

OFFICIAL - SENSITIVE

to pull his arms out so he could be controlled in the small area...I had no concern with what was happening in the use of force. If I had seen anything I would have questioned this at the time..."

- 7.5.28 DCM Farrell had observed the use of force until taking over from DCO Tulley who had been struggling to get [D687]'s arm out from beneath him. He had had no concerns with the techniques being used by the officers on his arms (DCOs Martin and Tulley) and head (DD Haughton) whilst the ligature was removed. DD Haughton said the *"use of force was fairly quick. He didn't resist too much; moving around and moving arms away from officers...not extreme violence."* DCO Martin said *"he was not a difficult man to restrain. He did not put up much of a fight."*
- 7.5.29 All the officers described the techniques they had used and these were approved HO techniques based on their descriptions. They denied that they had pulled [D687] back by the nose or grabbed his neck, other than to lift the ligature off. They all said that they had not twisted his fingers, pushed his wrist back, kned him in the ribs or sat on his back. They acknowledged that the wrist inflection / final lock might be felt on the wrist and finger / thumb but all said no pressure had been used or needed. The room had been small and narrow (4 steps by 3 steps – photos 3-5) and there had been four adult males in there with [D687] so this might have caused any rib injury accidentally and whilst trying to control [D687] who was none compliant at the time. Nurse Parr's evidence supported this. None had made the comments alleged.
- 7.5.30 All the officers said DCO Martin had the left arm and DCO Tulley the right but had struggled and DCM Farrell had taken over. DCO Tulley's report stated force used to control [D687]'s legs and made no mention of arm restraint. The reports were reviewed post incident and this should have been challenged at the time. Other than this, the officers were consistent in their interview evidence with the use of force reports and Incident Statements they had completed contemporaneously. They were consistent in their accounts of who used what force apart from DCO Tulley. I found the officers interviewed credible.
- 7.5.31 The Panorama footage did not show the use of force. Officers could be heard trying to de-escalate and someone said *"ok it's off. Right the ligature's away"* soon after all the officers moved forward and the footage ended. I was satisfied the footage ended because DCO Tulley had become involved in the use of force so was unable to continue convert filming. A major concern was that two managers had BWC on but had not activated this (DCMs Donnelly and Farrell) as this would have been overwhelming evidence of events in the toilet area.
- 7.5.32 DCM Donnelly said he could not remember why he had not switched his on. DCM Farrell said he could not remember if he had had a camera on the strap or was just wearing the strap. He said the cameras were small and there had only been a limited amount. He could not remember switching it on. The BWC policy said 'BWC shall be worn at all times whilst the Manager is on duty 24/7, unless an exception is granted by the G4S Duty Director...Staff should activate the BWC to record all contacts with detainees in the performance of official duties dealing with incidents and responding to alarm calls...use of force.' If it is not activated a record should be made of the reasons. A BWC recording should not be made in an area where