160:10	95:19,22,25	impressions 7:3,4	indefinite 73:1
hot 144:19 145:10	161:10,12,17,21	96:15,18 97:2,9	8:17	85:13 100:9
hour 61:13	161:23 162:1,3,7	97:18,25 98:3,18	improved 98:19	independence 72:8
hourly 146:18	162:10 163:16	99:1,3,4 101:12	98:22,23	72:15,22
147:11	164:3,5,9,15,22	102:12 103:1	improvements 84:6	independent 89:10
hours 112:11 116:7,12 123:17	165:3,9,19,24	161:15 177:9	inaccurate 164:21	91:2 92:4 136:3 Indian 141:23
142:11,16 143:7	169:11,19,24 171:11,17 172:23	IMB's 46:23 49:2	inappropriate	indicate 148:23
147:14 149:23,23	173:2,12 177:7	89:24 90:8 97:4	10:10 20:18 47:9	indicated 139:21
house 3:20 5:23	human 153:18	immediacy 71:2	47:16 49:16 81:4	indicates 143:4,24
11:20 14:9 15:19	humane 94:18,22	immediate 18:6,7	90:4	indicates 143.4,24
16:19 17:12	humanely 96:7,9	19:2 56:17 60:16	inappropriately	51:25 52:3,22,25
23:22 31:20,23	humanity 173:21	63:18 71:24	45:17	90:5,21
33:2 34:1 37:7	humans 116:22	74:17	incident 22:22	individual 7:2
44:3,21 46:18,21	humiliated 153:17	immediately 15:16	30:8 68:1 82:9	47:13 64:13
48:9 50:6,7 51:4	163:1	16:20 18:4,15	114:14 115:4,6	76:23 96:2,3
51:22 56:8 81:15	humiliating	76:22 155:9	119:20 126:4,17	130:22
82:13 83:16,19	144:25	162:17	127:3 133:25	individually 45:22
83:23,23 86:16	hunger 114:23	immense 68:14	153:15 154:24	61:9
89:15,17 90:1	hungry 130:12	129:9	156:9,10 157:4	individuals 94:7
91:7,19 93:19	hurting 125:10	immigrants	171:20 173:6	induction 49:6,22
71.7,17 73.17	141 ting 123.10	120:24	1/1.20 1/3.0	1114444011 77.0,22
	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>

108:23 109:4,10   inside 6:14 115:10   ir	nvestigate 52:13		140.2 172.16
108:23 109:4,10   inside 6:14 115:10   in	_	Ţ	1 40.2 172.17
			149:2 173:16
	nvestigated	<b>Jackie</b> 89:21,24	key 18:6 32:17
109:15,19 110:9   119:3 120:13	171:19	94:10 97:12	54:23 55:4 71:2
I	nvestigation 89:2	James 1:4,5 20:4	141:1
122:2 127:4 <b>insight</b> 48:15	96:14,17 171:22	20:15 23:12	keys 173:24
133:21 144:6,12   <b>insist</b> 21:23	174:15,16 175:3	91:15 178:1	kicking 111:14
164:2 <b>insofar</b> 46:6	175:10	<b>Jamie</b> 65:16 84:11	127:22
inflate 48:3   instance 14:6 27:7   in	nvited 9:1 92:9,10	84:22 85:15,19	kidnapped 107:24
influence 158:17   instances 4:13   ir	nvolve 36:17,18	January 33:16	119:20
159:4,7,11,11,19	nvolved 31:2	94:11	Kill 156:20
159:23 <b>instinct</b> 64:15	41:23 151:10	jingle 173:24	killed 108:1 109:8
influencing 81:5   Instinctively 64:20	156:11 158:16	job 7:6 91:16	148:5
•	ranian 114:23	96:10	kind 34:25 36:25
<b>information</b> 10:1 177:12	155:14	jobs 40:1	38:9 54:12 62:23
	RC 9:25 16:19	joint 11:1	85:12 93:1 95:5
42:12 73:24,24 109:9 120:20	20:20 54:25 55:6	jointly 10:24	98:11 101:15,20
79:24 80:2 85:24   insulting' 94:2	55:9,18 106:14	· ·	104:5 115:3
90:18 91:7 102:1 intact 58:4 60:2	107:8 113:18	joking 109:5 Jon 175:13,18	134:23 160:14
102:25 137:14 <b>integrated</b> 26:22	120:15 164:18	Jon 1/3:13,18 Jones 174:21	kitchen 116:9
	RCs 3:20 34:11		kneeling 124:15
informed 19:19 intended 26:20	36:4	journey 125:19	knees 172:12
	solation 107:15	judgment 82:20	knew 6:4 18:10
110:20 135:21,23   intends 176:17	107:20 111:1	82:22	36:2 46:15 50:21
135:25 138:11,12 <b>intention</b> 53:20	114:19,20 126:21	judicial 1:13 31:15	50:22 51:10
138:15 144:11 <b>Interaction</b> 102:8	127:1,17,24	31:19 138:18	66:10,11 85:5
163:22 interaction 102:5	127.1,17,24	July 3:3 33:3	87:19 120:3
	ssue 10:13,14	169:2,5	125:18 132:13
126:6 153:24 interested 125:17	14:12 16:12 19:8	jumping 29:20	154:19 160:13
	22:6 29:21 33:13	June 2:3 35:11	knife 114:7 129:12
1 · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	42:9 44:10 50:25	37:2 38:14 43:1	131:6
1 · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		168:23	
123:16 interpreter 62:22	51:9,22 52:15	Justice 49:17	knife-edge 56:5
injuries 43:22 110:12,18 118:1	54:23 55:4 69:16	161:19,20 168:23	62:11
172:20 118:7,12,13	78:24 82:24 84:4	justified 99:20	knocked 146:23
injury 123:15 121:17 132:21	85:4 96:23	<b>JW</b> 87:15	know 2:22 5:13
	ssued 68:3	JW's 88:5	6:7,17 8:9,12
1 -	ssues 1:24 27:7		10:3,8 11:20
inquiry 1:8 28:9 30:1	29:1 36:3,17	<u>K</u>	13:10 14:24 18:1
59:11 60:4 69:18   intervene 47:10	37:22 38:19	Kate 89:2	23:23 24:10,11
72:1 81:14 83:10   89:25	40:20 41:7,20	keen 3:9 89:16	24:18,19 29:7
84:5,10 105:17 <b>intervention</b> 28:24	42:17 49:6 57:6	keep 20:1,11 25:13	30:21 31:4 32:15
106:7,13,21,21 interview 89:1	64:4 67:9,10	25:14 60:2 63:11	34:4,10 36:8
115:8 139:13,15 168:12	68:18 69:12	102:3 123:9	37:15,19 39:18
139:24 140:22,24   interviewed 86:7	73:15 79:2 84:7	keeping 64:24	41:14 42:1,16
141:4 143:3 144:7	86:15 89:3 92:22	74:9,10,11,12	45:21 46:3 48:16
169:12 170:2,8   interviews 86:6	97:2,21 98:9	kept 68:24,24	48:17 51:6,6,12
171:14 175:11,14   174:19	102:4,13,21	101:25 107:11	53:7 54:10,11
175:18,23 176:2 intrusive 129:17	131:1 141:1	111:25 112:24	56:9 57:8,21
176:5,14,17,20 <b>invaded</b> 30:9	165:1 168:22	113:1,11,21	58:11 60:1 61:7
177:2,4,11,20   invariably 7:5   is	ssues' 164:20	122:7 131:6	63:11,18 64:14
·			

				Page 193
			1	1
64:17,21 66:24	177:4	148:17,18,18	31:11 42:12,25	89:22 90:24
67:7,9,10,17,19	late 66:15 112:11	162:8 172:25	46:22 53:10 62:1	94:17 99:7,14
67:22 68:6,10,22	141:20 142:16	letting 67:22	70:24 95:1 99:6	looks 150:18
69:2 70:16 73:1	144:3 168:23	level 11:10 48:8,15	99:20 101:12	lose 54:10,10,11
73:5,6,7,24 74:4	laughed 122:5	64:20 68:19 87:6	139:10 144:2	lost 133:5,6 148:20
74:12 75:8 76:3	laughing 109:5	110:14 112:23	live 105:12	lot 40:22 44:14
80:3,5 81:24	122:3	129:5 147:2,9	living 158:11	47:23 62:24
88:9,18 89:1	laundry 159:23	levels 96:23	LIVINGSTON	64:10 70:14
90:9 91:11,24	162:12,20,23	100:18 147:18	1:3,6,7 20:22	98:13 102:18
94:10 95:11,11	<b>Lawson</b> 174:20	176:25	61:11,18,23	116:19 125:25
96:18 97:21,25	layout 87:19	Lewis 30:12 61:2	101:8 104:20	127:18 140:10
98:6,13 99:18,21	115:22 165:8	liaison 14:3	178:3	149:12 157:18
100:7,15 101:1	lead 70:1 72:10	library 150:2	local 36:5,16	lots 8:19 18:12,13
102:22 107:12	<b>leading</b> 55:14 57:2	life 37:15 129:1	171:19	68:25 70:14
110:17 111:4	57:4 82:3 97:12	133:1	lock 153:7,11,13	loud 155:24
132:12,18 133:6	leaf 8:6	<b>light</b> 106:20	153:14	low 17:8 144:21
135:16 136:2,11	learn 66:8 81:2	lighten 56:1	lock-in 116:12	169:20
137:19 138:5	learned 148:7	likelihood 69:7	121:8	lower-level 17:14
145:12 146:16,18	learning 98:7	likes 26:24 116:21	lock-up 150:9	lump 172:14
153:15 155:4	learnt 4:21 66:16	limit 22:14	154:7,18	lunch 115:17
157:24 158:2,18	167:19	limitations 25:24	locked 109:20	
159:4 160:1,19	leave 49:23 116:2	25:25 51:12	116:15,19,21	<u>M</u>
160:25 161:2	117:17,23 120:8	72:19,21	117:2 126:25	MacPherson
165:1,15 166:14	137:3 149:25	<b>limited</b> 27:8 42:13	130:5 144:16,24	65:16 84:11,22
167:7 170:18	leaving 125:9	45:9 68:18,20	144:25 149:16	main 11:12 12:7
176:20	led 28:24 32:12	73:21 102:17	150:21 153:9	13:16 27:19,24
know' 97:2	64:21 81:3	limiting 30:22	155:5,8 173:13	48:24 73:20
knowing 144:18	141:21 155:17	limits 3:17 62:22	locking 153:11	109:2
knowledge 31:18	168:13	line 2:8 10:9,10	locks 175:8	maintain 23:7,13
32:6 73:16	left 29:2 53:13	13:2 33:24 34:5	London 5:6	25:5 63:5
140:21	111:19 150:4	39:17 40:5 43:12	long 13:22 57:22	maintaining 59:20
known 19:4 48:22	161:21	43:14 158:7	83:18 105:2	63:19
48:22 74:14	leg 124:16	lines 4:14 19:1	119:10 132:20	<b>major</b> 54:15
150:7	legal 9:18 21:7	49:13 91:4 94:17	145:5 162:5	making 24:17 32:7
knows 28:9	25:2 33:4 72:20	<b>lining</b> 56:17	163:2	49:14 62:14
	75:9 93:24 100:5	lips 114:21,22,25	long-lasting	73:14 110:2
L	119:24 120:4,7	130:23	169:16	127:18 135:11
<b>labour</b> 141:11	120:13 148:15	<b>list</b> 7:13 41:7,13,20	longer 140:10	137:24 152:22
lack 8:14 136:17	176:13	58:5 93:20 141:1	look 10:4 27:22	158:8 160:12,21
lacked 31:21 72:7	legitimate 51:16	listed 44:20	69:11 86:12 91:1	161:3
72:15	52:18 86:5 100:3	listen 135:6 158:13	92:6	man 111:18
lady 112:5,15	104:6	listened 122:19	looked 28:25 61:8	114:20 115:8
122:24	legs 44:3 125:1,21	148:2	108:1 113:9,10	121:20 141:22
Lampard's 89:2	125:22 172:10,12	listening 39:21	146:23 153:21	142:3 144:1,4
language 49:10	174:1	42:20 122:14	154:21 155:20	150:7 154:15,19
54:18	letter 41:11 74:20	164:14	156:18 158:23	159:20 160:2
languages 74:1	74:23,25 75:5	litigation 34:18	<b>looking</b> 2:24 27:24	173:19
large 8:18 50:12	76:4,8,12 77:2	little 5:15 9:6	37:2 38:13 46:23	managed 6:5
50:13 73:11	81:12,25 148:14	11:24 19:22 29:7	63:8 69:5 86:1,1	management 4:21
80:19 153:20			ĺ	4:25 7:9 9:25
	1	•	1	1

				Page 194
11:9,12 15:20	McGinley 35:16	132:1,2,6,10	25:17 27:4 31:5	163:14,17 164:20
16:8 17:5 18:16	35:21	133:3,8,11,12,15	32:15,21,22	164:22 165:1,18
20:20 30:18 31:5	meal 149:3,9	133:19 134:4,8,9	33:22 36:24 37:5	167:2,17 168:7
31:7,7 32:21	meals 44:6	134:12,18,22	38:15 39:6 41:3	168:20,22 169:17
34:11 37:7 47:18	mean 9:22 11:13	135:1 149:14	41:6,8,13,16,20	170:5
48:12 50:6,7,16	11:25 13:18	152:16 153:2	41:22 42:4,12,23	mentally 31:21
51:4,11,23 55:18	14:23 17:15 18:1	157:15 163:14,15	46:1 60:20 64:3	120:16 131:3
56:4 58:13,17	24:9 25:15 27:1	168:22	75:18 77:4,8,9,17	151:14 153:8
64:3,7 65:23	27:13 28:17,18	medications 132:8	77:22 81:19 82:1	166:22 168:18
75:8 77:4 81:5	32:9 33:22 40:18	medicine 121:12	82:10 89:11	mention 83:15
81:15 82:5,13	45:20 48:9 50:15	medico-legal	92:25 98:1	mentioned 24:14
83:22,22 89:15	51:5 52:2 58:10	168:25 169:4	meets 86:20 87:2	71:23 92:25
89:17 93:19,24	59:5,18 68:7	meet 9:4 75:17	<b>Mehraa</b> 29:22,25	104:3 155:15
94:2 95:6 97:19	74:10 77:12,13	meeting 3:25,25	member 16:17,19	161:24 170:10
98:16 99:10,17	80:5 85:9 88:9	4:5,7,8 5:21 8:24	31:13 46:19	mentioning 67:13
100:14	95:3,4 96:5	9:1,20 10:2,5,6	82:19 91:14	mess 114:1
management's	101:15	10:21 11:25	95:14 96:13,16	message 21:4
25:11 93:19	Meaning 123:8	12:15,17 13:19	101:18 103:5,17	25:15,18 49:1,5
manager 2:14 5:5	meaningfully 23:5	15:25 20:4,15	127:20 147:24	50:17 55:13,14
12:4 44:21 84:2	means 6:14 21:18	26:6 27:9,25	158:7	80:6 97:9
91:8,11,17 96:21	48:15,17	29:24,25 30:4,9	members 2:8	messages 8:14
154:16,24	meant 28:6 42:10	30:10 32:20	17:22 56:21	met 3:4,19 13:24
managers 62:4	42:12 53:7 58:17	33:16,21,25 34:2	89:12 93:15	24:13 26:9 30:5
77:19 99:11	62:19 81:22	34:2 35:11,14,15	94:15 101:17	30:5 44:1 47:24
177:7	measure 84:9,14	36:9,12,15 37:2,4	103:10,21 137:20	50:22 53:4 84:1
managing 2:8 51:8	84:21 85:6 86:4	38:14,18,18 39:8	154:25 161:7	86:8 87:12 94:8
manhandled	112:24	39:12 42:7,14,15	177:7	119:21 137:19
154:13 155:13	measured 110:8	43:2,8,17,18 45:4	memorandum	151:9 167:20
manner 117:24	measurements	45:11 46:18,25	15:13 16:3 20:1	metres 157:7
120:25 122:1	75:20	48:20 50:4,18	20:11,12 32:12	Michael 44:20
155:3	measures 72:11	53:11,23,24 54:3	35:9,12	Michelle 7:14
March 8:24 12:15	99:21 112:22	54:4,6,22 55:4,11	memories 108:20	33:16
19:11 22:5,19	medical 45:1	55:14 56:3 57:21	164:11	micro-managem
38:18 140:8	49:17 128:9	58:3,24 59:3,15	memory 41:15	57:16
141:14 171:11,17	132:16 134:24	59:16,23 60:10	66:25 106:16	mid 154:22
172:2	135:4 142:11,21	60:11,12,19,21	men 160:11	<b>middle</b> 61:24
mark 89:17	143:20 145:12	61:1 62:19 63:17	mental 23:6 24:3,4	112:5 118:25
Marsden 86:8	146:8 148:22	75:14 76:10,22	24:8,11,12 31:21	121:1 154:1
Mary 94:12,13	150:17 151:1	77:14,24 78:5,13	37:22 108:3,17	migraines 149:11
mass 130:21	152:18 159:5	78:15,17,21 80:9	113:8 117:20	mind 54:9 55:2
<b>matching</b> 20:7,18	161:19,20 163:12	81:2,15 86:11	126:11 127:16	62:13 71:8,16
materials 110:19	164:18,19 165:2	92:7 93:14 94:9	128:24 129:21	76:3,6 135:12
maternal 119:4,21	166:3 168:23	95:9,12 97:15	130:1 136:19	137:25 169:21
120:1 122:17	174:4	98:12 104:1,4,11	140:15 143:1	mind' 97:4
matter 34:23 45:8	medication 108:4	104:13 120:13	145:21 146:1	mindful 176:24
47:17 48:11,13	108:14 110:6	meetings 4:12 9:23	147:20,21 148:22	minor 106:15,25
49:3 76:13 166:8	117:15,19,22	9:25 11:11 12:1	149:15 150:14	122:3,13 123:6,9
matters 92:21	131:13,14,17,18	13:2 15:2,19,22	151:3,17,21,23	135:16
mattress 156:16	131:20,21,24,25	16:15 21:25	152:2,5 160:18	minutes 44:5
	,,,		,	
	<u> </u>	l	<u> </u>	<u> </u>

				Page 195
70.00 (1.10	15 5 15 16 25	27.10.62.10	762	102 7 120 7
58:22 61:13	15:5,15 16:25	25:18 62:19	news 56:2	102:7 139:7
170:24 171:4	36:16	71:17 100:25	NGO 27:19 51:11	151:3
misremembering	mouth 74:9 160:4	necessary 18:15	73:8	noted 94:17
15:17	move 42:25 61:14	56:10 57:17 neck 172:4	NGOs 6:11 72:8	notes 25:17 86:11
missed 68:5 98:4	90:1 125:24 156:5	neck 1/2:4 need 2:24 7:16 8:5	87:20 nice 56:1	86:15 88:10
100:19 128:18 mistreated 141:10	moved 107:19	8:19 15:12 16:5		93:14 102:18,19 130:2 132:19
145:16 154:13	114:18	17:17 19:20	Nigeria 141:9,12 142:9 146:8	147:4,8 152:11
155:12 160:17	moving 20:8	21:10 25:20,21	148:5 151:8	174:4
mistreatment 66:4	105:10 157:1	39:22 40:2 49:7	161:11 163:8,22	notice 58:5 74:3
66:20,22 67:6,11	<b>MP</b> 171:18,19	54:17 89:4 100:1	164:25 166:18	88:20 123:11
72:3 144:20	173:1	126:1 139:10	167:1,13 169:24	172:5
164:25	multi-faith 150:8	145:7 176:23	173:19	notified 16:20
misunderstand	multiple 164:22	needed 9:5 21:12	Nigerian 150:7	174:14
46:10	mumbling 155:19	22:11 45:8 54:18	night 66:11 111:6	notify 17:11 18:24
misunderstanding	Murphy 30:25	57:18,24 59:18	111:14,20,22	noting 76:18
21:20 49:2	33:19	75:2,3 92:1	112:9 116:6	November 1:8
mixed 111:17	Murray 174:20	99:22 102:11	118:25 122:8	93:15 97:23
mixed 111.17 mixed-race 153:20	music 97:7	121:24 131:21	123:1 131:10,13	138:25 139:3
mobile 119:8	Muslim 136:13	133:10,14,19	131:15 133:17	number 16:24
mockery 160:14	mutually 22:1	136:25 148:12	141:15,20 145:1	22:9 27:3,10
mode 59:25	mystified 48:10	157:12,14 161:1	147:15 150:22	36:16 50:13,16
mollify 63:5,20	mystifying 101:7,7	needing 59:24	153:6,9,12 155:6	70:16 72:2 73:11
64:23		needs 21:16 24:10	163:21	91:14 92:25
<b>Molyneux</b> 94:13	N	24:13 45:2 49:8	nightmare 114:3	109:11 121:16,18
moment 53:24	N 177:24	50:22 53:4 68:13	115:21 163:20	132:25 143:23,24
58:2 126:18	<b>naive</b> 5:10	negative 10:6	nightmares 115:5	157:20 165:4,8
<b>Monday</b> 66:11	naked 172:17	34:13 83:5,11	152:4 163:19	177:5
119:12,13	173:12	Neil 3:5 4:1 33:1	167:1 169:19	numbers 2:25 8:18
monitored 130:6	name 31:18	nervous 135:17	<b>nights</b> 111:2,16	80:19
Monitoring 89:10	106:23 110:16	138:6	112:18 113:21,24	numerous 6:16
91:3 96:1 136:3	117:16 122:16	never 6:19 15:15	165:12	85:2
monkey 56:18	124:2,4 144:1,5	20:14 37:12,17	no-one 85:18	nurse 24:4 128:9
month 4:22 8:25	148:4,11 151:9	38:6,11 42:23	128:3 130:3	142:11,17 143:11
months 13:2 38:16	153:19 165:12	46:15 52:18	135:21 138:11	143:13 145:8
43:3 93:15 97:24	named 174:19	57:17 58:10 82:2	149:7 150:25	146:2,7,9,11
months' 168:20	names 94:16	87:15 91:25	nods 22:12	147:21 148:8,22
mood 56:2	Naomi 19:12,25	99:15,20 109:16	noise 127:18	148:23 149:15
<b>MOORE</b> 105:10	31:14 56:23	118:13 119:8,19	noisy 126:25	150:14 151:3,4
105:17,23 139:7	79:16,20 84:1	120:12 121:2,3	non-controversial	151:23 152:16
170:22 171:8,11	90:15	126:18 129:15	86:23	160:18,23 163:7
morning 1:3 105:2	narrow 115:11	130:10,15 135:25	normal 5:17 124:2	163:9,13 164:10
123:17 142:14,16	national 106:23	137:8 138:14	normally 34:24	164:13 172:24
145:1,3,11	174:22	147:18 152:8	57:5,5	nurse's 142:20
mornings 149:12	nationality 127:9	153:13 155:10	note 5:14 9:22	nurses 164:23
Moroccan 159:20	Naturally 116:21	156:12 158:1,21	23:1,1 43:4 47:8	174:7
motivating 52:1,3	nature 76:12	159:8,16	50:4 51:2 77:10	0
52:23,24	near 127:18 156:1	new 34:3 36:1	78:4 88:6 95:12	
MoU 4:21 14:25	nearest 60:13	82:11 98:20	95:12 98:13	<b>object</b> 114:5 157:6
	necessarily 12:3			objecting 55:15

				Page 190
observation	7:20,21,23 9:2,9	117:5 118:15,25	operations 2:7	28:6 36:19 71:6
146:24 152:11	10:23,24 11:7,8	120:19 122:14	operations 2.7 opportunities	87:21 90:3 92:24
observations	11:21 12:4,8,23	123:18,21,25	117:8	100:13 116:8
146:18 147:3,9	12:25 14:1 31:2	124:6,7,13,23,25	opportunity 12:19	149:21,24 154:14
150:20,22 152:8	31:7 33:15 46:24	124.0,7,13,23,23	13:11 106:2,5	155:13 156:18
observe 103:6	53:9 54:21,23	127:4 131:20	112:14 117:6	outstanding 139:9
147:22	55:1,4,7,9,12	132:25 133:12	128:13,16 135:14	overall 11:21
observed 129:17	58:6,9 60:23	134:2 136:8	138:3 139:4	30:22 140:20
147:11,14 167:12	61:3 62:1 63:6	141:21,25 142:1	170:17	overlap 164:12
obtaining 9:16	63:13 78:9 79:17	142:3,6 146:22	opposed 39:25	oversight 135:8
obvious 53:17	80:20 83:24	153:25 154:13	85:6	158:6 177:8
57:19	99:11 102:6,12	155:25 156:4,21	optimism 5:11	overstep 89:17
obviously 5:17	103:1 104:12	156:22 157:20,22	options 63:15	Owen 174:20
13:8 15:21 18:21	107:1,4 108:8,11	158:3,16 159:3	order 63:5 107:5	OWCH 174.20
28:11 32:14	108:15 110:2	159:15 161:5	124:12 136:21	P
36:13 61:5 63:8	118:5,10 121:23	163:3 164:1	139:8	pacify 64:23
66:6 68:1 176:23	122:20,22 129:14	171:16 172:1,2,5	ordered 116:14	pack 162:24
occasion 14:20	132:13 137:15,16	172:18 173:24	117:2	page 11:3,13 12:12
15:24 26:3,5	137:17 144:13	174:18,24 175:10	orders 86:2 164:8	12:13 15:6 16:12
29:24 30:1 84:12	148:12,14 156:1	officers' 164:8	organisation 2:20	19:9,11,21,21
84:16 87:12	157:22 161:13,14	officials 177:8	3:16 9:17 11:3	22:2,21,25 23:2,8
92:13 117:18	163:22 165:13	Oh 5:16 17:15	19:7 25:19 42:20	26:7 35:19 39:10
121:14 126:15	167:19,25 168:14	84:18	52:11 53:19 54:1	39:13 44:19
127:19 155:13	168:16 171:15	OISC 38:9	54:8,25 55:5	58:20 59:12
156:14	172:25 174:12	okay 13:17 32:25	57:3 64:13 68:9	69:19 74:20 76:7
occasionally 46:11	177:8,10	65:11 96:20	68:12,17 69:6	78:2,3 79:11,19
92:18	Office's 26:20 47:2	104:24 150:12	72:16,19 73:15	79:19 86:19
occasions 82:16,18	169:6	<b>Olayie</b> 174:20	73:19 80:7 92:5	89:23 95:23
92:14 93:7	officer 29:22 30:5	old 119:5 121:21	92:15 93:1,8,20	96:25
132:25 148:22	116:16 118:6	122:20 135:24	99:10 100:8	pages 15:7 43:23
168:8	121:12 124:14	138:13 160:3	101:24 102:3,14	pain 44:14 126:1
occupational	125:20,21,23	older 144:2	103:21	126:12,13 172:11
44:11	133:17 144:7,10	Ombudsman	organisational	172:18 173:8,17
occurred 43:17,18	150:23 151:22,24	136:4	66:1	174:7
154:25	153:7,22 157:8	omission 58:7	organisationally	painful 140:11
October 32:10	157:10,13,15	once 45:25 157:19	60:2	pains 173:23 174:1
86:9 171:20	162:15,19,21	159:21 160:2	organisations 6:4	pair 124:17
175:3	172:7,7	ones 146:3	11:23 36:18	pandemic 140:4
offensive 109:13	officer's 153:19	ongoing 38:2	48:23 49:18	panel 27:19
122:1 153:6	175:17	40:16,24 163:19	76:14 137:24	146:24 155:22
offer 36:20	officers 5:24 6:25	onsite 24:4	organised 150:6,8	Panorama 28:10
offered 56:10	7:3,17 8:1,21	Oozeerally 174:9	161:24	28:14 61:6 63:24
76:22 119:8	23:21 67:9 70:17	open 13:22 80:23	origin 141:23	64:8 66:2,3,9,10
128:11 152:23,24	74:6 88:18 94:19	136:15 148:1	154:1	66:12,20,22 67:6
offering 37:6	94:23 95:2 96:21	opening 155:17	original 20:7	69:17 72:3 74:17
80:24 100:16,22	96:22 107:14,19	openly 87:3	outdoor 155:17	74:21 75:25
100:23	109:3,5,13,20	openness 94:20	outright 153:6	80:12,13 81:13
office 2:21 3:5,16	110:23 111:25	operates 95:25	outset 70:22	81:17,22 82:14
4:18 5:3,24 6:14	112:15 114:16	operational 12:5	outside 26:18 28:3	84:7 93:16 97:2
				97:3,24

				Page 197
	Ì		l	l
<b>paper</b> 117:6	49:2 51:9 53:24	11:2,8 13:24	111:13 120:16	49:23 56:23 72:5
paragraph 1:22	57:6,7 62:15	14:2,13 18:11	127:16 143:17	98:17 103:3
2:25 3:2,21 9:7	63:17 64:13 65:7	27:10 30:23 33:3	165:11 176:7	place 18:18 20:24
13:8,14 16:11,14	66:14 67:1 70:23	34:19 35:25	person's 24:2	23:13,14 24:5,19
17:3 22:3,20	82:9,10 85:16	48:21,25 49:21	45:17 114:25	37:2 59:25 60:1
23:11 24:1 31:12	88:16 94:9 99:17	49:25 55:8 57:11	122:16	65:19 69:3,4,10
32:25 35:13 37:3	100:12 101:23	63:4 65:2 72:7	personal 66:1	70:18 75:2 88:7
39:13 41:2,18	103:14 106:19	73:5,11 76:11	119:14	88:9,11 92:3
43:2,19,25 46:17	126:11 141:2	77:18 79:10	personally 53:18	129:15 131:5
47:1 48:19 50:2	particularly 6:22	80:14 83:25	66:21 99:9 103:8	136:14,21 140:6
51:15 59:12 62:3	12:20 18:7 27:13	84:20 88:21	176:8	142:13,15 144:13
69:18 72:1 78:3	27:15 40:10 60:9	90:10 92:16 93:7	personnel 117:2	150:19 154:18
79:4 81:14 83:3	63:17 65:24 68:1	100:16 103:22	persons 105:11	158:6 160:20
84:10 93:17	68:20 71:17,24	109:8 111:8,10	176:6 177:6	167:3
108:7 112:13,17	90:10 100:9	111:18 113:1,7	perspective 171:22	<b>placed</b> 111:7,18
114:8,13 123:4	106:8 117:1	113:11 116:19	pervasive 72:25	113:14 124:14
123:12 126:9,14	129:6 149:18	118:17 127:6	petrified 144:16	129:4 134:13
129:23 130:7	153:1 169:11	131:5 137:19	pharmacy 134:22	143:19 156:16
133:2 134:16	parties 11:16	143:25 146:21	phase 175:10,12	plainly 164:21
138:16 141:18	parties' 72:7	150:1 155:11	175:23 176:2,17	<b>plan</b> 26:24 152:10
163:23 166:11	partition 115:11	159:5,10	176:22 177:5,14	152:12
169:8	143:16	period 2:21,22	<b>phone</b> 47:24 62:21	<b>plane</b> 120:11
paragraphs 26:4	parts 37:15 58:17	8:25 11:6 14:19	91:14 117:23	125:12,14,20
28:8 89:10	172:21	15:12 17:21	118:7 119:5,7,8	126:6 127:13
106:22 107:22	party 67:13	22:20 35:5 41:11	119:10,11 162:4	planned 139:10
132:3 141:6	pass 91:7	42:5 50:12 64:11	162:5	plans 18:8 19:3
163:4 165:25	passed 24:2 29:18	64:14 69:21	photographic	<b>plastic</b> 114:4,7
168:9	<b>passing</b> 34:4 84:3	76:25 77:3 82:3	122:16	123:25 129:12
parameters 100:6	95:5	82:17 83:24 85:3	<b>phrase</b> 4:19 59:5	<b>play</b> 150:5 175:19
paraphrasing	pastors 161:25	91:10,12,21	88:14 90:21	<b>played</b> 159:20
104:5	pathway 27:23	92:14 93:4 98:3	100:22	175:19,21
part 1:13 16:15	patient 45:1	99:8 161:12	phrased 4:23	<b>plead</b> 123:9
32:1,17 54:15	119:22	165:3,19,23	<b>physical</b> 68:1 71:6	pleaded 110:22
57:9 76:7 83:17	patronising 45:16	174:4	73:22 111:3	111:24
91:23 100:12	patronising' 94:3	permission 14:25	126:12 145:20	pleading 130:3
124:8 133:7,21	pattern 38:15	19:20 20:9	physically 121:3,4	please 1:4,10,15
145:24 149:12	Paul 3:4 4:1 11:25	permitted 105:20	123:13 127:14	1:19 12:11,14
150:2 154:5,9	12:16 13:25	139:17	141:10 144:21	19:10,21 22:2,25
155:22	23:10 43:4,5	person 14:4,22	155:10,12	23:9 26:7 35:19
partially 165:10	54:4 58:12 60:12	23:4,20 26:6,9	picked 50:23 95:9	39:10,18 40:3
participant 115:9	74:23 87:2 88:22	28:8,9 31:20	picking 95:24	44:19 55:19,21
participants	95:16,19 104:12	32:2 43:22 44:2	picture 97:3 102:4	56:9,12 58:20
176:13	paying 145:19	44:13 46:7 68:2	102:13	79:18 86:10
participate 130:20	peacefully 154:14	68:8,11 69:6	piece 32:24 34:10	93:11 95:23
particular 4:12	pen 117:6	71:3,10 72:14	170:22 171:8	96:25 114:18
17:4 27:14 30:6	penultimate 16:11	80:24 82:23 84:8	pig 56:18	plus 58:17
32:2 33:24 35:3	95:15 96:12	84:13 85:11	Pincus 2:12 14:15	pm 55:22 58:19
40:11 42:9 43:12	people 2:10 6:19	91:15 101:18,18	15:10 18:17 29:6	104:25 105:6,7,9
43:14 45:7 47:15	6:22 8:18 10:22	110:4,9,24	29:24 42:19	109:18,18 139:8

				Page 198
120 11 154 17	02.20	02.5.6	154.22	156516610
139:11 154:17	83:20	82:5,6	154:23	156:5 166:19
171:5,7 177:19	possible 18:21	prefer 169:14	priority 54:7 58:3	173:25
point 3:8,24 4:8,18	21:17 40:18,21	preferable 112:3	prison 73:2 94:19	proposal 6:1 7:7
7:21 10:7,9	42:18 44:9 51:13	preferred 162:1	94:22 95:2	41:12
11:19 12:7 13:3	65:8 72:2 73:21	preparation	prisons 95:1 136:3	proposals 77:21
14:7,18 15:22	74:13,14,15 75:6	168:25	private 15:25	protect 91:8,22
16:4 20:20 21:9	75:7 76:5 94:6	prepare 41:8,21	25:22 75:2,17	143:17 161:2
21:14 25:11	130:17 132:22	prepared 75:15	115:13	protected 175:2
26:21 27:2,2	136:24 176:22	105:17 128:1	probably 14:6	protection 113:13
36:19 37:9 38:1	possibly 11:24	140:4,25 167:9	29:3 61:12 73:10	protest 114:22
38:4,23 43:10	13:3,7 59:22	169:4 170:1	82:21 88:15	130:11,24 154:4
45:24 46:16 48:5	104:21	prescribed 110:6	107:17 112:6	154:10,10,23
58:12 59:10 62:9	post 3:4 4:2 10:13	132:9,11 134:3	139:10	155:6
64:6,10 66:23	10:19 12:7 15:14	134:25 145:23	Probations 136:4	protesting 100:11
67:18 68:7 73:3	87:13,24	163:15 168:21	problem 19:25	protests 100:13
78:20 82:10 86:3	post-traumatic	prescription	problems 106:16	130:19,20,21
88:4,16 91:18	106:17 110:4	117:20 152:17,24	110:3 112:25	prove 122:15,19
95:21 96:12,20	posters 73:23	presence 6:13 12:9	113:8 127:16	provenance 95:11
97:1,14,23 98:8	potential 168:14	30:16 31:8 49:19	129:13 134:20	provide 37:23 41:7
99:2 114:4 118:5	potentially 17:3,10	68:21 90:13 98:5	137:6 147:19	41:20 44:9 54:12
130:16 152:2,8	17:10 26:12,13	100:21	148:1 163:14	54:12 102:10
pointed 51:16	power 64:5,25	present 94:14	procedure 135:22	131:23 132:1
104:6	76:2 80:12 81:23	104:12 107:7	136:1,6 138:11	152:9 159:5
points 15:9,10	powerless 59:22	119:18 133:24	138:15	169:14 176:21
20:3 22:6 54:5	<b>PPO</b> 161:15	presented 37:12	procedures 90:6	provided 19:19
65:12 75:18	practical 38:5	40:12	90:22	34:18 44:8
99:18 102:19	54:13 86:23	pressed 121:12	proceed 104:23	102:12 118:12
police 135:20	137:6	pressing 121:14	proceeding 142:4	119:6 137:13
138:10 141:14	practically 149:24	pressure 52:7 53:2	proceedings 1:13	139:12 144:6
174:12,14,15	practice 14:23	53:3 129:9 130:5	process 79:17	167:7,22 168:12
policy 17:6 18:18	15:3 34:23 44:21	131:4 136:19	109:4,15 123:14	175:18
100:10	practise 136:17,22	presumably 7:22 53:18 55:7 62:25	131:12 144:12	provides 106:23
<b>polite</b> 45:23 52:21 59:4,21	pray 136:9,12,13		148:8	106:24 107:23 138:24 141:8
,	136:16,25	63:9 88:6,21	processed 95:6	
politely 121:10	<b>prayer</b> 150:11 151:10,12 161:23	presume 87:7 presuming 97:4	<b>produced</b> 139:15 171:20	170:13 173:3
poor 128:25	,			<b>providing</b> 27:19 33:3 36:7 39:19
population 26:23 posed 106:21	prayers 136:10,12 136:15 150:6,6	pretty 56:3 previous 3:25 4:22	<b>professional</b> 45:23 110:7 136:2	39:24 40:5,13
posing 142:6	162:2	5:4 19:11,21	171:19	68:10 75:9,10
position 14:15,18	praying 136:15	47:19 66:12	Profumo 139:17	170:21
16:4 21:2,2,3	preached 150:9	79:19 164:25	139:19,21 170:20	<b>provision</b> 39:15
29:3 42:14 54:19	prebook 6:20	previously 44:4	programme 88:5	PSU 161:15
117:11 124:15	precautionary	57:10 80:11	97:6	174:12,17,19,21
134:13 175:7	112:24	81:24 108:11	progress 59:19	174:12,17,19,21
positive 7:3,7	precedent 6:3	prior 2:21 11:18	progressing 20:9	PSU's 174:15
12:21 13:5,11,13	preceding 151:6	16:2,6 19:19	progressing 20.9 prompted 4:2 10:1	psychiatric 39:20
24:14 34:2 42:15	precise 166:14	20:9 33:22 35:14	32:12	psychiatrist psychiatrist
78:4 83:16	predecessor 4:3,19	41:14 45:4 80:17	properly 52:13	132:12 169:25
positively 13:9	4:23 15:17 64:23	108:9 132:14	136:18 137:1	psychological
positively 13.3	T.23 13.1 / UT.23	100.7 132.17	150.10 15/.1	psychological
		<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>

Brook House Inquiry

				Page 199
			I	l
109:24 115:16	qualified 93:25	135:14 138:3	151:1 170:15,18	19:1 23:25 25:18
126:7,13 129:9	100:4	raised 9:13 10:24	170:22 171:8	29:10,10 30:4,10
166:22	quality 147:15	13:21 18:3 23:21	176:8	33:6,11 34:20
psychologically	quarterly 41:6,13	23:23 24:8 26:18	reading 104:23	41:15,17 54:22
131:3	41:19 81:25	33:13,14,20	106:1 139:20	55:10 66:10
<b>PTSD</b> 108:4	86:20	38:19 40:21	171:10 178:5,7,9	72:17,18 77:1
140:14 169:3,18	<b>question</b> 6:24 55:2	45:13,25 46:24	reading-in 61:14	78:15 81:20,20
170:6	88:4,11 99:7	53:14 54:2,24	reads 13:9	87:23,24 92:18
public 112:5 119:9	101:24 103:25	55:5,8,17 56:12	ready 162:17	103:8,11 104:17
126:20 127:1	104:16 132:22	58:8 64:4 67:22	real 109:22,23	106:18 110:13,15
publicly 176:11	questioned 72:23	69:13,13,13 70:7	realise 56:14 73:12	110:19 112:14
pull 124:19 125:2	questioning 122:1	70:12 76:9,16,24	realised 111:7	118:1 119:15
125:14	questions 1:18	78:19 84:7,12	112:8 133:13,19	132:9,21,24
pulled 124:24	79:25 101:9,9,11	90:10,15 92:1,23	reality 135:21	133:20,24 135:9
125:7,16	104:19 106:21	97:2 102:4,14	138:10	135:13,18,25
pulling 125:1,4,17	109:6,11,14	raising 23:20	really 4:20,24 8:8	136:4 138:1,7,14
<b>punching</b> 126:23	110:15,16 121:16	29:11 37:19	12:18 13:10	142:14,25 143:19
127:22	121:18,22,24	39:14 40:9 48:5	41:25 46:15 48:1	146:11 152:23
punish 159:6	142:18 143:1	48:12 51:2,9	50:18 60:21	163:10,16
punitive 72:11	145:20 146:12	56:6 58:6,16,25	67:23 71:19	recalls 132:5
84:9,14,21 85:6	147:19 163:17	59:5,6 61:8	75:16 78:4	receive 29:14
86:4	165:21 166:7,17	63:11,14 65:7	101:24 144:21	41:25 73:13
purpose 15:22	queue 157:9	72:9 90:19 91:25	145:9 153:9	77:25 151:25
20:6,16 21:6,15	queuing 157:6	92:2,15,20 98:9	155:7 166:24	168:19
22:16 26:20,21	quick 29:8 90:23	ran 30:4	reason 7:10 21:9	received 29:17
27:24 75:1,5	90:25 139:7	range 21:16 50:10	21:17 23:2 30:13	44:12 51:19
128:4 167:6	quickly 28:25	rape 113:16,19	33:10,11 43:7	105:13 106:20
purposes 2:19 5:9	145:25	rapidly 27:21 28:23	48:2,24 50:23	135:4 138:20
push 131:19	quietly 141:24		60:1 85:7 87:25	139:16 147:10 161:20 163:13
<b>pushed</b> 64:19 172:6,10	<b>quite</b> 10:5 13:9 24:25 34:9 41:1	RAPT 48:22 49:4	92:3 100:17 111:11 140:18	
pushing 65:8	56:14,20 67:11	49:12,21 56:9 76:11 80:7,20	160:7 165:15	receiving 32:19 36:22 45:3 50:15
put 3:1 4:11 13:12	67:16 68:18,19	81:3	reasonable 16:17	85:18 131:17,18
17:16 26:17 29:2	70:10 76:4 83:20	rare 58:10	38:23 75:13 90:7	134:3
42:13 59:25 60:1	90:23 95:7 99:6	ratio 113:5	reasonably 32:16	reception 6:1
60:14 62:10	102:17 119:17	reached 4:5 38:22	73:4	109:2,3
63:20 73:1 74:2	155:22	85:15 123:23	reasons 7:13,15	recognise 177:13
82:23 84:8,13,20	quote 173:7	155:21 168:6	8:16,23 16:25	recollect 66:23
107:15,17 109:19	quotes 26:14	react 97:15	17:24 18:14 22:9	94:16
110:23 111:1	quotes 20.14	reacted 133:11	27:3,11 37:19	recollection 18:19
114:18 119:11	R	reaction 24:6	38:11 63:21	29:15 34:1,20
122:4 125:12	racial 71:11	26:25 63:22 67:8	64:22 68:17,19	60:17 65:22 66:7
127:14 130:3	153:23	94:25	68:25 72:2 75:1	78:17 82:15,16
146:17 162:25	racist 68:3	reactive 42:10	80:19 86:5	84:1,25 93:5
puts 61:6	rainy 60:18	reactively 42:3	103:13	103:2
putting 13:5 65:1	raise 47:13 51:17	read 13:8 104:4	reassigning 21:17	recommendations
74:3 82:8	57:5 58:11 65:14	105:20 106:6	reassurance 136:8	135:1 175:5
	70:11 73:12	138:16 139:9,17	reassure 75:7	reconcile 59:15
Q	84:15 102:2	139:21 146:9	recall 9:21 18:25	78:8,10
<b>QC</b> 171:18 173:1	103:13 104:7			)
	<u> </u>	ı	ı	ı

				Page 200
166 4 167 17	20 10 40 21 24	1		1.00.10
166:4 167:17	38:10 48:21,24	relate 88:13	reluctance 65:14	169:10
recorded 69:23	51:10 55:16	related 53:8	103:12	reminded 113:18
132:18 147:18	60:23 70:17,25	140:24 166:21	reluctant 10:2	134:13
151:4,5 160:23	74:6 76:11 87:1	169:19	remain 167:22	remit 75:23 90:3
163:13 165:2	95:18 96:19	relates 65:24	176:25	removal 88:20
167:14	151:2	101:11 171:9	remainder 44:12	118:9 120:3
records 101:25 102:3 128:9	refers 28:3 29:5	relating 147:2 relation 24:8	remained 84:6	123:14 125:17,18
	reflect 64:10,10 68:5,14 140:17	31:22 33:25 35:2	123:22 142:10 143:8 145:4	126:10,12 138:19
132:16 142:12,21	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			138:21 171:16,24
143:21 145:13	147:9 reflected 28:13	47:20 69:17,20 76:11 85:16	remains 27:1 170:16 177:16	remove 118:6,17 124:21 126:2
146:8 147:4,6		104:1,15 167:15	remarks 68:3	124:21 126:2
148:23 149:8,10 150:18 151:1	reflecting 36:8 reflection 53:21	170:23 175:14	176:1 178:11	
150:18 151:1	98:2	relations 88:18	remember 3:22	removed 107:9,21
163:12 164:18	reflections 99:11	relations 88.18	4:8 6:2 9:22	118:8,10,19 119:1 123:13
165:2,13 166:3	reflective 68:7,9	4:4,5,17,20,24,25	15:16 18:17,23	126:5 137:17
166:15	reform 100:8,10	5:2,12 7:2 11:6	29:15,17,19	142:9 151:8
Red 5:5 6:5 49:18	refresh 66:25	12:7,22,25 16:7	34:24 45:5 48:10	renew 152:21,24
redacted 106:11	67:15	24:15,16 59:18	53:22 54:4 60:10	repeat 9:16 14:21
144:2,5 148:4,11	refugee 27:18	61:25 62:2 63:5	60:10,11,17,18	19:18 20:17 21:4
151:9	28:20 169:7	74:17 84:16	65:4,23 66:9,13	22:14,16,24 23:3
refer 1:16 3:21	refusal 27:14 28:2	86:17,18 89:8	67:14 72:22	26:11,16 28:15
4:11 24:3 28:4	28:15 149:8	98:18,22 99:9	78:10 82:24 85:9	29:23 82:13
31:18 37:24	169:6	100:14	85:25 87:22 88:2	repeated 37:5 60:5
49:11,12 50:2,24	refusals 36:10	relatively 34:4	92:13,22,24 93:1	78:18 93:20
70:9 79:5,8,10,14	130:8	64:8 84:3 87:13	93:6,9,10 94:8	157:14
80:14,15,25	refused 22:23	relaxing 177:17	95:20,21 97:11	repeatedly 4:11
88:24 89:11 93:7	36:14 87:15,22	release 28:25	97:16 98:24,25	33:13,20 43:13
reference 1:14	130:10 152:20	145:1 169:3	99:1,4,5,5 103:12	51:16 53:11,16
78:23 148:10	168:16 172:19	released 118:22,24	103:24 104:15	54:3 104:6
references 67:11	refusing 26:15	131:9 140:13	107:11 109:11	133:12,18 157:10
147:8	87:25	169:2,18	110:8,11 116:5	164:23
referencing 37:21	regarding 14:15	relevant 2:21,22	117:16 118:11	repeating 55:2
referral 28:1,19	79:24 121:18	8:25 11:5 14:10	119:2,3,10 121:5	reply 19:23 157:16
79:17 93:25	137:15 175:5	14:19 15:12	121:20 123:25	report 17:4,16,25
102:1	regards 36:15	17:21 22:19 35:5	124:4 126:15	71:12,13 73:18
referrals 46:13	regime 119:2	35:6 41:11 42:5	127:19,22 128:5	101:23 108:10,11
48:8 49:7,14,15	registered 24:4	50:11 64:14	132:6,19 135:10	128:1,3,4,15
49:16,20 57:8	registration 109:4	69:21 82:17	137:10 140:12	153:15 158:7
80:7,23 93:3	131:12	83:23 91:10,12	142:1,15 143:11	159:1,25 167:9
referred 6:17 9:12	regular 13:24 23:7	91:20 92:14 93:4	143:18,22 144:17	167:10,20 168:25
29:5 32:19,23	23:13 25:5 42:15	98:3 99:8 140:1	146:2,6 147:17	170:1 171:20
34:3 43:10 44:11	49:16 57:9 90:13	reliant 74:3	148:8,13,24	174:11,16,22
78:16 80:19 84:3	regularly 123:1	relied 171:22	149:17 150:14	175:3
94:1 98:19	134:8 146:20	religion 127:9	151:23 153:19	reported 69:19
168:14,24	regulated 38:9	136:17,22	154:4 156:22	70:5 71:5,17
referring 1:18	rehabilitative	religions 150:10	157:24 160:24	114:14 158:1,14
2:25 10:7 27:18	159:16	religious 137:7	164:13,14 165:4	159:2,15 163:8
33:21 34:16	reiterates 132:23	reliving 134:15	165:5,11 167:22	165:22
	-	-	-	-

				Page 201
	1	1		1
reporting 16:13	105:10,12 127:3	resulted 167:9	risk 16:18 17:13	116:7,14 154:8
103:16,22 108:9	respectful 52:20	resume 176:17	17:23 18:8 19:3	154:14,17 155:5
108:13,16,24	respond 13:20	Resuming 166:11	71:24 82:23,25	RTS 176:15
109:1 120:6,9	22:5 38:20 46:4	retained 175:17	101:17 160:8	rude 117:24
reports 71:22	51:21 52:12,14	return 79:10	role 1:25 2:6 3:17	133:22 134:4
169:4	76:5,16	116:14 117:2	4:10,15 5:1,4 6:5	rudely 121:9,13
represent 115:7	responded 21:13	121:7 171:1,4	7:18 9:4 11:18	133:11
representation	28:22 38:19 82:2	returned 113:25	35:25 46:5 49:3	ruder 154:2
148:16	99:19 153:12	114:24 127:1	51:21 86:22 90:8	rule 34:25 92:12
representative	167:20	151:14 162:24	91:8,22,23 96:1,3	127:25 128:1,3,4
73:7 120:8,13	responding 46:4	164:5 172:22	97:20 98:9	128:15 167:9
representatives	91:16 99:4	returning 104:24	room 21:7 25:3,22	168:5
105:19 120:5	responds 79:20	126:14 130:7	28:12 36:25 48:1	rumours 88:8
139:17 176:13	response 6:24 8:2	134:16 141:18	53:23 54:16 75:2	run 11:20 12:5
represented	8:10,11 22:5	155:5 163:23	75:17 77:15	26:14
119:25	29:8,8 36:21,22	169:8	107:18 111:12,13	running 52:7 53:9
request 14:20,24	37:1 40:11 41:23	review 1:13 31:15	112:2,3,10	57:7 74:11,13
15:2 19:18 22:23	41:25 42:7,8	31:19 69:12	113:21,25 114:2	83:23 151:10
26:5,15 35:1	44:12,20 45:3,10	85:24 138:18	114:3,10,17	
39:2 46:21 47:15	46:23 51:12,18	148:23 151:2,17	115:11,12,20,22	<u> </u>
47:20 48:13	51:23 77:2,25	151:20 152:5	115:23,24 116:3	<b>S1940003</b> 175:20
75:20 82:18,19	79:15,23 82:20	160:19 167:25	116:4,16,17,18	Saeed 145:12
87:22 88:1 90:1	82:21 88:6,25	reviewed 69:24	117:2,15,17,23	safe 110:23 111:25
100:20 105:21	89:22,24,24 90:7	163:12 165:21	121:15,16,17	114:18 116:3,18
139:16,18	104:8 167:23	167:25	122:4,7,8 123:17	123:10 130:3
requested 35:14	174:23	reviewing 25:16	126:21,25 127:21	150:11 158:6
44:10 63:15	responses 29:16	reviews 149:15	131:6 132:7	161:8
87:16,18,23	responsibility	164:22	133:16 136:12,16	safeguarding
105:18 143:3	11:21 12:6 98:6	revisited 9:5	137:4 141:21	16:13 17:6 18:18
149:10	responsible 2:6	ridiculous 109:6	143:5,10,14,16	19:8 53:4 57:6
requesting 23:3	responsive 13:7	<b>riding</b> 56:18	143:19,22,24	69:20 70:1 71:1
37:5 39:3 62:15	74:10	<b>right</b> 2:5 3:10 9:7	144:18 146:24,25	71:13 91:8,11,13
121:10 123:9	responsively 27:22	9:18 10:12,16	149:17 150:24	91:13,17 99:3
128:14 174:13	rest 115:12 165:10	14:10,17,22	155:14 156:17,18	101:14
requests 9:24 20:8	restful 177:17	22:13 31:19,25	158:20 159:22,22	safer 29:6,9,12,14
63:14 64:3 77:4	restrain 127:20	33:17 35:17 39:7	160:4 162:12,15	29:16 44:22
81:19	restrained 68:2	41:24 42:6 47:16	162:24 164:1	91:19 92:7 98:10
required 20:5	123:14 125:20	51:19 69:24 70:1	165:8,8,10,11	saliva 160:4
99:21 108:11	127:14	76:14,19 77:11	room-sharing 29:1	Samaritans 40:2
requiring 16:2,6	restraint 123:21	80:16 81:17	roommate 111:21	49:19
reserve 106:18	123:23 175:1,6	83:10 89:18	114:15 115:17,19	sat 134:25 145:4
resist 123:20	restraints 127:14	93:21 98:24	144:4 148:3,11	satisfied 24:21
124:12	restrict 62:5 63:3	106:18 134:23	158:23	<b>Saunders</b> 3:19,23
resistance 142:6	63:4 86:22 100:1	167:3	roommate's	4:6 5:21 87:8,10
resisted 124:20	restricted 129:21	rights 110:20	165:12	87:12
resisting 125:16	restrictions 14:12	144:11	roommates 158:4	saw 4:9 5:1 24:12
125:18 157:3	69:3,4,10 140:4	ring 133:16	158:19	25:12 34:12
resolve 42:17	176:24	<b>riot</b> 123:19 124:1	rooms 73:3 111:13	66:17 67:5 75:23
respect 101:11	result 32:6 111:1	ripped 114:1	112:16 113:3	108:17 113:25
				114:20 115:2
	1	1	1	1

				Page 202
			l	
118:15 122:10	145:15,22 146:9	33:7 34:13 36:13	self-harming	41:10,19 43:17
131:5 141:22	146:12 163:9	37:20 40:15	155:12	72:1 74:25 75:3
148:21,23 149:13	166:21 167:12,15	41:10 47:17	self-worth 173:22	76:8 81:24 83:18
155:11,14 156:14	scary 111:19 115:5	48:11,12 61:19	send 122:21	sets 16:14 86:14
159:8,16,21	116:21 126:24	63:12 72:4 74:19	148:16 162:8	setting 16:5 32:1
Sayers 174:20	scene 155:1	79:11 86:14 88:3	senior 2:13 57:10	34:3
saying 14:17 20:25	screamed 124:10	93:23 96:20	154:16,24 177:7	severely 31:21
24:7 25:5 26:9	screaming 113:23	100:2 101:5,5	177:8	sewing 130:23
33:6 36:14 42:6	172:18 173:8,16	105:6 115:25	sense 8:16,23 11:9	sewn 115:1
45:19 57:12	screen 12:11 55:19	116:1,3 121:24	11:11,13,15,17	sexual 111:24
76:17 77:8 78:21	58:20 74:19	123:2 130:21,22	72:25 73:9 100:7	131:8 160:12,21
79:20 81:5,7	86:10 89:23	134:19 137:2	103:23 173:22	sexuality 141:12
84:19 87:9 91:1	93:11	139:8 142:23,24	sent 12:14 19:12	160:9,16,25
94:21 95:18,19	screening 163:6	145:6,8,22 146:9	39:11 43:20	sexually 107:24
95:22 96:8,10,15	164:10,11,15	155:24 156:5,25	44:12 46:20	110:24 111:22
97:13 103:11	166:4	157:2 158:8	55:22,22 57:14	141:10 150:15
104:15 114:17	scrutiny 26:17	163:11 164:1	58:21,22 74:20	shaken 60:19,21
134:5 160:24	28:3 SDCOs 174:20	170:25 172:24	92:15 117:15	share 10:2 107:18
says 12:15 15:21	SDCOs 174:20	173:17 174:16	122:23 148:5,14	111:20 114:17
15:23 19:15,24	seated 142:10	seeing 8:19 25:4	164:3,4 174:12	123:10
20:10,15,16	second 14:21	37:20 42:16	separate 113:3 115:12 122:4	shared 23:12,16
23:10,19 24:1 26:16 28:11	15:21 21:18 22:8	67:25 133:21 seek 14:24 38:21	169:4	54:25 55:6,8
44:23 55:25	22:10 24:1,7 26:6 27:3 30:10	48:3 113:12		115:22 122:8,25 165:10
67:19 71:4 76:22	36:10 37:20	seeking 40:18	separated 128:14 143:16 165:10	
86:17 88:17 90:2	38:21,21,24	42:24 63:20	<b>Separation</b> 112:21	sharing 28:12 112:4 143:25
95:15,25 96:6,12	62:15 82:19	117:18	September 1:14	sharp 157:5,17
97:1 123:6	84:18 120:10	seen 19:11 25:8	41:12 74:21	sharp 137.3,17 she'd 47:24,25
126:12 130:3	124:5 164:15	47:25 53:3 56:19	75:25 81:13,16	she u 47.24,23 sheet 175:2
138:21 141:9,11	165:3,19	66:2,20 81:12	81:25 174:11	shields 123:19
141:16 163:8,9	second-hand 38:5	89:21 115:3	serious 28:18	shift 80:12 147:4
166:5 168:13	75:19	129:8 142:11,12	56:15 96:14,17	shivering 173:14
173:6	second-in-comm	142:20 143:10,20	97:5 133:14	shock 108:17
scared 28:12	48:17	143:23 145:11	154:24 168:7	109:23 134:11
109:22 115:4	secondary 158:22	146:1 147:2,5,8	seriously 43:6	shocked 67:7 88:7
117:12 130:2	secondary 136.22 secondly 47:14	149:8 150:18	seriousness 134:3	153:14
131:7 135:17	secure 5:23	151:22 152:10,17	sertraline 145:23	<b>shocking</b> 67:4,25
137:3 138:6	security 112:23	153:18 154:22	152:19	68:4,4
141:21 142:7	113:4 114:15	160:21 164:18	service 5:5,6 39:20	short 7:6 23:18
144:23 145:17	117:1 119:18	165:13 166:15	68:10 86:2	61:21 105:8
146:15 148:4,25	120:23 123:16	167:10 174:8	100:24 150:8	119:17 170:25
153:17 155:4	172:16 173:11	segregation 143:6	services 73:25	171:6 174:24
156:9 158:2,10	see 8:5 15:21 16:13	154:19	108:2,3 151:10	shortly 117:13
158:21 159:1,3	19:15 20:10	self-critical 68:8	151:12 161:22	171:2
159:14 160:1,15	21:10 22:9,23	self-harm 18:9	session 22:24	shouted 156:4
160:17 161:7	23:9,19 24:4,23	19:4 71:25	sessions 2:16 30:5	shouting 54:5
164:5 169:20	24:24,24 25:2,19	109:24 129:10	53:12 75:1	111:12 113:22
173:25	25:20,21,23	132:18 134:11	set 16:22 17:16	116:20 127:22
scars 125:8 128:12	26:14 27:9,10	self-harmed 157:5	18:23 35:12	showed 146:9
	<u> </u>			
	<u> </u>	I	<u> </u>	<u> </u>

				Page 203
162.0.166.20	40.7.16.40.13	21 12 24 10	71 7 16 70 22	, ee 06.22
163:9 166:20	48:7,16 49:12	21:12 24:10	71:7,16 78:23	staffing 96:23
shower 44:6,15	50:4 54:4 58:14	25:22 26:1 28:21	83:3 89:4 91:8	100:17
shown 28:9 66:3	59:13 60:12	35:15 77:10	91:21 92:16	stage 11:5 161:18
66:22 67:6 69:8	74:22 80:1,3	78:19 101:16	99:16 132:24	stairs 44:5
69:17 72:3 75:25	87:2 88:23	137:4	142:25 158:9	stamped 172:7
145:13	Skitt's 51:23 104:8	somewhat 63:3,4	specifically 32:16	stand 88:12
sic 3:2	sleep 111:20	soon 44:9 63:25	66:7 67:21 69:16	standard 17:4,8
side 115:24 116:2	113:24 131:10,22	109:19 156:20	99:4 106:3 127:8	18:23 19:1
125:21,22 143:15	144:17 153:3	176:22	175:14	<b>Standards</b> 136:2
157:7	173:23	sorry 6:24 8:8	speculate 8:7,8	171:19
sight 148:17	sleeping 159:21	17:15 20:22	spelt 38:8 49:10	standing 9:15
sign 17:1	sleepy 152:22	23:25 25:10 34:7	spend 149:21	10:15 33:8 64:17
signed 15:1 20:14	slight 76:1 151:13	39:15 41:3 49:8	spent 149:22	124:16 155:13
27:25 138:25	<b>slightly</b> 5:10 11:16	55:2 67:14 71:15	spice 28:11 158:20	156:18 157:9
152:9 170:14	21:4 83:4	78:2 83:14 85:23	158:25 159:4,12	Stansted 171:17
<b>significant</b> 16:19	slow 5:15 small 65:13 92:25	102:24 128:21	spiky 154:20	172:17 173:11
17:13,23 50:9	103:9 116:4	sort 4:17 5:4 6:13 7:13 8:14 11:9	spin 13:13	stark 25:1,8 start 6:6 52:17
signing 57:24		11:18 13:12 14:4	spoke 6:25 120:12	
signposting 38:10	151:7,12		120:20 148:3	started 4:23 33:2 89:13 108:4
silver 56:17	small-staffed 74:12	22:18 25:1 27:2	153:25	
similar 6:9 30:11	,=	30:18 39:6 40:6	spoken 8:20 45:6	144:19,22 149:11
66:21 69:16 85:2	smartphone 119:5	56:1 68:6,10	spreading 74:7	155:21 157:19
165:8	smashed 155:23	69:16 70:24 71:1	staff 2:8 9:3 16:1	160:11 161:4
simply 166:6	smell 115:14	71:20,21 76:1	16:16,19 17:12	starting 88:3
singled 127:8	Smith 33:16	82:7 84:6 99:8	17:22 18:24 19:6	starts 22:4
sit 73:8 139:10	smoke 158:22	120:10	25:2,14 29:22	state 45:7 67:3
site 45:2	smoked 158:20,21	sounded 56:25	30:2 31:13 34:18	73:11 106:11
sites 84:3	social 3:9 4:10	57:15	34:21 36:17	107:4
sitting 125:20	21:8,11 23:15	sounds 47:14	37:14 46:8,19	stated 148:19
141:23 144:17	25:3,7 33:8 38:4	56:14 171:3	56:21 62:10,13	statement 1:7,12
160:3	75:17 94:19	space 6:10 34:3	74:3 80:21 82:18	1:17,18 3:1,2,22
situation 11:14	108:2	42:15 62:20	83:24 91:14	5:20 7:11 9:6,12
29:1 56:15 59:23	soft 174:9	68:21 83:19	94:18,21 96:13	9:14 10:14 22:20
60:3 64:5 65:9	solely 171:22	115:18 136:13,17	96:16 97:16	23:1 26:2,4 28:7
71:3 84:23	solicitor 35:2	151:19	101:17,19 102:2	28:7 29:20 31:12
122:18	106:7 120:2,9 140:5 161:16	spaces 150:3	103:6,10,17	31:14,25 32:7,10
situations 17:21		spare 108:15	106:8 117:21	32:25 33:12,14
18:3,5,12 47:13	176:20	speak 21:8 24:22	119:7 120:21	34:16 35:2,13
71:19 73:3 84:24	solicitor's 120:1	36:19 72:22	121:5,8 122:2	37:3 41:2 43:2,5
six 113:4 123:16	solicitors 38:8	80:25 89:9	123:6,16 126:17	43:17,24 45:11
176:20	107:16 111:5	117:23 122:12	127:20 132:9	46:17,25 48:6,19
size 57:3	115:7 118:23	138:6 140:17	134:4 143:9	50:2,3 51:15
skilled 36:6	124:5 128:8	146:25 161:5	146:22 147:5,12	53:17 54:18
skills 94:19,22	129:7 140:23	<b>speaking</b> 103:9	147:16,18,24	59:11 60:4 62:3
skin 125:9	146:17 147:7	148:13 158:11	152:6 153:5	69:18 72:1,4
Skitt 9:8,10 14:1,6	149:9 167:8	170:3	154:25 158:7	77:10 79:4 81:14
23:10 36:14 37:4	169:15 170:3,4	specialist 37:24	161:6,8 164:24	83:2,5,11,12 84:4
43:4,5,19 44:22	Somali 160:2	specific 13:19 14:3	176:14 177:7	84:5,10,19 89:9
45:12,18 47:8	somebody 10:22	17:20 66:4,20	staffed 7:6	93:17 100:23

10 December 2021

				Page 204
	l	Ì	l	l
104:8 105:13,18	stomach 172:13,14	159:14 167:13	109:25 132:18	56:12,19 62:12
106:5,10,13	172:21	173:20	suitcase 162:25	76:3 91:16 92:10
126:10 129:24	<b>stood</b> 16:25 154:14	subjective 76:19	suits 139:11	97:13 105:2
130:7 132:19	<b>stop</b> 49:14 120:3	<b>submit</b> 148:12	summarise 43:24	110:9 112:10
134:16 138:24,25	124:10 126:23	submitted 140:23	83:4 106:22	117:7 119:17
139:1,12,23	134:9 172:18	170:2	107:22 112:12	129:24 132:10
140:1,4 141:3,19	stopped 63:14	subscription	126:9 129:23	143:6 155:23
163:24 166:12	85:17 152:6	152:22	132:3 133:20	157:18 176:22
169:9 170:9,13	160:5 161:4	subsequent 13:2	141:6 163:4	surely 52:10 64:7
170:14,21 173:2	stopping 75:23	59:5 61:6 64:2	165:25 168:9	sureties 33:8
statements 1:21,23	131:25	subsequently 4:6	summarised 114:8	surety 9:15 10:15
33:4,9 34:18	story 45:17 46:3	4:21 32:11	132:15	surgeries 37:8
67:3 99:16	46:10 67:20	substantially 17:2	summarises 86:16	43:6 53:12
states 20:2 106:23	straight 136:21	substantive 168:11	167:11	surgery 6:18 16:15
107:1 142:21	straightforward	<b>subtle</b> 82:15	<b>summary</b> 2:6 9:7	20:5 21:15 26:19
147:10 152:19,20	80:24	success 5:8	14:17 22:7 74:24	44:2 47:25 83:18
163:12 164:19	strange 52:5	suffer 106:17	77:24 105:18,20	172:15
166:3 167:11	strangulation 97:6	140:15 165:20	105:23 123:3	surprise 81:9
168:1,15,18	strap 172:13,13	169:22	138:16 139:15,18	surprised 8:13
stating 57:19	strategic 2:7	suffered 113:19	170:25	10:6 11:24 12:3
122:16	strategically 81:22	131:4 133:4	summer 4:15 5:21	67:5,7 81:1
status 169:7	stress 106:17	138:23 144:20	89:13	97:16 167:16
stay 65:21 116:6	110:5 130:5	149:18 152:3	Sundays 162:1	surrounded 156:3
stayed 143:24	stressed 75:8	163:19 166:18	supervision 113:2	156:21,24
165:12	131:7 133:8	167:16	129:5,5,25	<b>suspect</b> 102:22
staying 143:11	148:25	<b>suffering</b> 16:18,18	supine 175:7	suspected 28:10
stench 115:15	stressful 109:12,16	17:12,13,23,23	supplied 132:8	suspicion 32:18
stenographers	117:10	110:4 113:7	<b>support</b> 7:17 8:22	38:2,6,12 99:25
106:8	stressing 44:13,24	146:10 148:20	9:14 10:14 23:7	101:7
step 21:12 90:3	stretch 59:9	149:11 164:24	24:11,19 25:25	suspicions 8:14
Stephen 36:14	stretched 7:6	168:7	26:23 27:20	suspicious 86:21
80:1,3	100:18	suggest 13:15	31:15 33:4 34:19	86:25 93:24
stepped 4:13 10:9	<b>strict</b> 113:2	21:22 104:21,24	36:1,11,17 37:16	Sussex 174:12,15
33:24 34:5 39:17	strike 114:23	142:13 170:25	37:23 39:22,24	sustainable 57:22
43:11 114:5	stripped 173:22	suggested 41:24	40:16,24 45:8	sustained 123:15
steps 24:9 73:14	strong 30:16 74:8	42:7 44:9 56:24	49:4 50:14 54:13	128:7 145:23
173:24	119:23 129:6	suggesting 7:19	77:16 80:24 92:3	146:10 172:20
stereotype 127:6	strongly 45:14,20	suggestion 36:13	100:16 134:24	swapped 114:15
Steve 14:1,6 23:10	78:17	41:16 52:16 55:3	137:7,13,24	swift 28:24
37:4 39:14 43:4	Struck 87:6	78:12	159:16 161:20,22	sworn 1:4
43:5,19 44:22	struggle 125:3	suggestions 77:7	167:5 168:20	SXP000030
47:8 49:12 50:4	168:18 169:10	suggests 143:21	175:7	174:16
54:4 58:14 60:12	struggled 149:16	147:13 165:7	supported 148:2	symptoms 140:15
74:22 87:2 88:23	166:6 169:17	suicidal 18:7 19:3	supporting 35:24	166:22 168:8
Steve's 12:18	struggling 48:1	129:3,4 132:23	suppose 46:2 67:2	169:17
<b>Stevens</b> 174:21	153:7	133:1 141:16	supposed 146:20	sync 31:9
stick 65:21	stuff 68:6 74:16	148:19	147:11	system 27:20
Sticking 19:9	style 57:16	suicidality 129:21	sure 6:17 28:5	90:11 99:2 100:8
stitched 114:21	subjected 71:11	suicide 71:24	37:10 40:11 50:1	158:5
	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>

				Page 205
Sama 26.9 25 20.5	40Ura 00.25	94.19 97.20	67.12 60.1 0	00.10 10 21
<b>Szopa</b> 26:8,25 29:5 30:11 43:21 44:1	talks 88:25	84:18 87:20	67:13 69:1,8	80:18,18,21
45:6 56:23	tantamount 53:25	99:25 100:15 117:4 154:11	70:11 72:6 73:20 74:2 75:13,21	81:20 82:3,6
<b>Szopa's</b> 47:20	60:6,22	171:21	80:8 81:4 91:25	83:2,3,10,21,24
Szopa \$47.20	target 158:3 Taskera 122:15,15	terrible 114:24		85:2,8,14,23
T	122:17,22 137:16	terrified 173:15	92:2,21 95:25 99:15,17 100:4	87:11,23 88:11 88:14 90:6,8,16
<b>T-shirt</b> 162:14,25	tasks 86:24	test 18:5 20:21	100:19 104:3	90:22 91:16,21
tab 1:11 12:12	tasks 80.24 tasted 149:5	28:11	120:10 130:22	91:23,24 92:17
55:20 93:12	tattoos 113:10	text 19:22 55:21	134:5 138:23	92:18 94:10,14
table 78:20 117:5	taunted 127:4	102:18	146:5	94:14 95:3 96:10
tablets 152:20,22	team 5:7,8 19:13	thank 1:20 12:17	think 3:5,24 4:6,19	97:12 98:21 99:1
tackle 73:15	24:3,15 29:6,9,12	13:10 23:20	5:18 7:5,11,15	99:13,14 100:22
Tactical 174:22	29:15,16 34:11	40:15 48:5 58:24	8:3,12,13,21 9:2	103:14,16 110:25
take 13:5,13 29:12	44:22 65:6 74:12	61:19,23 90:19	10:6,12 11:9,24	111:22 112:6,23
37:2,9 40:17	95:14 97:16	93:13 101:8,10	12:1,2 13:3,4,15	114:6 119:11,12
48:9 49:7 51:4	103:9 106:7	103:25 104:18,19	14:5,5,8,11,16,23	119:16 123:24
59:2 73:14 75:2	123:1 151:21	103.23 104.18,19	15:17 17:15 18:5	124:2 126:3,19
77:10 78:18	152:2 165:19	104.20,20 103.1	18:25 20:12	124.2 120.3,17
90:18 93:3	170:17	105.4,10,22	21:19,20,21,23	120:19 127:4,23
100:12 132:7,8	technical 176:15	139:6 170:16,20	21:23 23:16	135:6,9 136:20
150:2 154:18	techniques 175:1,6	170:20 171:3	25:24 28:13,14	136:24 137:5,20
156:8 157:11	technological	175:23,24 176:12	30:5,10,13 31:2,4	144:2 149:22
taken 4:15 24:10	102:16	176:14,16 177:14	32:10,11,20 33:1	154:8 157:22
30:20 40:8 41:5	telephone 23:5	177:18	33:20,21,22	158:13 160:3
43:15 49:8 59:13	119:3,6,14 140:6	thanks 5:13 44:24	34:25 35:14 36:8	164:1
59:17 97:17	tell 34:21,21 47:16	them' 118:18	37:6,9,11 38:15	thinking 8:10
108:12,24 111:11	70:11,18 79:21	theme 3:13,14	38:17,17 40:6,10	10:13 22:13
118:9 123:18	96:2 101:16	4:12	40:12,25 41:1,11	113:12
124:13 133:7	115:2 116:12	therapeutic 37:16	41:15 42:3,5,22	thinks 52:12 87:15
140:6 142:4,8	121:8 132:9,10	39:20	43:24 45:25	132:25
143:13 144:15	133:10	therapist 44:11	46:25 47:10,14	third 23:11 67:13
152:8 154:18	telling 27:16 51:25	_	47:25 48:7 49:1	72:7 88:4 96:6
156:8,10,12	52:2 71:18 85:22	98:4	49:4,8,9,12 50:5	96:25 157:4
157:24 158:4	123:5 142:3	thing 5:13 13:9,23	50:7,18 52:5,23	thought 5:11 8:3,4
159:10 162:14	148:8	18:6 47:5,21	53:20 54:2,17	17:11,22 18:17
Taliban 127:7	tells 71:4	56:1 70:23 72:6	57:15,21 58:11	29:23 40:4 42:19
talk 6:17 18:1 19:5	ten 44:4 113:2	101:1,15 115:3	58:15 59:4 61:11	47:12 49:3 50:5
39:23 60:22	ten-minute 104:22	177:16	62:8,9 63:24	51:24 52:2,17
67:14 72:8 73:18	tension 11:15	things 10:2,8	64:11,14,23 65:5	53:1 62:25 69:14
74:16 80:21	terms 11:1 13:19	13:13,21 17:14	65:6,8,14,17	69:22 70:11
89:12 112:8	17:4 18:2 20:25	18:13,13 27:5	66:10,11,13 67:2	75:15 81:10,11
126:4 150:17	25:10 31:4 32:7	29:11,14 31:11	67:8 68:8,9,16,17	84:12 95:7 98:8
170:11	32:14 37:19 38:1	36:10 38:5,23,25	69:5,10,15,22	101:4 112:3
talkative' 151:4	45:24 47:22 49:4	43:16,19 44:14	70:8,14 71:8,15	116:17 118:21
talked 2:17 70:24	50:14 53:9 55:13	46:6 47:6 48:6	71:16 72:24 73:1	137:6 159:5
71:1 76:10 77:21	62:11 63:16	50:13,21,23	73:3,8,20,25 74:8	173:10,15
104:4	65:20,23 66:25	55:15,18 57:6,7	75:12,13 76:4,5	<b>thoughts</b> 18:8 19:3
talking 11:5 22:6	68:19,20 70:10	57:24 61:8 63:14	76:18 77:1,2,5	129:4 132:17
47:5 49:20 84:17	73:16 81:25	64:19 65:8,14	78:19,21 80:10	134:10 144:22
94:7				

				Page 206
	l	l	l	l
146:13	106:25 109:10	39:2 44:17 48:7	tough 112:22	41:6,19 63:9
threat 54:2 60:16	110:13 112:14	48:20 49:21,25	tour 87:18 110:6	73:21,23 124:10
100:2 160:14	113:24 115:3	58:11 65:18,20	144:8	133:9 140:20
threatened 53:14	117:10 118:4,12	70:6 71:10 72:14	toyed 54:1	147:25
87:3 114:5 153:4	118:23 119:18,25	80:14 81:8 82:8	toying 60:15	triggering 153:10
threatening 54:14	120:5,10,12,21	85:11 94:4 97:21	tracing 5:6,9	170:11
60:15	123:7 129:20,22	103:5 104:2	tracksuit 162:13	trouble 111:9
threats 78:18	131:18 132:13	111:5 112:20	traffic 129:2	troublemakers
three 4:12 11:2	136:23 139:25	116:16 117:8,21	trafficking 168:15	111:8,12
45:4,12 56:22	140:10 141:1	117:23 118:7,10	train 36:1 80:21	trousers 124:24,24
57:1 66:15 74:21	142:9 143:2	118:19,23 119:18	training 175:5	125:3,14
77:19 80:13	144:3 145:5	120:7,7,9 121:7	transcriber 3:1	truism 64:16
81:13 89:11	146:3,19 148:7	122:2,13,14,18	26:3	truly 6:19
96:21 105:11	148:16 149:14,20	122:25 123:7	transcribers 5:14	trust 48:23 49:22
133:13 149:23	149:21 150:11,20	124:5 125:24	22:21 59:12	72:15 73:6 79:7
171:4 176:5	151:14,16,19	126:1 128:6	176:16	79:9 80:8 161:1
177:11	152:12,14 153:1	130:16 131:13,20	transfer 46:21	trustee 77:9
three-day 131:15	153:8 154:7,22	132:25 136:5	112:16 141:17	truth 46:14 138:24
three-minute	159:13,24 161:1	137:8 140:23	162:10 164:12	170:13
171:1	162:5 164:2	145:6,13,16	166:9 174:11	try 5:15,18 9:25
threshold 17:17	165:5 166:17,19	146:7,10 148:4,5	transferred	63:5 73:15 75:5
67:24 70:25	167:23 169:10,19	148:24 149:16	107:12 111:16	137:2 147:25
71:23	169:22,24 173:23	151:24 152:16	112:1,4,18	trying 9:24 13:12
throat 172:7	times 6:10 41:16	153:22 154:16	161:21 162:16,18	21:21,23 27:9
thrown 172:16	42:6 112:10	158:5 160:18	163:2 166:2	50:24 62:18
173:11,13	116:10,13 129:18	161:13 162:7,15	169:1	68:12 118:24
ticket' 155:20	136:14,15 140:12	164:2,3,23 167:1	transition 64:10	119:22 120:3
tied 172:12 tight 125:25	149:4 153:6	172:4 173:18	traumatic 166:25 169:23	124:25 160:25 turn 2:24 19:9
0	157:14 160:8 timetable 116:5	tone 38:13 39:6		22:2 43:22 79:11
time 2:13,14,25 3:6,12 6:1,19 8:9		45:15,20,22 76:16,18,18	traumatising 113:20	172:3
9:20 12:2,18,25	timings 139:7 Tinsley 33:25	98:11 162:22	tray 44:15	turnaround 90:23
14:10 18:18	46:21 56:8 83:16	top 16:14 23:8,19	treat 173:18	turned 7:15 38:24
19:16 22:10	83:19,23 84:2	54:7 58:3 78:2	treated 32:8 96:7,8	51:21 172:3
25:22 26:13 27:8	90:1	86:19 93:23	99:12,12 120:17	Turning 133:2
27:19 28:5 29:11	tired 142:17	109:13 162:14	127:2,8,10	162:10
31:10,11 32:22	tired 142.17 tiredness 133:4	top-down 57:16	130:11 135:19	TV 117:5
34:17 37:20 39:2	tissue 174:9	torment 115:16	138:9 153:5,18	Twitter 10:13
40:4 41:3,3 42:8	title 91:16	torture 113:18	153:24 154:11	two 1:21 10:22,25
42:25 49:22 52:9	today 139:9	128:7,17,19	161:9 164:6	11:23 20:3 25:9
56:6,22 61:7,7,12	toes 172:8	142:19 146:13	treatment 120:14	38:19,19 43:20
62:10,23 64:2	toilet 115:10,12,14	163:10 164:16	135:4 159:14	77:17 81:13 85:3
65:16 66:16,16	115:15,19,21,25	165:22 166:17	173:2	93:15 94:15
68:5 69:12 70:2	116:2 143:15,18	167:11,21 168:13	trend 9:23	96:22 111:2,16
75:4,14 76:24,25	165:9	tortured 107:24	trends 64:1	115:23 118:9
81:10 82:3,4,4	toiletries 108:15	110:1 142:20	Tribunal 107:3	120:4 122:8
85:9 88:8,15	told 3:8 14:2 15:15	145:22	Tribunal's 107:5	133:13 142:2
90:24 92:25	15:16 21:25 29:6	total 140:9 170:23	tricked 118:20	143:25 147:12,14
99:13 105:12	29:24 33:2 39:1	touched 31:16	tried 5:22 16:10	147:15 156:23
	I	I	I	I

157:23 165:4,12					1 agc 207
169:3 171:4   23:12,16 25:8   30:17 32:9,13   158:24 160:5   170:25 174:21   volunters 25:23 24	157.23 165.4 12	16.22 20.2 11 13	151-14 152-3	168-14	voice 162·22
172:2   174:6     30:17   32:9   13   163:18   165:20   170:25   174:21   volumer 57:23.24   vigue 21:6   18:2   57:86   62:5   67:5   69:8   102:4   13   159:24   vigue 27:5   66:8   102:4   13   159:24   vigue 27:5   66:8   102:4   13   129:22   138:11   46:9   159:24   vigue 27:5   32:11   understood 4:3   vigue 27:5   33:10   33:20   35:7 36:25   75:11   vigue 27:5   33:12   vigue 27:5   33:20   35:7 36:25   75:11   vigue 27:5   33:12   vigue 27:5   33:24   vigue 27:5   33:11   vigue 27:5   vigue 2					
two-131:15 171:1   tying 17:3   type 2:16 18:2   57:8 62:5 67:5   69:8 102:4,13   159:24   understands 46:9   90:8   understands 46:9   90:22    —————————————————————————————————					
tying 17:3         49:24 61:3 65:9         166:24 173:25         view 10:9 20:20         volunteer 25:4         40:1 46:8           57:8 62:5 67:5         69:8 102:4,13         159:24         understood 4:3         updating 74:4         26:21 27:23 0:13         33:20 35:7 36:25         75:11         volunteer 25:4         40:1 46:8           159:24         understood 4:3         updating 74:4         26:21 27:23 0:13         33:20 35:7 36:25         75:11         volunteer 25:4         40:1 46:8           192:22         understood 4:3         updating 74:4         26:21 27:23 0:13         19:6 30:2 37:14         volunteer 25:9 9:3           108:1 113:12         undertones 153:23         upward 172:11         76:17 80:4 98:8         19:6 30:2 37:14         volunteer 25:9 9:3           112:20 141:14         undertones 153:23         undertones 153:23         undertones 153:23         undertones 153:23         undertones 153:23         violent 173:21         violent 71:6         volunteer 25:4         vulnerable 6:23           123:12 133:3         136:16,17 149:15         18:11 128:15         123:12 124:11         172:13         172:13,8         violent 173:21         violent 173:21         visit 14:21 19:20         123:14         123:12 124:11         123:23 127:14         123:12 124:11         123:23 127:14         123:12 124:11         123:23		*			-
Spin		*			·
57:8 62:5 67:5 698 102:4,13   159:24	·				
159:24   159:24   159:25   169:26   179:22   179:25   179:25   179:25   179:25   179:25   179:25   179:25   179:25   179:25   179:25   179:25   179:25   179:25   179:25   179:25   179:25   179:25   179:25   179:25   179:25   179:25   179:25   179:25   179:25   179:25   179:25   179:25   179:25   179:25   179:25   179:25   179:25   179:25   179:25   179:25   179:25   179:25   179:25   179:25   179:25   179:25   179:25   179:25   179:25   179:25   179:25   179:25   179:25   179:25   179:25   179:25   179:25   179:25   179:25   179:25   179:25   179:25   179:25   179:25   179:25   179:25   179:25   179:25   179:25   179:25   179:25   179:25   179:25   179:25   179:25   179:25   179:25   179:25   179:25   179:25   179:25   179:25   179:25   179:25   179:25   179:25   179:25   179:25   179:25   179:25   179:25   179:25   179:25   179:25   179:25   179:25   179:25   179:25   179:25   179:25   179:25   179:25   179:25   179:25   179:25   179:25   179:25   179:25   179:25   179:25   179:25   179:25   179:25   179:25   179:25   179:25   179:25   179:25   179:25   179:25   179:25   179:25   179:25   179:25   179:25   179:25   179:25   179:25   179:25   179:25   179:25   179:25   179:25   179:25   179:25   179:25   179:25   179:25   179:25   179:25   179:25   179:25   179:25   179:25   179:25   179:25   179:25   179:25   179:25   179:25   179:25   179:25   179:25   179:25   179:25   179:25   179:25   179:25   179:25   179:25   179:25   179:25   179:25   179:25   179:25   179:25   179:25   179:25   179:25   179:25   179:25   179:25   179:25   179:25   179:25   179:25   179:25   179:25   179:25   179:25   179:25   179:25   179:25   179:25   179:25   179:25   179:25   179:25   179:25   179:25   179:25   179:25   179:25   179:25   179:25   179:25   179:25   179:25   179:25   179:25   179:25   179:25   179:25   179:25   179:25   179:25   179:25   179:25   179:25   179:25   179:25   179:25   179:25   179:25   179:25   179:25   179:25   179:25   179:25   179:25   179:25   179:25   179:25   179:25   179:25   179:25   179:25   1	v <u>-</u>	-		1	
159:24   types 25:9 66:21   27:25 32:11   27:25 32:11   upset 167:16   upset 17:16					_
types 25:9 66:21         22:22         46:91         upset 167:16         50:4 59:10 76:12         19:6 30:2 37:14           UK 35:25 107:10         108:1 113:12         12:20 141:14         undertake 91:21         undertones 153:23         undertones 153:23         undertones 153:23         timeral 46:19         violent 73:21         violent 73:21         vulnerabilities           US 35:25 107:10         13:11         128:15         128:11 128:15         10:19 119:6,8         143:18         violent 73:21         vulnerabilities           umbrella 35:24         unable 23:4         124:21 136:3         136:16,17 149:21         128:11 128:15         128:11 128:15         128:11 128:15         128:12 124:11         172:13 36:12         172:3,8         173:18         173:18         173:18         229:39 19:22         155:11         Waist 110:8 123:21         Waist 110:8 123:21         123:21         Waist 110:8 123:21         123:21         Waist 110:8 123:21         123:23         123:23         123:23         123:24         123:21         Waist 10:31:3         123:21         Waist 10:20         Waist 10:20         Waist 10:20         Waist 10:20         Waist 10:20         123:21         123:22         123:23         123:23         123:23         123:23         123:24         123:23         123:23         123:24         123:24	· ·				
Part					
U   UK 35:25 107:10   108:1 113:12   121:20 141:14   undertake 91:21   undertake 91:21   undoubtedly 97:4   unifortunately 137:16   unberla 35:24   unable 23:4   124:21 133:3   136:16,17 149:21   unict 112:21 136:2   unict 112:21 136:2   unict 112:21 136:2   unict 112:21 136:2   122:17 132:5   unemomfortable 129:18   undermining 53:6   understand 7:14   understand 7:14   understand 7:14   25:12 28:4 46:7 50:25,25 52:10 50:25,25 52:10 50:22,25 52:10 50:21,26 16:19 50:22,24 141:4 143:6 145:24   unsubstantiated 175:24   unreassuring 45:9	v I		_		
UK 35:25 107:10	92:22	· ·			
UK 35:25 107:10 108:1 13:12 121:20 141:14 ultimately 137:16 umbrella 35:24 unable 23:4 124:21 133:3 136:16,17 149:21 unaware 72:2 uncertain 65:20 uncle 108:2 118:23 119:4,6,11,13,16 119:21 120:2 122:17 132:5 uncomfortable 129:18 underage 112:8,25 underower 88:16 understand 7:14 25:12 28:4 46:7 50:25,25 52:10 understand 7:14 25:12 28:4 46:7 50:25,25 52:10 understake 91:21 unitorunately unitorunately unitorunately unitorunately unitorunately unitorunately unitorunately 13:11 128:15 unitorunately unitorunately unitorunately 13:11 128:15 unitorunately unitorunately unitorunately unitorunately 13:11 128:15 unitorunately unitorunately unitorunately 13:11 128:15 unitorunately unitorunat		*			
108:11 113:12					
121:20 141:14					
ultimately umbrella 35:24 unable 23:4 unable 23:4 unable 23:4 124:21 133:3 136:16,17 149:21 uniform 124:2 154:21 uniform 124:2 175:13 uniform 124:2 175:14 uniform 124:2 175:13 uniform 124:2 175:13 uniform 124:2 175:13 uniform 124:2 175:13 uniform 124:2 175:14 uniform 125:13 ide:13 visited 110:7 uniform 124:2 visiting 35:25 ide:10 ide:10:7 uniform 124:2 175:14 uniform 125:14 uniform 125:15 ide:15 uniform 124:2 175:14 uniform 125:15 ide:10:3 uniform 124:2 175:14 uniform 125:13 ide:10:3 uniform 124:2 175:14 uniform 125:13 ide:10:4 uniform 125:14 uniform 125:14 uniform 125:14 uniform 125:13 ide:10:4 uniform 125:14 uniform 125:15 ide:10:3 uniform 125:14 uniform 125:15 ide:10:3 uniform 125:14 uniform 125:15 ide:10:3 uniform 125:14 uniform 12					· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
Table   Tabl			· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	· ·	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
unable 23:4         unfounded 52:12         unfounded 52:12         unfounded 52:12         unfounded 52:12         uniform 124:2         174:17 175:6,7         visit 14:21 19:20         21:7,18 26:11         waist 110:8 123:21           uncertain 65:20         uncle 108:2 118:23         143:6 154:19         59:10,16         21:7,18 26:11         23:12 19:20         123:23 127:14         waist 110:8 123:21         123:23 127:14         wait 19:20 115:16         126:1 131:22         wait 19:20 115:16         126:1	· ·			· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	133:11
124:21 133:3					W
136:16,17 149:21					
unaware 72:2 uncertain 65:20 uncle 108: 2 118: 23 119:4,6,11,13,16 119:21 120:2 122:17 132:5 uncomfortable 129:18 underage 112:8,25 undercover 88:16 undermining 53:6 understand 7:14 25:12 28:4 46:7 50:25,25 52:10 52:15,16 61:9 50:25,25 52:10 52:15,16 61:9 101:21 115:7 132:22 141:4 143:6 145:24 147:6 149:9 152:12 155:16 159:13 162:18 166:6 168:5 170:2,3 176:23         unaware 72:2 unit 112:21 136:2 36:25 58:24 59:3 59:10,16 usually 7:1 58:13 59:10,16 usually 7:1 58:13 59:10,16 usually 7:1 58:13 59:10,16 usually 7:1 58:13 101:15 10:15,17 132:5 usually 7:1 58:13 101:15 10:15,17 132:5 usually 7:1 58:13 102:12 value 12:22 45:18 118:13 122:12 value 10:22 12:24 5:18 103:9 value 12:22 45:18 85:20 value 12:22 45:18 85:20 value 12:22 45:18 103:9 value 12:22 45:18 103:9 value 12:22 45:18 50:25,25 52:10 spinorecedented 87:20 unprecedented 175:4 unsure 37:25 unsatisfied 24:18 unsubstantiated 175:4 unsure 37:25 unusual 88:12 unveltoming 12:25 verify 46:14 unsure 37:25 unusual 88:12 unveltoming 12:25 verify 46:14 10:2 unveltoming 13:21 versu 73:7         36:25 58:24 59:3 ship 19:4,13 ship 19:15,17 132:5 ship 19:4,13 ship 19:15,17 132:5 ship 19:4,13 ship 19:4,14:14 ship 19:4,13 ship 19:4,14:14:14:14:14:14:14:14:14:14:14:14:14:1				1	
uncertain 65:20 uncle 108:2 118:23 119:4,6,11,13,16 119:21 120:2 122:17 132:5 uncomfortable 129:18 understand 7:14 25:12 28:4 46:7 50:25,25 52:10 52:15,16 61:9 65:12 86:9 99:23 99:23,24 101:12 101:21 115:7 132:2 115:16 143:6 145:2 unreassuring 45:9 unsatisfied 24:18 143:6 145:2 unsure 37:25 unsure 37:25 170:2,3 176:23	· ·	_		•	
uncle 108:2 118:23         171:19         usually 7:1 58:13         161:13         wait' 134:6           119:24,6,11,13,16         unlawful 31:23         138:20         unlawfully 107:9         unlawfully 107:9         138:20         unloked 145:2         value 12:22 45:18         visited 110:7         118:13 122:12         waiting 141:21,22         vaiting 141:21,22         vaiti				*	
119:4,6,11,13,16   119:21 120:2   122:17 132:5   unlawful 31:23   138:20   unlawfully 107:9   129:18   underage 112:8,25   undercover 88:16   understand 7:14   25:12 28:4 46:7   50:25,25 52:10   52:15,16 61:9   65:12 86:9 99:23   99:23,24 101:21   115:7   132:22 141:4   143:6 145:24   143:6 145:24   143:6 145:24   143:6 145:24   143:6 145:24   143:6 145:24   143:6 145:24   143:6 166:6 168:5   159:13 162:18   166:6 168:5   170:2,3 176:23   170:2,3 176:23   170:25   unwell 31:21   versus 73:7   86:16 86:5   155:19,19 160:15   155:19,19 160:15   155:19,19 160:15   155:19,19 160:15   155:19,19 160:15   155:19,19 160:15   155:19,19 160:15   155:19,19 160:15   155:19,19 160:15   155:19,19 160:15   155:19,19 160:15   155:19,19 160:15   155:19,19 160:15   155:19,19 160:15   155:19,19 160:15   155:19,19 160:15   155:19,19 160:15   155:19,19 160:15   155:19,19 160:15   155:19,19 160:15   155:19,19 160:15   155:19,19 160:15   155:19,19 160:15   155:19,19 160:15   155:19,19 160:15   155:19,19 160:15   155:19,19 160:15   155:19,19 160:15   155:19,19 160:15   155:19,19 160:15   155:19,19 160:15   155:19,19 160:15   155:19,19 160:15   155:19,19 160:15   155:19,19 160:15   155:19,19 160:15   155:19,19 160:15   155:19,19 160:15   155:19,19 160:15   155:19,19 160:15   155:19,19 160:15   155:19,19 160:15   155:19,19 160:15   155:19,19 160:15   155:19,19 160:15   155:19,19 160:15   155:19,19 160:15   155:19,19 160:15   155:19,19 160:15   155:19,19 160:15   155:19,19 160:15   155:19,19 160:15   155:19,19 160:15   155:19,19 160:15   155:19,19 160:15   155:19,19 160:15   155:19,19 160:15   155:19,19 160:15   155:19,19 160:15   155:19,19 160:15   155:19,19 160:15   155:19,19 160:15   155:19,19 160:15   155:19,19 160:15   155:19,19 160:15   155:19,19 160:15   155:19,19 160:15   155:19,19 160:15   155:19,19 160:15   155:19,19 160:15   155:19,19 160:15   155:19,19 160:15   155:19,19 160:15   155:19,19 160:15   155:19,19 160:15   155:19,19 160:15   155:19,19 160:15   155:19,19 160:15   155:19,19 160:15   155:19,19 160:15   155:19,19 160			•	•	
119:21 120:2   122:17 132:5   138:20					
122:17 132:5		_	61:15		
uncomfortable         133.20         vague 85:23         65:21 78:23         143:9           underage 112:8,25         unlocked 145:2         value 12:22 45:18         65:21 78:23         walk 44:4 48:2           understand 7:14         25:12 28:4 46:7         57:16         van 163:2 172:17         21:8,11,18 25:3,4         walked 116:2           50:25,25 52:10         50:25,25 52:10         variety 18:14         34:22 35:16,23         walking 60:18           52:15,16 61:9         87:20         various 22:5         VER000110 93:11         visits 2:9 3:6,9         walking 60:18           132:22 141:4         unsubstantiated 143:6 145:24         various 22:5         VER000110 93:11         visits 2:9 3:6,9         14:12 17:11 27:3           143:9         various 22:5         verbally 57:21         19:18 22:8 23:15         65:7 67:21 68:13           143:9         various 22:5         verbally 57:21         19:18 22:8 23:15         143:9           143:9         various 22:5         verbally 57:21         19:18 22:8 23:15         14:12 17:11 27:3           152:12 155:16         unsure 37:25         unusual 88:12         verify 46:14         Verita 86:6,9         42:10 14:13 19:9         43:2 28:23:15         65:7 67:21 68:13         70:10 71:4,11         74:16 82:8 86:6         75:16 85:16         86:21 87:4 89:7			V		<u> </u>
129:18       107:20       value 12:22 45:18       85:18 103:9       walk 44:4 48:2         underage 112:8,25       undercover 88:16       undermining 53:6       van 163:2 172:17       21:8,11,18 25:3,4       walked 116:2         understand 7:14       25:12 28:4 46:7       90:20       variety 18:14       75:18 85:20       walking 60:18         52:15,16 61:9       87:20       various 22:5       various 22:5       vails 103:13       watch 43:48:2         99:23,24 101:12       unreasonable 28:2       various 22:5       VER000110 93:11       visitor 20:7,17       walked 116:2         101:21 115:7       132:22 141:4       143:6 145:24       46:3,6 47:6       visitors 25:13,19       walking 60:18         132:22 141:4       VER000110 93:11       VER000110 93:11       visits 2:9 3:6,9       4:10 14:13 19:9       4:10 14:13 19:9       33:3 35:20 62:1         147:6 149:9       152:12 155:16       159:13 162:18       verify 46:14       Verita 86:6,9       29:21 33:1,8       86:21 87:4 89:7         159:13 162:18       166:6 168:5       170:2,3 176:23       unwell 31:21       versus 73:7       85:16 86:5       155:19,19 160:15					
underage 112:8,25         unlocked 145:2         46:3,6 47:6         visitor 20:7,17         116:10 173:25           understand 7:14         25:12 28:4 46:7         57:16         van 163:2 172:17         visitor 20:7,17         walked 116:2           50:25,25 52:10         52:15,16 61:9         90:20         variety 18:14         variety 18:14         27:11 38:11         36:1,2 65:6,16,20         walking 60:18           52:15,16 61:9         87:20         unreasonable 28:2         various 22:5         85:4,22 100:6         want 2:19 8:8           99:23,24 101:12         unreasonable 28:2         unreassuring 45:9         VER000110 93:11         visits 2:9 3:6,9         14:12 17:11 27:3           132:22 141:4         unsubstantiated         175:4         verbally 57:21         25:2,3,7,23 26:1         70:10 71:4,11           147:6 149:9         unsure 37:25         unsual 88:12         verify 46:14         36:10 38:4,21,24         66:25 82:13 84:8         86:21 87:4 89:7           159:13 162:18         166:6 168:5         120:25         versa 79:14         84:13,21 85:12         121:22 122:6           170:2,3 176:23         unwell 31:21         versus 73:7         85:16 86:5         155:19,19 160:15					
undercover 88:16         unnecessarily         67:19         21:8,11,18 25:3,4         walked 116:2         155:18 160:7           understand 7:14         unnecessary 70:6         unnecessary 70:6         variety 18:14         75:18 85:20         walking 60:18           50:25,25 52:10         50:25,25 52:10         87:20         unrecedented         87:20         27:11 38:11         36:1,2 65:6,16,20         walking 60:18           65:12 86:9 99:23         99:23,24 101:12         unreasonable 28:2         unreasonable 28:2         various 22:5         VER000110 93:11         visits 2:9 3:6,9         14:12 17:11 27:3           132:22 141:4         unsubstantiated         175:4         verbally 57:21         121:2,5         29:21 33:1,8         33:3 35:20 62:1           147:6 149:9         unsure 37:25         unsual 88:12         verify 46:14         29:21 33:1,8         36:10 38:4,21,24         62:5 82:13 84:8         86:21 87:4 89:7           159:13 162:18         120:25         unwell 31:21         versus 73:7         85:16 86:5         155:19,19 160:15					
undermining 53:6         van 163:2 172:17         75:18 85:20         155:18 160:7           understand 7:14         variety 18:14         122:10,11 129:2           50:25,25 52:10         unprecedented         87:20         80:18 103:13         36:1,2 65:6,16,20         155:16 159:22         wall 143:16           99:23,24 101:12         unreasonable 28:2         unreassuring 45:9         various 22:5         VER000110 93:11         visits 2:9 3:6,9         14:10 14:13 19:9         33:3 35:20 62:1           132:22 141:4         unsubstantiated         175:4         verbally 57:21         25:2,3,7,23 26:1         70:10 71:4,11           147:6 149:9         152:12 155:16         unsure 37:25         unusual 88:12         verify 46:14         29:21 33:1,8         70:10 71:4,11           159:13 162:18         166:6 168:5         120:25         versa 79:14         4:10 14:13 19:9         86:21 87:4 89:7           170:2,3 176:23         unwell 31:21         verify 46:14         36:10 38:4,21,24         86:21 87:4 89:7           120:25         unwell 31:21         versu 73:7         85:16 86:5         155:19,19 160:15			1.5		
understand 7:14         unnecessary 70:6         173:11         visitors 25:13,19         walking 60:18           25:12 28:4 46:7         90:20         27:11 38:11         34:22 35:16,23         122:10,11 129:2           50:25,25 52:10         87:20         80:18 103:13         36:1,2 65:6,16,20         155:16 159:22           65:12 86:9 99:23         99:23,24 101:12         unreasonable 28:2         unreassuring 45:9         various 22:5         VER000110 93:11         visits 2:9 3:6,9         walking 60:18           101:21 115:7         101:21 115:7         unsatisfied 24:18         various 22:5         VER000110 93:11         visits 2:9 3:6,9         4:10 14:13 19:9         want 2:19 8:8           143:6 145:24         175:4         unsubstantiated         175:4         verbally 57:21         25:2,3,7,23 26:1         70:10 71:4,11           159:13 162:18         unsure 37:25         unusual 88:12         29:21 33:1,8         36:10 38:4,21,24         86:21 87:4 89:7           159:13 162:18         120:25         versa 79:14         86:25 82:13 84:8         98:7 112:25           170:2,3 176:23         unwell 31:21         versus 73:7         85:16 86:5         155:19,19 160:15		· ·			
25:12 28:4 46:7 50:25,25 52:10					
50:25,25 52:10         unprecedented         27:11 38:11         36:1,2 65:6,16,20         wall 143:16           52:15,16 61:9         unreasonable 28:2         various 22:5         137:23 162:7         wall 143:16           99:23,24 101:12         unreassuring 45:9         unsatisfied 24:18         VER000110 93:11         visits 2:9 3:6,9         14:12 17:11 27:3           132:22 141:4         unsubstantiated         VER000249 89:6         19:18 22:8 23:15         33:3 35:20 62:1           147:6 149:9         unsure 37:25         unsure 37:25         unsual 88:12         verify 46:14         29:21 33:1,8         74:16 82:8 86:6           159:13 162:18         unwelcoming         120:25         versa 79:14         84:13,21 85:12         98:7 112:25           170:2,3 176:23         unwell 31:21         versus 73:7         85:16 86:5         155:19,19 160:15		•		,	
52:15,16 61:9       87:20       80:18 103:13       85:4,22 100:6       wall 143:16         65:12 86:9 99:23       99:23,24 101:12       unreasonable 28:2       various 22:5       visits 2:9 3:6,9       14:12 17:11 27:3         101:21 115:7       unsatisfied 24:18       verbally 57:21       19:18 22:8 23:15       65:7 67:21 68:13         143:6 145:24       175:4       verbally 57:21       25:2,3,7,23 26:1       70:10 71:4,11         147:6 149:9       152:12 155:16       152:12 155:16       152:12 155:16       152:12 155:16       152:12 155:16       152:12 155:16       152:12 155:16       152:12 155:16       152:12 155:16       152:12 155:16       152:12 155:16       152:12 155:16       152:12 155:16       155:19,19 160:15         159:13 162:18       166:6 168:5       120:25       versa 79:14       84:13,21 85:12       121:22 122:6         170:2,3 176:23       unwell 31:21       versus 73:7       85:16 86:5       155:19,19 160:15				· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,
65:12 86:9 99:23       unreasonable 28:2       various 22:5       137:23 162:7       want 2:19 8:8         99:23,24 101:12       unreassuring 45:9       vER000110 93:11       visits 2:9 3:6,9       14:12 17:11 27:3         132:22 141:4       unsubstantiated       VER000249 89:6       19:18 22:8 23:15       65:7 67:21 68:13         147:6 149:9       unsure 37:25       verbally 57:21       29:21 33:1,8       74:16 82:8 86:6         152:12 155:16       unusual 88:12       verify 46:14       36:10 38:4,21,24       86:21 87:4 89:7         159:13 162:18       verita 86:6,9       62:5 82:13 84:8       98:7 112:25         170:2,3 176:23       unwell 31:21       versus 73:7       85:16 86:5       155:19,19 160:15	,	_			
99:23,24 101:12         unreassuring 45:9       unsatisfied 24:18       VER000110 93:11       visits 2:9 3:6,9       14:12 17:11 27:3         132:22 141:4       unsubstantiated       VER000249 89:6       19:18 22:8 23:15       33:3 35:20 62:1         143:6 145:24       175:4       verbally 57:21       25:2,3,7,23 26:1       70:10 71:4,11         147:6 149:9       152:12 155:16       152:12 155:16       152:12 155:16       152:12 155:16       152:12 155:16       152:12 155:16       152:12 155:16       152:12 155:16       152:12 155:16       152:12 155:16       152:12 155:16       152:12 155:16       152:12 155:16       152:12 155:16       152:12 155:16       152:12 155:16       152:12 155:16       155:19,19 160:15         159:13 162:18       120:25       120:25       120:25       120:25       120:25       120:25       120:25       120:25       120:25       120:25       120:25       120:25       120:25       120:25       120:25       120:25       120:25       120:25       120:25       120:25       120:25       120:25       120:25       120:25       120:25       120:25       120:25       120:25       120:25       120:25       120:25       120:25       120:25       120:25       120:25       120:25       120:25       120:25       120:25<	,			· /	
101:21 115:7       unsatisfied 24:18       VER000198 86:10       4:10 14:13 19:9       33:3 35:20 62:1         132:22 141:4       unsubstantiated       VER000249 89:6       19:18 22:8 23:15       65:7 67:21 68:13         147:6 149:9       unsure 37:25       unsual 88:12       verbally 57:21       29:21 33:1,8       74:16 82:8 86:6         159:13 162:18       unwelcoming       Verita 86:6,9       62:5 82:13 84:8       98:7 112:25         170:2,3 176:23       unwell 31:21       versus 73:7       85:16 86:5       155:19,19 160:15					
132:22 141:4       unsubstantiated       VER000249 89:6       19:18 22:8 23:15       65:7 67:21 68:13         143:6 145:24       175:4       unsure 37:25       verbally 57:21       25:2,3,7,23 26:1       70:10 71:4,11         152:12 155:16       unusual 88:12       verify 46:14       36:10 38:4,21,24       86:21 87:4 89:7         159:13 162:18       unwelcoming       Verita 86:6,9       62:5 82:13 84:8       98:7 112:25         170:2,3 176:23       unwell 31:21       versus 73:7       85:16 86:5       155:19,19 160:15	· ·	0		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
143:6 145:24       175:4       verbally 57:21       25:2,3,7,23 26:1       70:10 71:4,11         147:6 149:9       152:12 155:16       121:2,5       29:21 33:1,8       74:16 82:8 86:6         159:13 162:18       159:13 162:18       166:6 168:5       120:25       Verita 86:6,9       62:5 82:13 84:8       98:7 112:25         170:2,3 176:23       170:2,3 176:23       170:2,3 176:23       170:2,3 176:23       170:2,3 176:23       170:2,3 176:23					
147:6 149:9       unsure 37:25       121:2,5       29:21 33:1,8       74:16 82:8 86:6         152:12 155:16       unusual 88:12       verify 46:14       36:10 38:4,21,24       86:21 87:4 89:7         159:13 162:18       unwelcoming       Verita 86:6,9       62:5 82:13 84:8       98:7 112:25         170:2,3 176:23       unwell 31:21       versa 79:14       85:16 86:5       155:19,19 160:15					
152:12 155:16		* =			· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
159:13 162:18			· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
166:6 168:5					
170:2,3 176:23 unwell 31:21 versus 73:7 85:16 86:5 155:19,19 160:15		S	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		
001100010				· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
$r_{1}$ and $r_{2}$ and $r_{3}$ and $r_{3$	· ·				· ·
Tool 131.5	understandable				
73:4,10 vividly 53:22 60:9 13:23 14:20 17:1	· ·				
9 - 17 1-7 1-7 1-7	understanding	149:20 150:1		60:11	
14:10 15:14 16:3   163:10 164:16   21:5 23:6 24:22	14:10 15:14 16:3		163:10 164:16		21:5 23:6 24:22

				Page 208
26:10,13 27:8,11	154:21 162:13	128:2,24 136:18	22:12 31:12,14	worsening 38:25
27:12 36:5 40:19	Wednesday 65:17	136:20 138:1	31:25 32:7 33:4	39:6 109:24
40:20 42:9,14,15	79:8 81:7 84:11	153:4 158:18	33:9 35:2 43:24	worst 120:18
42:18 59:18,21	week 12:17 39:11	160:9 161:17	45:11 61:13 66:5	149:12
69:1 75:5,7,7,16	66:12 79:5	166:22 168:19	77:14 79:7 83:10	wouldn't 7:17 13:1
76:4 77:14 80:8	107:13 160:11	white 153:20	84:4 89:8 100:22	17:17 18:14,15
82:11 83:18	176:18 177:21	154:20 156:15	105:5,13 106:10	27:6 29:4 40:25
89:25 118:6	weekend 12:16	wide 34:9	106:13 129:23	47:23 55:11 57:5
121:11 129:10	weeks 56:11 58:1	widely-known	130:17 163:23	57:7 58:12 65:4
142:23,24 148:15	74:21 80:13	34:10	169:9 170:9	67:17,23 69:19
163:11	81:13 166:13	wider 25:20 34:11	witnessed 121:3	71:16 82:24 95:2
wanting 37:20	176:5,20	38:1 100:7,10	140:17 157:4	wounds 131:6
wash 162:14	weigh 63:15	101:1	158:17 159:19	wrath 82:23,25
washing 162:12	weight 121:22	willing 65:13	160:2 164:7	wrist 125:6 126:16
wasn't 4:23 7:12	welcome 24:9,19	82:25 169:11	witnesses 176:4	157:5
8:20 11:13 14:25	52:11 150:10	willingness 82:12	177:5,10	wrists 123:15
16:21 19:4 21:3	welcomed 42:2	Wilson 1:4,5,7,11	Witnessing 142:7	124:18 125:4,8
21:14 24:19 34:1	81:23 82:1	1:12,16,25 5:13	woman 112:5	125:10 172:8,10
34:23 42:20	welcoming 80:22	8:8 12:14 39:11	122:11 153:20	172:21
48:14,18 75:15	welfare 2:4 5:24	48:5 61:19,24	word 74:7,8	writing 13:20
75:22,23 81:1,5	5:24 6:6,10,14,20	89:1,7 99:7	wording 18:25	41:17 169:15
82:9 85:1 87:20	6:25 7:2,2,16,20	101:8,10 104:19	45:15 78:15 86:2	written 7:13
92:3 96:3 103:19	7:21,23 8:1,17,20	104:20 105:1	words 33:6,7	110:19 171:15,23
111:20 112:2	24:15 26:19	178:1	49:13 50:19	171:25 173:5
115:13 117:10	68:21 70:16	wing 96:21,22	56:11 137:10	
125:17 131:18	73:13 74:6 79:17	107:11,12,15,17	153:13 155:19	X
135:4 136:14	100:21,24 112:7	107:18,20 111:1	156:19 173:7	<b>X</b> 177:24
137:23	112:15 122:12,24	111:4,6,6,7,10,17	work 2:9 3:9 4:4	
watch 129:5 150:5	123:1,8 135:3,23	112:1,5,19,20,21	7:20,23,24 8:4,15	Y
watched 129:20	137:12,20 138:12	112:22,24 113:1	14:13 24:12	yard 155:18
watching 66:18	144:10,13 161:13	114:19,20 117:1	25:20 33:8 36:5	159:21
129:19	Wells 44:20	126:20,21 127:1	42:17 51:20 56:8	yeah 5:4 11:12
way 31:17 51:23	went 32:20 109:3	127:1,17,24	57:3 62:5,24	25:24 32:21
52:19 53:5,6	114:16 116:2	129:7,7 143:18	63:3 68:9,12,14	51:14 70:19
62:6 72:11 75:3	117:13 135:22	143:22,24 149:22	74:25 75:23 78:7	77:12
82:8 117:16	138:12 145:7	154:9,9,16	78:12 80:22	year 10:18 80:21
120:11,17,20,22	149:4 152:15	155:15,16 156:15	100:1,15 106:9,9	81:16 82:17
121:6 122:11	weren't 14:16	156:24 157:23,25	177:13,15	97:22 98:21,25
126:4,23 130:11	17:12 22:15	164:2 165:8	worked 84:2 124:6	107:3
135:19 138:8	32:22 38:9 39:16	wings 68:22 92:21	working 2:8 12:22	years 10:19 44:4
145:25 153:5,23	66:19 74:1 75:9	115:10 116:10	12:24 21:15 31:8	106:15 121:21
153:25 154:12	75:9 83:11 85:1	wish 22:9 64:20	75:11 95:2 100:7	122:20 135:24
156:25 161:9	86:4 92:3 100:2	176:14 177:16	108:5 109:7	138:13 140:7
way' 51:19	100:5,5,11	wished 128:22	120:23 124:5	160:3
ways 55:11 63:9	wet 162:24,25	164:16	worried 111:21	yesterday 2:12
we're 27:9	wheelchair 44:8	withdrawn 165:14	131:7 158:23	14:14 15:11 29:7 29:25 42:19
wear 162:21 163:1	44:16 172:23	165:16	worry 120:9	
wearing 114:11	173:13	withdrew 105:5	worse 39:8 70:12	49:24 98:17 103:4
123:19 124:1	<b>whilst</b> 111:19	witness 9:14 10:14	110:3 129:3,21	
				young 110:3,23

				Page 209
120:16 127:15	<b>18</b> 27:17 28:22	163:25 164:19	<b>34</b> 28:8	
141:22 156:14	31:12 35:19	165:14 166:3,14	<b>35</b> 121:21 127:25	7
160:2	104:2 107:19		128:1,3,4,15	7 93:12 107:22
100:2		167:8 168:1,4,23	, , ,	109:18 132:17
$\overline{\mathbf{z}}$	122:20 135:24	169:2 171:12,14	<b>35(3)</b> 167:9 168:5	143:21
<b>zoom</b> 12:13 15:9	138:13,25	171:17,20 172:2	<b>36</b> 43:23 44:19	<b>73</b> 138:16
140:6	<b>19</b> 72:1 139:3	173:3,5 174:11	<b>37</b> 43:23	<b>75(c)(ii)</b> 112:13
140:0	140:9 143:24	175:3	<b>38</b> 35:13 89:23	<b>75(d)</b> 114:8
0	160:3	<b>2017/2018</b> 86:7	<b>39</b> 37:3	<b>76</b> 123:4
<b>0.01</b> 79:2	<b>19:28</b> 143:21	<b>2018</b> 1:14,16 2:3	4	<b>77</b> 132:3
<b>03:35</b> 143:4	<b>19:50</b> 152:19	3:2,22 5:20		<b>78</b> 126:9
<b>03:56</b> 143:4		22:20 26:4 28:7	4 12:12 106:22	<b>79</b> 132:3
<b>03:30</b> 143.4	2	32:25 33:16,21	171:20 175:3	
1	<b>2</b> 106:22 148:24	33:24 34:17,19	<b>4.16</b> 55:22 58:19	8
1 1:11 15:6 142:14	157:7 165:8	35:13 37:3 41:2	40 58:20	<b>8</b> 59:12 150:19
143:5,8,25	169:2 175:10,12	50:3 62:3 64:2	<b>40s</b> 154:22	160:20
143.3,8,23	176:17,22 177:5	79:4 81:16 83:2	<b>41</b> 74:20,23	<b>80</b> 132:3,15
144:13 143:3	177:14	83:17 89:2,8	<b>42</b> 41:2,18 123:12	<b>82(a)</b> 133:20
	<b>2.00</b> 139:11	94:11 98:25	<b>43</b> 76:7 126:14	<b>82(b)</b> 134:1
178:1,3 <b>1.25</b> 139:8	<b>2.10</b> 171:5	169:5	<b>44</b> 43:2 74:23 78:2	<b>82(c)</b> 133:20
	<b>2.15</b> 171:7	<b>2019</b> 169:5	<b>45</b> 43:19,25 61:13	<b>83</b> 132:4,15
10 1:1 22:2,21	<b>2.43</b> 177:19	<b>2021</b> 1:1,8 138:25	79:19	<b>84</b> 129:23
81:14 92:12	<b>20</b> 58:22 140:8	139:3 170:14	<b>46</b> 79:11	
109:18 151:2,18	160:3 163:25	<b>2022</b> 176:18	<b>48</b> 46:17 47:1	9
152:6 168:1,4	164:19 170:24	177:21	163:4	<b>9</b> 170:14
<b>10.58</b> 61:20	<b>2013</b> 10:14	<b>20s</b> 144:3 153:21	<b>49</b> 47:1 163:4	<b>9.00</b> 154:17
100 97:13	<b>2015</b> 10:15 32:10	<b>21</b> 112:17 149:23	<b>4A</b> 143:5	<b>9.30</b> 1:2
<b>106</b> 178:5	34:19	165:14 176:18		<b>99.9</b> 78:6,11
11 12:12 107:9	<b>2016</b> 2:3 3:3,21	177:21	5	
152:13	4:15 5:21 32:13	<b>22</b> 19:11 140:9	<b>5</b> 55:20 69:19	
<b>11.30</b> 61:17,19,22	33:3 42:5 87:24	166:3	147:11 174:11	
<b>12</b> 84:10 107:22	89:13 95:10	<b>23</b> 175:20	<b>5.23</b> 142:13	
173:3	<b>2017</b> 2:22,23 5:22	<b>24</b> 86:9	<b>50</b> 48:19 133:23	
<b>12.32</b> 105:7	5:22 8:24 12:15	<b>25</b> 3:2 32:25 74:21	163:23	
<b>12.40</b> 104:25 105:6	22:22 26:3 35:11	75:25 171:14	<b>51</b> 50:2 130:7	
<b>12.44</b> 105:9	38:14 41:12 43:1	173:5	<b>52</b> 51:15	
<b>13</b> 12:15 19:21	43:3,21 44:13	<b>26</b> 3:21 114:13	<b>54</b> 165:25	
108:7	46:18 61:25 62:9	<b>27</b> 26:7	<b>55</b> 165:25	
<b>139</b> 178:7	74:21 75:25	<b>28</b> 171:17 172:2	<b>56</b> 133:2 166:11	
<b>14</b> 19:9 27:16	81:13,25 86:9	<b>29</b> 9:7 22:5 39:10	<b>57</b> 79:4	
<b>14-year-old</b> 26:10	93:15 97:23	<u>4</u> 77.144.337.10	<b>58</b> 62:3 134:16	
<b>14:46</b> 151:2	106:14 107:8,9	3	<b>59</b> 168:9	
<b>15</b> 1:8 22:25 44:13	108:9 132:17	<b>3</b> 59:12 107:8		
152:18	140:8,9 141:14	108:9 141:6	6	
<b>150</b> 96:22	142:14 143:5,8	148:24	<b>6</b> 23:9 147:14	
<b>16</b> 69:18 141:6	143:21,25 144:15	<b>30</b> 22:20	166:14 167:8	
<b>16:37</b> 58:21	145:3 147:3,11	30s 144:3	<b>60</b> 133:23	
<b>17</b> 140:8 141:18	147:14 148:18,24		<b>61</b> 89:10	
143:25 162:12	150:19 151:2,18	141:14	<b>62</b> 93:17	
<b>171</b> 178:9	150:19 151:2,18	<b>32</b> 26:4	<b>64</b> 89:11 168:9	
<b>176</b> 178:11	160:20 162:12	<b>33</b> 28:8	<b>65</b> 169:8	
	100.20 102:12	33 40.0		