

BROOK HOUSE INQUIRY

First Witness Statement of Shayne Munroe

I provide this statement in response to a request under Rule 9 of the Inquiry Rules 2006 dated 5 July 2021, and a supplemental request under Rule 9 dated 13 October 2021.

I, Shayne Munroe, of an address known to the Inquiry, will say as follows:

Background

1. My name is Shayne Munroe. My year of birth is DPA
2. I have a degree in Criminology. Before working with G4S, I worked in a betting office and a bank, and I did voluntary work with young offenders.
3. I worked with G4S from February 2016 to September 2017. I was hired for the role of a Detainee Custody Officer (“DCO”), but it took some time for my CRB check to come through. From March to May 2016, I did the role of an ACO (I cannot now recall what the letters stand for, but I think it was Assistant Custody Officer). ACOs had no detainee contact and were equivalent to an OSG (operational support grade) in the prison context. I passed the training for the DCO role in March 2016 but did not go into the role until 21 May 2016 when the CRB check came through.
4. I am no longer employed by G4S. At the end of April 2017, I was involved in an incident with a detainee when he became angry and threatening towards me. A few days later, I was suspended pending an investigation. I was dismissed at a disciplinary meeting on 17 September 2017 following broadcast of the Panorama programme. I provide further information at paragraphs 75 to 86 below.

5. It should be noted that I was working in Brook House for only about four weeks during the period 1 April to 31 August 2017, which is described by the Inquiry as the 'Relevant Period'.
6. I currently work as a probation officer and have done so for three years. I do voluntary work with young offenders with my local youth offending team and have done so for roughly 10 years.

Application Process

7. I was attracted to working as a DCO with G4S because I wanted to do overseas escorting work. I enjoy travelling and had seen detainees on my flights in the past and observed how positively they interacted with their escorting officers. They appeared quite relaxed to me and behaved like friends towards each other. I remember reading about the transporting element of the DCO role and decided to apply. From what I read in the job description I thought the role would be a stepping-stone. This was not the case. G4S had previously held the contract for overseas escorting but lost it to Tascor and had not updated their recruitment information.
8. I do not recall the recruitment process very well. I remember that I filled out an application form, had an interview and was offered the role. I do not remember if there were any tests involved. I do not think that it prepared me for the role. There was nothing to the process, and while I think that there is only so much that you can get out of an interview and role plays, what I walked in to in Brook House was very different to what I expected from the application process or even after the training.

Culture

9. When I worked as an ACO, everyone was lovely, welcoming, and helpful to each other. When I moved into the DCO role, it became evident quite quickly that the

culture in Brook House was very cliquey. A lot of the staff had worked there for a while and knew each other well. They lived in the same towns and areas, and often car-shared to work. They had existing relationships. I was A-wing staff but had experience working on every wing. I did not find that they operated differently. When it came to a working culture, my experience was that everyone knew what was needed to make the day run smoothly, and in general people worked well together to get it done so that they could have some down time.

10. I think that staff morale was generally good (although I only worked at Brook House for approximately four weeks of the Relevant Period). From December 2016 to April 2017, I worked in B-wing, but then I was moved to D-wing. I felt that morale on D-wing was poor compared to other wings where it was generally alright. The officers working on D-wing did not seem very interested in being there, and I felt bored when I was there because there was no real communication amongst the staff. It felt like every man for themselves and there would often be times when officers would go off the wing to complete tasks without communicating with the officers they were working with. D-wing also seemed darker than other wings because of the colour of the walls, and it faced the back of the building.
11. I did not pick up on any foul attitudes towards detainees at any point while working at Brook House. Generally, everyone got on well with the detainees and there was a good rapport between the officers and the detainees. Detainees knew which officers they related to best and tended to avoid anyone they did not like or get on with. When I saw the Panorama programme, I was shocked because I had never seen treatment like that (i.e. the violence and attitudes that were seen on Panorama). I worked on the same lines with some of the people who were recorded on the programme which means that a lot of the footage occurred while I was on shift working on other wings. I found it very disturbing to see that this was going on when I was working there. Generally, staff and detainees got on well. I never saw staff members inflicting violence on detainees or heard them talking about wanting

to inflict violence. I was aware that there were conversations that I was not privy to. I did not use the staff room at Brook House, and I spent my breaks in my car.

12. I had no particular concerns about how the values of G4S or its culture impacted on the general protection of detainees or the protection of especially vulnerable detained persons. When I saw detainees who were on the Assessment Care in Detention and Teamwork (“ACDT”) process (who were feeling suicidal or not eating for long periods of time), they often ended up on E-wing. I saw other colleagues having conversations with them and taking them away from the crowd to make sure they were okay. This may have been to ensure the boxes were ticked, but they were still making sure that the observations were done. I did not have concerns about any of the detainees who I was in contact with.
13. I did have concerns about how the values and culture impacted on the management of staff. Where issues were raised about staff, nothing was done or acted on. I raised three grievances about things that happened to me while working in Brook House, and I feel that my grievances were not dealt with as appropriately as they should have been. When I voiced an issue, the other person would give their version of events and my view was brushed aside as if there was just a misunderstanding (see paragraph 64 below). I also feel that the management and handling of complaints did not promote the core values of G4S (such as integrity).
14. On 10 June 2016, shortly after I moved into the role of DCO, I made a complaint to the Director of Brook House which detailed a few incidents about how I was spoken to and treated by people who were managing me [INN000001]. An extract of the complaint is below:

“Throughout my training course the G4S core values were promoted as a blueprint to follow at all times in any role at Brook House. The three that currently stand out the most to me in these situations are: Best People, Collaboration & Teamwork and Integrity which has so far been very difficult to

uphold these in the past few weeks. Not only does it appear that staff members are not adhering to the core values themselves, it feels to me that my lack of DCO experience has been exploited and has made way for other experienced staff members to behave vindictively by putting me in situations that could have essentially got me into quite severe trouble had I made mistakes.

I have been very sceptical about putting this in writing as I have already had quite a sour experience with a few other staff members and would be very disheartened if it continued out of retaliation to my raised concerns. Ideally, I would have liked to have discussed this with my line manager (Dave Roffey) before taking it higher however on our first encounter in the Visits Centre, I found him very disrespectful and condescending and do not find him very approachable.

I am very disappointed with my experience as a DCO thus far. I would appreciate if the contents of this letter were acknowledged and some form of action taken. I am an advocate for creating positive colleague relationships in the workplace and do not come to work to feel bullied, victimised, ridiculed or to be disrespected whether it be covertly or overtly by any member of staff at Brook House.”

15. In my opinion, the senior management of Brook House were rarely seen or heard. They stayed in their area of the building and rarely came on to the wings. In my view, there was a gap between what the values and priorities of the senior management were stated to be, and what they actually were. I thought that senior management was fine in terms of ensuring that the day went as planned and things got done. However, when it came to dealing with issues or concerns that were raised, it was very much ‘what they said goes’. This is evident in the incident relating to my dismissal, which I discuss at paragraphs 76 to 85 below. I had concerns around the quality of the investigation and had made notes to raise with senior management at a disciplinary meeting held on 17 September 2017. However,

I was dismissed during this meeting and was not given an opportunity to speak about my concerns relating to the investigation.

16. There were a lot of existing intimate relationships and friendships between senior management, Detention Centre Managers (“DCMs”) and DCOs, and boundaries were blurred when it came to being in work and being professional. When I say intimate relationships, I mean physical relationships but also close interpersonal relationships. I cannot comment on these relationships outside of work, but it was clear in the workplace which members of staff were in these friendship groups. The most obvious friendship group that I can recall involved Dave Killick, Jack Bannister, Bonnie Spark, Dave Roffey, Dave Aldis, Ben Shadbolt, Michelle Brown, Dan Haughton, and Steve Dix. I cannot remember the names of everyone who continued friendships away from the workplace, and I did not pay attention to which staff were in relationships. In my opinion, these relationships meant that officers and management were unable to separate their personal relationships from their professional behaviour. I felt that nothing was confidential, and if I raised any issues with management, it would become pub talk within the friendship group. If one member of the group had an issue with someone, the rest of the group also had an issue with that person. That was my experience and how they interacted with me.
17. I was not aware of any occasion where someone raised a concern about the treatment of a detained person. I think for a lot of staff if they had concerns, they were more likely to keep them to themselves because it was unlikely to go anywhere. That said, it was never brought to my attention by detainees that staff were treating detainees badly.

Physical Layout of Brook House

18. I am asked to comment on a map showing the location of the buildings within Brook House and what they were used for [CJS004587]. Brook House was built like a Category B prison and had similar security measures in place. I think the

management tried to incorporate aspects of prison management into running Brook House (for example, Oscar 1 was the DCM with responsibility for the wings and activities, and Oscar 2 had responsibility for reception and visits). Detainees would sometimes say, “this isn’t prison; you might think it’s prison but it’s not”. However, I do not think that the physical layout of Brook House impacted on the care of detained persons.

19. The appearance of Brook House was quite dull, and the corridors were dark and did not have much natural light. A-wing and C-wing were at the front of the building and looked out onto the runway, so they felt a bit brighter. Wings B, D and E faced the wall and trees on the other side. Each wing was painted differently: A – red; B – green; C – blue; D – yellow/orange.
20. I am asked to identify any improvements to the physical setup or layout which might improve care of individuals detained at Brook House. In my opinion, Brook House could be made to look nicer, perhaps with brighter paint. They also had three beds in the ground floor rooms, which I think made the rooms overcrowded. The rooms were small and there was just enough space for two detainees in there. Three adult men sharing these rooms was too many.
21. My understanding is that E-wing was used for the most vulnerable detainees; those who could not behave well in an open environment (for example, getting into fights, or self-harming behaviour). They were removed to E-wing to manage risks or other problems. E-wing was also used as a transition for people who had been in the Care and Separation Unit (“CSU”). The CSU was situated at the back of E-wing. E-wing was a significantly smaller wing (perhaps only 10 or 11 rooms), and there was a closer level of care for detainees.
22. Detainees were located on E-wing based on their level of risk which would have been decided in Reception. On some occasions they would be relocated to E-wing following an incident that caused concern about the individual’s wellbeing (e.g., an

instance of self-harm or a medical issue). I am aware that quite a few detainees who had violent pasts or serious convictions were put in E-wing. Detainees would do the usual things that they would do on other wings, e.g., play pool and watch TV in the communal area. It was a closer and more intimate setting – it was an observation wing. It was calmer and quieter than the other wings. Detainees were not able to leave the wing as and when they felt like it. If they needed to go somewhere, a member of staff would take them, but they would not be able to go on their own. They did not associate with the rest of the detainee population. I spent a number of days working on E-wing and understood the basic running of the wing, but I do not know what the criteria was to be moved into or from E-wing.

Policies and Procedures

23. Policies and procedures governing my work at Brook House were drawn to my attention at the beginning of my employment. They were used regularly for the purpose of protecting and managing detainees. I do not think the policies were very useful, and I would regularly submit security information reports (“SIR”) and see no action taken. For example, I would submit a SIR to the security team if I noticed that a detainee had a smart phone or an illicit substance, and I would expect to see a room search within 24 hours, but this did not happen. It could be two days later before anything was done. I cannot remember much about the other policies and procedures because of how much time has passed. However, whilst I was working at Brook House, I always made sure I was up to date with the policies and procedures to ensure that my practice was guided by them.

24. I do not know whether the policies were properly maintained or updated. I do not think that they were always used in the context they should have been. For example, following an incident I had with DCO Bonnie Spark, our line manager, DCM Dave Roffey, encouraged her to write an SIR about me rather than speaking to us both to

get to the bottom of the issue and resolve it. I provide further information at paragraphs 55 and 64 below.

Training

General Training

25. I began the eight-week training course on 8 February 2016 and passed the course.

As explained above, although I successfully completed the training course, I was unable to go straight into my DCO role due to the extensive delays in my CRB check being issued. I did the ACO role instead until May 2016, which looking back I am glad about as it allowed me to have a better understanding of how the centre was run and the importance of support staff.

26. Although it was very informative, I do not think the training adequately prepared DCOs for the role. I had previous experience of working in volatile environments and I think this helped me a lot as Brook House was unpredictable. However, there were a lot of DCOs who did not have this experience and when they went live in their role, they were unprepared for instances of confrontation or detainees raising their voices at them. As explained above, the job description I read before applying for the DCO role and the reality of the role I went into, were two different things. In my opinion, training should have included shadowing days within the centre during the eight-week training course. That way people would get a better feel for what the job involved and make an informed decision on whether they wanted to continue.

27. When I first moved into the DCO role, there was no acknowledgement that I was eight weeks behind the other DCOs who I had trained with. Each DCO should have been provided with two-weeks of shadowing another officer, but I was not given that opportunity. It felt like I had been thrown in at the deep end, and although there were a few DCOs who were willing to help and teach me, there was equally as much

self-learning. Prior to going into the DCO role, I raised concerns with Vicky Nutton, who had trained me initially, that I might not get the shadowing opportunity. She was senior management and assured me that my shadowing would be arranged but that did not happen. That meant that there was an expectation of me to do what was needed in the DCO role, but I was unaware of what the job actually required of me.

28. I have been referred to a document relating to the DCO initial training course (“ITC”) which was run in June 2017 [CJS006085]. The structure of the June 2017 course was different to the one that I did in 2016. In 2017, the two-weeks of shadowing were included within the eight-week training course. In 2016, the two weeks of shadowing were done after the eight-week training was completed (although as I mentioned, I was not given the opportunity to have two-weeks of shadowing). Control and restraint training was done in week 6 of my ITC in 2016, but in 2017 the training was in week 2.

29. I do not recall being offered refresher training. However, this was so long ago and so many other things happened during my employment at Brook House, that I honestly cannot remember.

30. As far as I was aware, anybody who was a DCO completed DCO training. From my understanding, there was no additional or specific training for activities staff. I never worked in activities so I cannot be certain.

Personal Protection Training

31. Personal Protection training was covered during the use of force training in the main training course. I do not recall being offered refresher training.

32. I cannot remember much about what was taught in the personal protection element of the training.

Use of Force

33. I successfully completed use of force training. I cannot remember the exact dates, but this was done in the sixth week of the main training course. That would mean the use of force training was in the week commencing 14 March 2016.
34. The quality of the training was excellent. DCM Jack Bannister, DCM Steve Webb and DCM Dave Killick delivered the training and they worked really well together and made it enjoyable for us. They ensured that the whole group was able to correctly do what they had demonstrated before they moved on. If a trainee was struggling, they would work with them individually. We were taught about instances where use of force would be planned and when it was appropriate to use a spontaneous use of force. Another thing that was emphasised was the need to complete a use of force report whenever we had to place hands on a detainee, even if it was the case that we placed our hands on their back to guide them away from a situation.

The role of a DCO and relationships with detained persons

35. I am asked to comment on the job description for a DCO dated 2009 [CJS004294]. I have never seen a copy of this document before. Having reviewed the document, it describes the role and reflects the requirements of being a DCO role; however, it does not reflect the reality of what the job was like, and it would not prepare someone for the job. It implies a controlled environment and does not reflect the challenges presented by spice usage and spice attacks, or the reactions that DCOs could get when they provided information about a flight. This document outlines the expectations of the role, but it is not an accurate reflection of the reality of the job. I can vaguely remember the contents of the job description that I saw from my time at Brook House. From memory, that job description was not an accurate reflection of the roles and responsibilities of a DCO either. The job description was more accurate in describing the DCO role at Tinsley House, which was a very

different environment to Brook House. Tinsley House was a lot calmer and quieter than Brook House. The staff seemed a lot more content in there, maybe because it was a lot more open with more natural light, less doors and keys, and a significantly lower number of detainees. The job description also mentioned overseas escorting which is why I applied but I became aware during training that G4S no longer held the contract.

36. The role of the DCO involved the basic running of the wings every day. This involved roll count, unlock and breakfast and a check to make sure nothing was broken in the rooms; lock-up, roll count and lunch; lock-up, roll count and dinner; lock-up, roll count and go home. If an incident took place, the DCOs would act on it, and sometimes we would need to conduct observations of detainees on ACDTs. The shifts for DCOs were 13.5 hours (from 07:45 to 21:15). It would generally be quite chilled when the detainees were unlocked and there was often nothing to do. Naturally it was loud in Brook House because of the high number of detainees on each wing.

37. I think I engaged well with detainees of all backgrounds. It was a multicultural environment and there was a mix of black, Asian, and European detainees. I found that a lot of the black detainees gravitated towards me when I started and appeared happy to see another officer on the wings who looked like them (one detainee referred to me as his 'big sister'). Although we were told not to share personal information for security reasons, it was obvious to them that I was from London and although I would tell them I was from North London they were easily able to identify that I was, in fact, from South London because of the words I would use and my accent. I used cultural similarities and differences to build rapport with all detainees and I would always ask where they were from, what it was like there and how long they had been in the UK. I would show an interest in their home countries and what life was like there and their lives here.

38. I would also play pool with the detainees which they seemed to enjoy. I found this was a good approach to building trust and rapport with everybody. I treated everybody fairly, regardless of their background and this was acknowledged by detainees on a number of occasions. I remember an incident when working on B-wing when a detainee refused to do something that another DCO had asked him to do but he did it with no issues when I instructed him to do it. His response was “he can’t tell me to do shit, but you can”. When I asked what made my instruction so special, he said, “‘cause he is rude and treats people like shit and has his favourites in here but you, you’re alright ‘cause you don’t treat people differently”. The DCO involved was called Darren Tomsett.
39. For those whose first language was not English, I would ask them to teach me some basic words in their native language. I rarely used interpreters, only on occasions if there were no other detainees who spoke the same language. I also found that the detainees were often reluctant to speak to an interpreter over the phone and would bring a friend with them instead or look for somebody that could speak English.
40. I believe my engagement and approach with detainees was noticed and appreciated by them and this is evident up to this day. A lot of detainees were from London and many of them live locally to me or to my relatives across London. I see some of them quite often on my daily travels. There have been occasions where I have bumped into detainees whilst with my family and theirs, and they have publicly praised me stating that I was ‘one of the few good people in Brook House’. I also travelled to Jamaica a lot as this is where I am from and have bumped into some detainees there because we are from the same parish, or I was visiting the area they are from. Again, there have been instances where they have publicly praised me to the people I was with.
41. There were other officers who were very helpful and attentive to the needs of detainees. There were some, however, who I believe thought they were working in a prison. My experience was that officers from the bigger towns and cities had a

better understanding of the multicultural environment of Brook House. Although I never witnessed any ill-treatment of detainees, I had the impression that I was not privy to certain behaviours that some DCOs might display when they were within their friendship group or clique (I never sat in the staff room).

42. Throughout our training we were told that DCOs were expected to have conversations with the detainees, to learn about them and what they were going through, and to try to find out how to make their time at Brook House a little bit easier. In practice this was frowned upon and the way I interacted with detainees was always made out to be a problem. I remember one occasion when I was having a conversation with a detainee in the corridor to B-wing and the Deputy Director of Brook House, Steve Skitt, walked past me on to the wing. About 10 minutes had passed and I was still talking to the detainee when he was finished on the wing and walked past me a second time. He looked at me as if having a lengthy discussion was a problem. It appeared to me that anybody who got on exceptionally well with detainees was considered by a certain set of DCOs and DCMs to be displaying inappropriate behaviour. I provide more information on some of the issues I experienced with other DCOs at paragraphs 51 to 55 below.

43. In my experience, the detainees were typically well behaved and did not display negative behaviour. There were no incentives to encourage positive behaviour. I cannot be certain that it would make a difference anyway. As I said, detainees generally tended to behave.

44. My understanding of the role of a DCO in the ACDT process was to make regular observations of the person and engage in conversation with them. The time that each observation should be made was specified on the ACDT (e.g., every two hours). I have no opinion on the adequacy of the procedure and practice. I can say that everybody was aware of who was on an ACDT on the wing, and we would work together to ensure that the observations were done.

45. I am asked to provide my understanding of the process in place for preventing drugs from entering Brook House. Visitors were always searched coming into Brook House, and mail was screened before being distributed to detainees. Property being brought in by visitors was also searched. This process was successful as I do remember a few visitors being caught with contraband. During training we were told that random searches would be carried out on staff when we enter the building; however, during my time at Brook House, I can only remember one time when a staff search was conducted.
46. I think this process was far from successful as drugs were entering the building. I was never privy to any conversations with other DCOs about where the drugs were coming from but there were a lot of rumours going around about staff or specific officers bringing things in. I had the impression that conversations were going on that I was not part of, and sometimes it sounded as if DCOs and DCMs were talking in a code I did not follow. I never witnessed any member of staff bringing items into the centre for detainees. There were times when detainees spoke to me and told me that members of staff were bringing things in for them and for other detainees, such as smartphones, cannabis, spice, money, and clothes/footwear. When this happened, I wrote SIRs to report it but to my knowledge nothing was ever done. It seemed clear to me that the management knew who was bringing in drugs, but they were not doing anything about it. Other officers and managers knew which detainees had drugs as they would refer to them as drug dealers. No action was taken. I could not understand why a detainee who was believed to be a drug dealer, was not moved to E-wing where they would be monitored and could not leave the wing freely.
47. I used SIRs if I had a conversation with a detainee who raised an issue that I thought might be of interest to the security team. I was aware that you could not always rely on what a detainee had said, and I had lots of conversations with detainees. Over time, I felt that submitting SIRs made things worse for me at Brook House. Because of the friendships and relationships between members of staff, there was no

confidentiality in the way there should have been. It also felt like no one was listening because nothing was done.

48. I never worked as one of the welfare team.

49. I never worked as part of the security team.

Relationships with staff

50. I experienced a lot of racist attitudes and behaviours from other staff, both overtly and covertly. Racism was present from DCO level, right up to senior management level. There was only one black person employed in a managerial role at Brook House and he was employed as the Diversity Manager. I had conversations with other black officers who highlighted that there had been many black DCOs who had applied for DCM roles in the past but were never successful which caused them to leave. In my opinion the disciplinary process for staff also suggested covert racism. There were staff who were known to have done things that would be considered disciplinary/dismissal worthy, but no action would be taken, or the punishment would be minor. However, the disciplinary process and outcome for black members of staff was more severe. For example, one black officer, DCO Will Fagbo, failed his probation because he fell asleep on duty [CJS000473]. Sleeping on duty on night shifts was a common occurrence and, on the occasions where management on night shifts witnessed it, from my observations no action was taken, and they appeared to turn a blind eye to it. DCO Babatunde Fagbo (Will's father) and I were two black officers who were dismissed following a complaint made by a detainee; whereas other staff had complaints made, but nothing came of it.

51. When I started work on A-wing, there were only four other females on the wing, and only one other black female. It was apparent to me that I was not welcome. From what I saw throughout Brook House, it was 'them and us' for those of us who were of an ethnic background, especially those who were black. There was a small

number of black officers (both ACO and DCO) working in Brook House for a long time before I joined, and their advice was to be careful of other (non-black) DCOs, to stay alert and to try not to get too involved in things because it would not benefit me.

52. When I first went into my DCO role in May 2016, DCO Bonnie Spark made my life hell at work by telling other members of staff that I was lazy and did not do my job. We were staffed on the same wing and were also on the same line, which meant we worked the same shifts the majority of the time. My first few days working with Bonnie showed me that she did not like me and, to date, I have no idea why. I made a complaint about my treatment to the Director, Lee Hansford [INN000001], but nothing was done. As far as I was aware, there was no investigation into the grievance. I had a meeting with Lee, and he said that he would raise the issues with Bonnie's line manager, DCM Dave Roffey, who described it as a misunderstanding. Bonnie and DCM Roffey were friends. Lee instructed him to do better in supporting me in the role as he was also my line manager, but this support did not appear. I never felt comfortable asking DCM Roffey for support.

53. I did not experience any retaliation or negative consequences after making this complaint, but I felt unable to approach some of the DCMs (mainly Ben Shadbolt, Steve Dix, Dave Roffey and Dave Killick) as I sensed resentment in their tone when they spoke to me.

54. The detainees were aware that Bonnie had an issue with me, and some detainees were under the impression that they could not engage with Bonnie if they were going to communicate with me. One detainee told me that Bonnie stopped speaking to him because he and I got along well. I heard rumours about myself being in relationships with detainees or having friendships with them while I was not on shift. This was not true. I was told by other members of staff and detainees that I was apparently the 'go-to' person if detainees wanted drugs brought in. This was not true, and in my opinion, it was a form of racism and stereotyping. It was assumed

that I was involved in drugs because I was a black woman from South London. It was very disturbing to hear, and because of these rumours, I stopped taking any belongings into the centre. I left my bag in the car and my food in the gatehouse where the ACO staff fridge was.

55. In August 2016, I was involved in an incident with Bonnie when she called me ‘a fucking black cunt’ in the presence of around six to eight other DCOs. I reacted to Bonnie’s comment by saying I would ‘slap her in the mouth’, although I backed away from the situation. Bonnie was encouraged by our line manager, DCM Dave Roffey, to submit an SIR about me. I submitted a grievance about this incident which provides full details [INN000002] and we were both suspended until December 2016. Bonnie denied that she had made this comment, and the other members of staff claimed they did not hear her say it. An investigation took place a few months after the incident, and other witnesses claimed they could not remember much of what had happened. Despite this they clearly remembered what I said and did during the incident, and they were certain that Bonnie had not said anything racist. I am aware that Bonnie is still employed at Brook House and is now a DCM.

56. I would often get friend suggestions on Facebook to connect with other DCOs. During my time at Brook House, DCM Jack Bannister came up as a suggested friend on multiple occasions. I had a look on his page and came across two pictures of him with black face. Although they were uploaded in 2010, these were profile pictures of his and are still there today. As I stated above, it was very cliquey in Brook House. DCM Jack Bannister, DCO Bonnie Spark, DCM Dave Killick, DCM Dave Roffey and DCM Steve Dix were all part of the same friendship group. Seeing Jack so brazenly posting black face pictures of himself on social media, made me even more cautious about engaging with him and any of the others that were within his friendship group.

57. I was not aware of any homophobic or misogynistic attitudes or behaviours amongst staff. I recall only one incident when I approached John Connolly, the use of force

instructor, to speak to him about becoming a use of force instructor myself. I had enjoyed the training and, as I wanted to progress on to escorting, I believed that being a qualified use of force instructor would be a beneficial skill. John said something along the lines of, this was excellent because they did not get many 'udder swingers' showing interest in becoming use of force instructors so I would be welcomed if I pursued it. Initially I did not have a clue what he was referring to and it was only later that day that I realised he was referring to female breasts. I am unsure if John had any other roles within Brook House, but I know he was a use of force instructor. He was significantly older than those who trained me during my eight-week training course.

58. I was told by detainees that some members of staff were bringing drugs and smartphones into Brook House. I never witnessed this myself, nor was I privy to any conversations with other members of staff who may have been aware of it. There were a few names that were frequently mentioned by detainees, but I never witnessed it myself. Whenever a detainee told me about staff bringing in drugs or contraband, I submitted an SIR report. I never saw that anything was done (e.g., increased staff searches when entering the building) and I came to the view that the security team and senior management must have been aware that it was going on but were choosing to ignore it.

59. I experienced bullying throughout my entire employment at Brook House. I submitted three grievances but nothing substantial came out of them (one incident was investigated while I was suspended). The claims I made appeared to be taken seriously at the point of receiving my grievance but were brushed to the side once the subject of the complaint gave their side of the story.

60. I never had any concerns about other staff being bullied.

Relationship with the Home Office

61. My working relationship with Home Office staff was non-existent. Home Office staff worked internally within Brook House, but I never saw internal Home Office staff while I was there. If they wanted information from a detainee, they would call the wing office to request it. If they had any communication to pass on to detainees, they would put it in an envelope and give it to an ACO to deliver to the wing. I can count on one hand how many times I saw a member of the internal Home Office staff come to the wing. There was no contact with any external Home Office staff.

Relationship with Senior Managers

62. My relationship with senior managers was non-existent. I only engaged with them if I required information on something. I remember speaking to Vicky Nutton, the trainer, on some issues but I cannot recall the details. I spoke the most with the manager who dealt with staffing and annual leave. Even then, the conversations were solely about those issues. Senior management were easily accessible and almost always available during the shift, but I very rarely needed them for anything.

63. The quality of leadership by senior management at Brook House was poor. There was no real leadership, and they were not involved in running the building. They stayed in their own section at the top of the building unless they came into the centre with external visitors or contractors. I never understood what they were doing. They were more collaborative with DCMs and DCOs who were their friends or intimate partners.

Relationship with DCMs

64. My experience of being managed in Brook House was disastrous. There were multiple instances where DCMs were rude to me or disregarded me. I also found that because of the friendships and relationships between staff in Brook House, any

issues that arose between DCOs were exacerbated by DCMs. An example of this is when DCO Bonnie Spark used racist language and complained to DCM Dave Roffey. Instead of trying to resolve the issue, he encouraged Bonnie to submit an SIR about me, rather than speaking to both of us to understand the problem. He was line manager to both of us, but he was also part of Bonnie's friendship group within the workplace. I submitted three grievances about my experiences at Brook House, but when DCMs were spoken to about the concerns I raised, they always found a way to make it seem as though there had been a misunderstanding and there was always a justification for their actions.

65. The quality of management by DCMs in Brook House was poor. DCMs were very cliquey with the DCOs who were their friends or intimate partners. They tended to collaborate more with them and assign them managerial tasks over other DCOs.

66. There were a small number of managers who I could go to for support confidentially.

Relationship with other DCOs

67. In general, I got on well with other DCOs and we all got on together to do our jobs. I was selective in the friendships that I made at the time but there are DCOs who I am still in touch with today. I was aware that some DCOs did not like me, and they made this known to others but never outright told me themselves. I will never understand why, particularly the DCOs who I did not work with or who commenced their employment at Brook House during my first period of suspension. I believe they prejudged my character based on the negative things they had heard about me.

Relationship with Healthcare Staff

68. I did not really engage with healthcare staff during my employment at Brook House. On the rare occasion that I did, they were always attentive to detainee needs.

Disciplinary and grievance processes

69. During my employment with G4S, I was subject to two disciplinary investigations.

The first was in August 2016 and arose out of the incident with DCO Bonnie Spark, which I mentioned at paragraph 55 above. Full details of the incident giving rise to the investigation is set out in [INN000002].

70. This incident led to both Bonnie and I being suspended and investigated. The outcome of the investigation was a written warning for both of us, and we had to attend a mediation session. Dan Haughton was the senior manager who conducted the investigation. I gave my version of events at a meeting in September or October 2016 and was told they would be speaking to other witnesses, after which I would be invited back for a disciplinary meeting. At the disciplinary meeting, I was able to discuss any issues or discrepancies I had with the investigation. On 5 November 2016, I wrote to Dan Haughton to record my ongoing concerns about the investigation, but I expressed a willingness to attend a mediation meeting [INN000003]. The mediation proved to be a waste of time and Bonnie justified her actions as a misunderstanding. I was not sure where the misunderstanding came from. We had barely exchanged words during my first few weeks as a DCO, but I was told by other members of staff that she was speaking negatively of me to others. I had hoped that she would answer some of the questions I had prepared for the mediation, but I was gaslighted. That was the outcome I had expected.

71. I did not appeal the written warning, as I was unimpressed by the conduct of the investigation, and I did not believe that an appeal would improve the outcome for me. The cliquy behaviour and lack of boundaries between DCOs, DCMs and the senior management led me to believe that nothing I said would be taken seriously and that any appeal would not go anywhere. I decided from then on that I would make a note of significant events (good and bad) so that I had a record of what was happening in relation to the way I was treated at work.

72. In my grievance dated 13 August 2016 [INN000002], I recorded that Bonnie was overheard telling other members of staff that it was not fair that I got away with things because I played ‘the race card’. In my letter to Dan Haughton dated 5 November 2016 [INN000003], I asked whether this incident had been investigated also, and if so, what the outcome was. There was no investigation.

73. In the same letter to Dan Haughton, I said that I was “*happy to accept that I heard incorrectly what was said in C-Wing office and no racist language was used. This has clearly been investigated as best you can to draw this conclusion.*” I accepted this conclusion because I wanted to move on from the situation, and I chose not to make a bigger deal out of it. The investigation was apparently thoroughly conducted, although as I mentioned at paragraph 55 above, witnesses were spoken to months after the incident took place, said they could not remember what had happened, but they were confident that Bonnie did not use any racist language, and they clearly recalled my conduct during the incident. The investigation seemed very slapdash and appeared to be another example of staff being unable to remove the personal from the professional. Most of the witnesses were friends with Bonnie, and Dan Haughton, who conducted the investigation, was also part of her friendship group. There was no cross-referencing of statements, and no one questioned the reliability of the accounts given in light of the time that had elapsed since the incident. I remain clear on what I heard, which was recorded in the grievance I made immediately following the incident on 13 August 2016 [INN000002]. However, I genuinely felt that if I pursued the issue any further, my experience at work would only get worse, and I wanted to put it behind me.

74. I was suspended from August to December 2016. When I returned to work, I was told that Bonnie and I would be working in separate areas of the building to avoid each other. This was not the case. I was moved to B-wing and Bonnie stayed on A-wing. Due to both wings being opposite each other, I saw her just as much as I would have had I stayed on A-wing. Although we only spoke to each other when it

was necessary, our working relationship improved, and this was noticed and commended by other staff who had previously worked with us on A-wing.

75. In April 2017, I was moved to D-wing after senior management realised that although Bonnie and I were separated by working on different wings, the separation was supposed to involve working on opposite sides of the building. This was frustrating because I wanted to stay on B-wing. Four months had passed and the working relationship between Bonnie and me had improved, but because the change had not been made straight-away, the move to D-wing was quite disruptive. During my first week on D-wing, on 22 April 2017, an incident occurred with a detainee called [D119] which led to a complaint against me and ultimately to my dismissal by G4S in September 2017.

76. I knew [D119] and got on very well with him. He had previously been resident on A-Wing. A few days before the incident that led to my dismissal we had an exchange of words, which was out of character for [D119] and the way he typically engaged with me. On my first day on D-Wing, he came into the wing office and asked for cleaning equipment. His request was directed to DCO Henry Hutton-Mawdsley who refused permission. [D119] then asked me, and I also refused so as not to undermine another DCO's authority in front of the detainee. [D119] became abusive, making comments about my weight and calling me a 'black bitch'. I told him not to go down that road because we were the same shade of brown. At that point, he walked out of the office making comments that I could not hear clearly. I did not report the exchange because [D119] and I had gotten on perfectly well up until then. As stated previously, his reaction was out of character, and I had intentions of speaking to him later in the day to find out if there was anything wrong, but I did not get the chance. [D119] was known to other members of staff for his disruptive behaviour, but he was always polite and jovial with me. Henry Hutton-Mawdsley witnessed the exchange, but I cannot comment on whether he reported it. Nothing happened as a result of this exchange.

77. When I came on shift three days later, on 22 April, it had been my intention to find out what was the matter as I was worried that there was something upsetting [D119] and I did not get the chance to catch up with him following the exchange earlier in the week. I was in the D-wing office immediately after unlock with two DCOs, Henry Hutton-Mawdsley and Will Fagbo. DCO Alex Rahim was also on shift, but he was not in the wing office at the time (he witnessed the incident from the servery which was directly opposite the wing office). [D119] came into the wing office saying that no one was going to chat rubbish to him, and he would hit any officer, regardless of whether they were male or female. He was clearly aggravated, and I thought he was referring to the exchange of words we had a few days previous. I said to him that it was a new day and he needed to let it go which seemed to stop his outburst. However, there had apparently been an incident involving [D119] and DCO Babatunde Fagbo (Will's father) during lock-up the previous evening. After [D119] walked out of the office, Henry asked Will if he had heard what had happened the night before between "his dad and [D119]". Will did not really engage in the conversation, but I asked what had happened. If an incident took place on the wing involving a detainee, I was of the view that it was important that we were informed so we were able to manage any further issues appropriately.

78. Henry was explaining the incident when [D119] reappeared in the wing office and began shouting. He thought I was talking about him and was very angry at me. I was standing behind the counter writing in the wing diary, and he hurled abuse at me and waved his hands in my face. I cannot remember the exact words that he used but he started getting aggressive and I told him to stop shouting and to take his hands out of my face. My reaction was defensive, and I repeatedly said that it wasn't me who was talking about him. It felt like he was shouting at me for about 10 minutes, but it was probably only a few minutes. Neither Henry nor Will took any steps to diffuse the situation. [D119] then made reference to my child asking me to swear on their life that I hadn't been speaking about him. I said I could and would swear on my child's life because it was not me. [D119] said that I was a shit mum, and my child would die because of that. At this point, I was angry and said

something along the lines of 'fuck you' or 'fuck off' or 'shut the fuck up'. I am unsure if [D119] heard this as Will ushered him out of the office immediately and Henry followed.

79. I was shaken during the incident, but it also really upset me because I realised that my colleagues would not step in to support me if a situation became volatile. I had thought they would step in, but they did nothing. Henry and Will returned to the office after ushering out [D119] Henry said, "that was crazy, you didn't even say anything about him", which made me more annoyed at the situation. I snapped at Henry (I think I called him a dickhead) and told him it would have been helpful if he had said something in the moment instead of standing around, staying silent. I told both Henry and Will that I would have appreciated if they had defended me rather than leaving me to deal with the situation on my own. Henry could have told [D119] that he was the one who had been speaking about the incident with Babs.

80. After the incident, I asked control to radio DCM Phil Page (who I think may have been Oscar 1 for the day). He called the wing office, and I briefly explained what had gone on, but he ended the call and came to the wing office to speak to me properly. I told him what had happened, including my involvement in the incident and said I was going home, because I did not feel comfortable working for 13 hours with people who would stand back in a volatile situation and offer no assistance. [D119] was not in the office when Phil was there as he had been ushered out, although he may have been lingering outside the office. Phil told me to bring my things so we could speak somewhere else, and I spoke to Phil in an office away from the wing. I explained the incident was the reason why I wanted to go home. Phil told me to take a moment to relax as I had been crying and he persuaded me to stay at work. He said he would find another place to staff me. I still wanted to go home but Phil persuaded me to stay and moved me to visits to work for the rest of the day.

81. I do not know whether Phil spoke to any other members of staff about what happened. I do not know what was said when Phil spoke to [D119] about what happened. As far as I am aware, no action was taken against [D119] regarding the

incident. I am aware that later that day, [D119] was removed from D-wing and placed in the CSU on either Rule 40 or Rule 42 (I cannot recall which) for jumping on the netting after lunch. I was told this by other members of staff as I was now working in a different part of the building.

82. A few days later, I was passing Michelle Brown's office on the senior management corridor. I think her role at Brook House at the time was the Head of Security and she was the duty manager that day. She called out to me to tell me that she needed to speak to me later that day. It was made out to be an informal chat, but when I was called to her office later, she told me there had been a complaint about an incident with a detainee [D119] and that I was being suspended. I did not have the opportunity to bring anyone with me to the meeting. I outlined what happened, but I was not asked any questions. I had to leave Brook House immediately and another DCO brought my things to me.

83. Two disciplinary meetings were cancelled, I believe because the senior management of Brook House had knowledge of the Panorama programme by that time. I received a copy of some of the witness statements in the investigation in August 2017, and it was clear that [D119] did not mention me at all in his written complaint. He did not refer to the incident in the D-wing office at all. His complaint related to the incident the previous evening before lock-up.

84. The investigation obtained witness statements from another detainee, [D720] [D720] who claimed that he witnessed the incident in the D-wing office, although he was not present at the time. His witness statement said that he witnessed me antagonising [D119] about the incident the previous evening. This made no sense to me as I was not on shift the day before and had no idea of what had happened. [D720] description of me was also very strange, because I knew him and got on very well with him. [D119] and [D720] were both on A-wing previously, which is where I first met them. They moved to D-wing at some point (I think it was during the time when the third beds were being installed on the

ground floor rooms of A-wing, so all the detainees had to be relocated). [D720] and I had built a positive detainee/DCO relationship. We often talked about our backgrounds, [D720] up-bringing and growing up in London, and general life experiences.

85. I attended a meeting on 6 September 2017 to address the claims that were raised during the investigation. I answered the investigator's questions and provided my version of events, but I was not asked specific questions about the allegations that were made against me. I had not received all the investigation documents and I remember spending time reviewing more documents in a break of the meeting and taking notes, which I typed up later at home [INN000005]. I was told that they would review the evidence and come back at a later date with their decision. I felt that they had already made their decision, but because the documents had not all been provided, they had to go away to reconsider.
86. On 17 September 2017 I was invited to a disciplinary hearing which determined the outcome of the investigation. I have provided a copy of my own notes made in preparation for the disciplinary hearing [INN000005], which gives some insight into the quality of the investigation that was carried out. As I mentioned at paragraph 15 above, I was not given the opportunity to raise my concerns surrounding the investigation at the disciplinary meeting and I was dismissed with immediate effect. Both DCO Babatunde Fagbo and I lost our jobs over the complaint.
87. The outcome of the disciplinary proceedings was set out in a letter from Steve Skitt dated 22 September 2017 [CJS005896]. The letter attached notes taken at the disciplinary hearing, although I do not have a copy of the letter or the notes as I burnt all the documents I held relating to Brook House. The letter referred to a "*proven disciplinary finding*" against me "*for a similar offence*" which I assume is a reference to the incident with DCO Bonnie Spark, which I discussed at paragraphs 55, and 69 to 73 above.

88. I do not know why the investigation and disciplinary process took so long, although I am of the belief that the Panorama programme had a significant impact on the proceedings. I believe that the disciplinary outcome was decided based on the incident potentially being perceived in the same light as what was seen on Panorama. I do not believe that the facts were considered in the disciplinary outcome because there were a lot of discrepancies in the statements, but they seem to have been deemed credible without any cross-checking. The investigation was very slow moving and, in my opinion, it was very biased. There was no action taken against the detainee who had threatened me or the member of staff whose comments had sparked the incident.

89. I did not appeal the outcome because by that time the Panorama show had aired and after seeing it, I did not want to have anything to do with Brook House or G4S. I had already decided that I wanted to leave before the disciplinary meeting, and I had brought a resignation letter with me. However, I was not given any opportunity to raise the concerns I had about the investigation, or to handover my resignation letter. I had only an opportunity to greet those in the room and to comment on the disciplinary outcome. I am asked by the Inquiry to comment on the entries in the disciplinary appeals log [CJS000473]. I made no attempt to appeal the dismissal, nor did I make any comments about submitting an appeal. I do not know what this entry relates to.

90. The Inquiry has asked me to consider the complaints made by [D119] [CJS001594] and [D720] [CJS005888], and the notes of their interviews with Michell Brown [CJS005880 and CJS005874 respectively]. I have also been asked to consider the note of Henry Hutton-Mawdsley's interview with Michelle Brown [CJS005894]. I am aware that Will Fagbo was interviewed by Michelle Brown, but I have not been provided with a copy of the transcript for comment. Nor have I been provided with a copy of the transcript of any meetings that I attended.

91. [D119] initial complaint [CJS001594] describes the incident that took place with Babs when I was not on shift. I played no part in the incident and had no idea that

it happened. It was this incident that Henry Hutton-Mawdsley was talking about which caused the issue between [D119] and me. I am asked what my reaction was once I discovered what had happened with DCO Fagbo (Babs) and my opinion as to whether his behaviour was appropriate. When Henry started speaking about it, I had no chance to react because [D119] came into the office and directed his anger towards me. I did not witness Babs' behaviour the night before and am unable to comment on whether it was appropriate. The first time I became aware of what had happened between them was when I received the investigation pack which included the statements.

92. [D720] complaint [CJS005888] describes the same incident involving Babs. Both [D119] and [D720] complaints appear to be in the same handwriting and written by the same person.

93. In his interview with Michelle Brown [CJS005880], [D119] claims that he heard me tell Will *"that prick over there had an argument with your Dad"*. I did not say this. I had not been on shift for two days and I was unaware of anything that had happened between [D119] and Babs the evening before. It was Henry who asked Will if his dad had told him about what happened, and when Will didn't respond, I asked about it. [D119] says that I was asking for ID cards, which is correct. I had only just started working on D-wing, and I was unsure of which detainees were resident in that wing. [D119] claims that I called him a 'bitch' and said, 'suck your mum'. I absolutely did not use these terms. I would not call a detainee a 'bitch', and I would never say, 'suck your mum'. It is an offensive phrase often used by Jamaicans, and when I was a child, I witnessed a violent machete attack in Jamaica because of this comment. This traumatised me, and to this day, I wince when I hear the term being used. I believe I was accused of using this term because of my known heritage and not because I was heard saying it. [D119] also states that I made myself out to be a victim when I was speaking to Phil Page. I called Phil Page to the wing to tell him I was going home after the interaction with [D119] and the lack of support

from my two colleagues who were present. [D119] was not in the office when I was speaking to Phil and would not have heard what was being said.

94. [D720] was interviewed by Michelle Brown [CJS005874] and was used as a witness to the incident between [D119] and me. However, he says in the interview that he did not really see anything as his room was on the first floor. He may have been present the night before to witness the incident with Babs, but he was not present or anywhere near the wing office, when the incident took place between [D119] and me. [D720] states that "*it's not the first time*", but I do not know what he was referring to. [D720] had not been present when [D119] had an outburst at me a few days before the incident, and I had never had a negative exchange with [D119] prior to that.
95. [D720] says he "*tried to talk to [me] after but [I] said it had nothing to do with [him]*". After I spoke to DCM Phil Page, I worked in visits for the rest of the day. [D720] came to visits a few hours later and tried to speak to me about the incident. I told him it was nothing to do with him, because it had nothing to do with him - the incident did not involve him, and he was not present. I had no reason to be in conversation with any detainee about the incident, especially not [D119] friends. Had [D119] come to me, I would have had no difficulty in discussing it with him. [D720] told me he was helping [D119] to write a complaint about me, and I told him to go ahead. I do not know if any other staff in visits witnessed the exchange; it was brief.
96. In his interview with Michelle Brown [CJS005894] Henry Hutton-Mawdsley referenced the incident from a few days prior when [D119] asked for a mop. He failed to mention that [D119] asked him for the mop first, and I only said no so as not to undermine him. That was what caused [D119] to have an outburst. I do not agree with Henry's interpretation of my reaction to [D119] and I was not 'screaming' at him. I didn't take it personally; as I said earlier, it was unusual for [D119] to behave that way with me. Henry failed to acknowledge in this interview that both times [D119] had an outburst with me, stemmed from his behaviour, firstly refusing

permission to access the cleaning supplies, and then speaking about [D119] to Will. He acknowledged that [D119] anger at me was misplaced but fails to take responsibility for the role he played.

97. I believe there were undertones of racist stereotyping in his description of the incident in the interview with Michelle Brown. There is a common stereotype of the angry, black female, and Henry implies that my default way of communication was ‘screaming’ at someone. He does not acknowledge that in the first exchange with [D119] about cleaning equipment, I did not raise my voice, and in the second incident, I raised my voice to be heard while [D119] hurled abuse at me. He focussed on the behaviour or reaction, but not on the events that triggered that behaviour and concluded he wouldn’t want to “*back someone up who acts like that*”. He also said that I used the term ‘go suck you mum’, which as discussed above, I absolutely did not use.

98. In this interview, Michelle Brown tells Henry that she will protect him as much as she can [CJS005897, at page 2], and that she would remove his name from the notes [at page 6]. This is an example of what I mean by cliques within the staff. There was no need for Henry to be protected, and it is unclear why she did not offer this kind of protection or support to all members of staff who were involved or called as witnesses.

99. Michelle Brown also states that she interviewed DCM Phil Page, but I have not been provided with a copy of the transcript of this interview for comment.

100. With reference to these documents the Inquiry has asked whether I accept the following in relation to this incident:

- a. Saying to Will Fagbo, at breakfast, “*that prick over there had an argument with your dad*” [CJS005880, page 2].
- b. saying to D119 “*look at this waste man*” [CJS005888 at page 4].
- c. calling D119 a “*prick*” outside of the office [CJS005880 at page 2].

- d. saying to D119, when challenged about discussing with Will what happened the night before with his father, *"I can say whatever I want; you do something about it; I don't like you"* [CJS005880 at page 2].
- e. saying to D119, *"hit me go on hit me"* [CJS005888 at page 4].
- f. saying to D119 when he got angry, *"you are a girl"* [CJS005880 at page 2].
- g. calling D119 a *"fucking dickhead"* [CJS005894 at page 3].
- h. telling D119 to *"suck your mum"* [CJS005880 at page 2; CJS005894 at page 3].
- i. raising your voice and swearing at D119 [see CJS005880 at page 3].

I do not accept saying any of the remarks at a. to h. above, and I have provided extensive details about the incident at paragraphs 77 to 79, and 90 to 96 above. I accept that my voice was raised, because [D119] was refusing to listen to me, and my voice was raised so I could be heard. I did not swear at him, except when he referred very negatively to my child, and then was ushered out of the wing. I cannot remember the precise words that I used, but I most likely said 'fuck you' or 'fuck off' or 'shut the fuck up'. At no point before that, did I swear at [D119] or use derogatory language. The incident with [D119] was the first and only exchange of this kind that I had with a detainee. I had never shouted at a detainee or been involved in a verbal argument with a detainee before.

101. I submitted three grievance letters to the Director of Brook House between June 2016 and March 2017. The first was dated 10 June 2016 and related to the support and treatment I received during my first two weeks as a DCO (discussed at paragraphs 14 and 52 above) [INN000001]. The second complaint I made followed the incident with DCO Bonnie Spark on 12 August 2016 (discussed at paragraph 55 above) [INN000002]. The third complaint was made on 1 March 2017 following an incident with DCM Dave Killick following my return from annual leave [INN000004]. The (new) Director of Brook House, Ben Saunders, called me into his office and said that he would speak to DCM Killick. After he was spoken to, I had feedback from Ben Saunders that it was a misunderstanding, but if there were

further issues, I should let him know. The contents of the grievance letters provide in-depth detail of my conduct and the conduct of other members of staff involved in the relevant incidents.

102. I do not believe that any of the grievances I raised had an impact on my dismissal. I believe there was a lack of confidentiality in relation to my grievances, and those who were mentioned or investigated because of these grievances went on to discuss them with other members of staff. As I said above, staff who I had never worked a shift with previously had negative preconceptions of me. For example, DCO Henry Hutton-Mawdsley commenced work at Brook House during my first period of suspension following the incident with DCO Bonnie Spark. He made it clear to other members of staff that he had an issue with me although I have no idea what this was based on as we had not worked together until I moved to D-wing in April 2017 and although we were on the same lines, we barely saw each other in and around the centre.

103. I was never involved in any grievance or disciplinary investigations relating to other members of staff. In July 2017, whilst suspended, I was contacted by Michelle Fernandes (HR manager at Brook House). She informed me that DCM Dave Killick was part of an ongoing formal process relating to grievances/complaints received as part of a wider investigation. He had requested to see my original grievance from March 2017. I was asked if I was content for a copy to be provided to him. I can only assume that my grievance against Dave was being used in an investigation against him, however I was never asked to participate in it or given any further information regarding any outcomes.

Staffing levels

104. From memory, there were approximately 30 DCOs on duty at Brook House during the day. I do not recall staff shortages impacting on the care and treatment of individuals. I only ever recall staff shortages impacting on when or how many

courtyards were opened. This was not a regular occurrence and on the rare occasion that there were not enough DCOs to man the courtyards, a decision would be made to have only one or two courtyards open, instead of all three.

105. There was never a time when more than four members of staff were on a wing, or more than one member of staff was present in the courtyard. Given that there were at least 100 detainees residing on each of A, C and D-wings, four or less members of staff could never safely manage the situation in the event of a mass brawl. If fighting or violence broke out, a first response would be called. Each wing had a designated first responding officer and they attended a first response incident, with all DCMs and the Healthcare team. There was never a guarantee that all officers would be available to respond to a first response call. That said, I did not witness volatile or violent situations very often. I found that it was easy to calm situations and I was never in a situation that became volatile or where I felt that I needed to call for a first response. I never felt unsafe working on A-wing or B-wing.
106. Staffing levels were low, but in my opinion it was manageable. Wings always had roughly 100 resident detainees with only three to four members of staff. The ratio of DCO to detainee was too low but it somehow worked. Brook House struggled with high turnover of staff, but there were times when it was quiet, when all that was required was opening the wing door or issuing toilet paper or toothpaste to detainees. As mentioned before, detainees were generally well behaved and were always helpful in diffusing situations before or during DCO involvement.
107. That said, it is possible that staffing had an impact on staff morale. It did not necessarily feel like that to me at the time, but sometimes the staff could be quite miserable. The shifts were long (13.5 hours), and I think this impacted the staff.
108. The Healthcare area was quite small in comparison to the rest of the building. There would always be one DCO in Healthcare as well as the nurses and doctor. It was very similar to a doctors' surgery and detainees could attend without an

appointment. If they did have an appointment, DCOs would put a slip under their door in the mornings. Healthcare was accessible to all the detainees at Brook House, and I was not aware of any difficulties in getting seen by a nurse or doctor. Every detainee was seen by Healthcare when they first came to Brook House.

109. I remember some DCOs were considered activities staff. DCO Callum Tulley worked in the gym, and he was rarely on the wings. If the DCOs who typically worked in activities were off, the activities were staffed like any other wing and another DCO would be placed to work there in their absence. The following activities needed to be manned: the library, culture kitchen, arts and crafts and the IT suite.

Tinsley House Staff

110. It was rare that staff from Tinsley House would work in Brook House but on the occasion that they did, I felt that Tinsley House staff were like fish out of water. The two environments were completely different and staff who were not used to the loudness and busyness of Brook House tended to stay close to the wing office. It seemed to me as though they felt intimidated by Brook House.

Treatment of Detained Persons

Detained Persons generally

111. I never worked in reception at Brook House. The processes for reception were different to the wings, and I am unable to comment on any questions relating to reception.

112. I have been shown a document referenced CJS006042, which is the induction policy from August 2016. This is the first time that I have seen this document, and I am unable to provide comments on it. I was usually staffed on A-wing, but I was

moved to B-wing in December 2016 following my return to work after my first period of suspension. B-wing was the induction wing. My involvement in the induction process was very minimal, as more experienced B-wing staff usually conducted the induction sessions. During the session, a video was played to detainees providing them with information on the facilities available at Brook House. Then they had a tour around the centre to show them where everything was. Documents CJS001955, CJS002203, CJS003786 and CJ003884 show that I gave an induction tour and talk to detainees on three occasions between 3 and 13 April 2017.

113. There was also an induction interview, which I recall doing having overseen them being done by more experienced B-wing staff; however, I cannot recall the questions that were asked (there may have been questions around diversity). I recall explaining to detainees how the wings ran, where they could get things (e.g., immigration forms), and issuing them with their cup, plate, bowl, cutlery and toiletries. I did not work nights on B-wing and was unfamiliar with the first night procedures. If I was staffed for nights, I was put on A-wing. That was the extent of my involvement in the induction sessions, although I know that other departments, such as chaplaincy, safer custody, welfare and activities, would sometimes come to speak at the induction sessions.

114. I had no formal training, and my training consisted of more experienced B-wing colleagues showing me what had to be done.

Activities for Individuals

115. In my opinion, the activities programme at Brook House was rubbish. The only activities I remember were English classes, Art/Textiles and the gym. The detainees would paint pictures and sometimes give their art to us to put up in the wing office. They would also print t-shirts for themselves. The library and IT suite did not run any classes or training. The kitchen (which I think was called the culture kitchen or something similar) allowed detainees to order food items and cook for themselves.

This was an activity that detainees had to apply for. It would take about a week to get a response to the application, and then another two weeks before they could go into the kitchen and cook their meal. This was something they really looked forward to and would often submit applications in pairs with their friends so they could order between them and cook enough food to share with as many of their friends as possible when they finished.

116. There were not enough activities to keep the detainees engaged and I think that this impacted on the atmosphere at Brook House. They were bored. The detainees could be boisterous when they were on the wing, and when they were laughing or joking around it could get very loud. If more activities were available, I think it would help detainees. It was the same thing day in, day out for them.

117. I am asked to provide my opinion on what activities could be run at Brook House (bearing in mind the space available to it). I have no idea what to suggest. There is not much space at Brook House for anything more than what already is available.

Immigration Rule 35 Process

118. Given that it has been four years since I worked at Brook House, I cannot remember what the Rule 35 process is. I am unable to explain my experience of how detained persons came to be reviewed, seen and processed under the Rule 35 process.

Use of Force

119. I was never involved in any instances of use of force/control and restraint techniques (“C&Rs”) during my time at Brook House, especially not during the Relevant Period. On occasion, I was detailed as the first responding officer for my wing, but this did not happen very often. Certain officers would always do planned

C&Rs, and the same people would regularly be the first responding officers. It was only when I was on duty with a less experienced officer or someone who started at Brook House after I did, that I was designated the first responding officer. I was never called to a first response incident. It sometimes happened that an incident could be over before the first responding officers, or the Healthcare team, arrived at the incident. I never saw an incident where the Healthcare team was required to provide treatment to a detainee following a first response. I do not recall ever calling for a first response.

120. Different levels of C&R were used to gain compliance. One of the lowest level techniques was the guided hold, where a member of staff would place their hand on the detainee's back and lightly under the detainee's wrist and guide them away. A more intense technique was to place your thumb behind the detainee's ear and turn it. All depended on the level of non-compliance. I vaguely remember the rule for Use of Force. What I can remember is that any use of force must be proportionate and no more force than was necessary was to be used to deal with the situation. The rule further stipulated that staff must not provoke or antagonise a detainee to the point that force became necessary.

121. Any time a member of staff put their hands on a detainee, they needed to fill out a use of force report. I remember that I had to fill out a use of force report once, but I cannot now remember the details of the incident. I cannot remember if I used the force, or if it was because I witnessed it and had to fill out a report as a witness.

122. I had no concerns about any use of force incidents that I was not directly involved in.

123. From what I saw during my time at Brook House, use of force was rarely used as detainees were generally behaved. There were occasions whereby officers were told to gear up for a planned C&R, but it did not end up proceeding. The most common reason for a planned C&R was detainee removal when they would have to

be taken to a flight. Some detainees' behaviour was quite boisterous but often their bark was worse than their bite. The C&R was planned because they thought the detainee would resist removal, but in the end, the detainee would go without the need for C&R. Another reason for a planned C&R was to relocate a detainee to E-wing or the CSU in preparation for removal. There were times when I was told to prepare for a planned C&R, but it never got to the point that I was needed because someone else was used or because the flight was cancelled. As I mentioned, specific officers were normally used for planned C&R.

124. The alternative to C&R techniques was to use your words and rely on the ability to diffuse situations through talking. I felt that I could calm situations and would often ask detainees, "Is this worth your time? Is this really what you want to argue about?" Some officers struggled to diffuse conflict situations, and they would antagonise the situation for a reaction. A line that was frequently used by officers was "at least I'm going home to my family tonight". I overheard this said to detainees. Although it was used as 'banter', I can only imagine how awful this would have been for detainees to hear. I tried to avoid family discussions unless they brought it up because for many detainees it was a sore subject. The detainees were stuck in Brook House and did not know if or when they would be let out. They used to say, "This is worse than prison. Here, I have no idea when I'm coming out". I thought some officers lacked understanding and empathy and could express frustration with the detainees.

Individual Welfare

125. From what I remember during the eight-week training course, we had a talk from the welfare officer about what the welfare department did and where to find them. There was no training tailored around managing the mental health of detainees. We were trained in the ACDT process and in conducting observations, but not in managing mental or emotional wellbeing of detainees.

126. I had no experience of detainees with mental health issues to be able to comment on the management of their mental health (whether it required the involvement of the Healthcare team or not). I think detainees who had mental health needs typically went to E-wing which is a place I rarely worked.
127. There was a serious spice problem in Brook House, which seemed to be at its peak between February and April 2017 (although I was not working in Brook House after this period). Spice and cannabis were very present and available, and you could almost always smell it. Brook House policies seemed to make no impact on drugs entering the centre. In my view the volume of drugs that were available could not have entered solely through visitors, which meant that somewhere in the process Brook House policies were being broken. I felt sure that there must have been an awareness of who, when and how the drugs were coming into Brook House, but little was being done. Staff were not searched at all, and I think I was only searched one time.
128. I think the availability of spice had a negative impact on the welfare and behaviour of detained persons. I heard stories from officers and detainees of how detainees would behave during a spice attack. I witnessed it first-hand on one occasion while on duty on A-wing. We had to shut the wing down and call for a medical response. One detainee had made cuts on his arms and was zoned out (when he came around, he said he saw a little devil jumping on his arm and he was trying to get it). I was worried that another detainee was dead because he was lying on the floor fitting and then he started foaming at the mouth. Another detainee was also zoned out, and a fourth was screaming a piercing scream. When I say the detainees were zoned out, I mean they could not articulate what they were feeling because they were so out of it. One of the detainees identified who had supplied the spice, and we had to usher him into a room to protect him in case anyone overheard him ratting. When we called for the medical response, we had to quickly get all the other detainees back to their rooms so that the medical response team could deal with the incident. In that moment, other detainees were helping us encourage everybody to

lock up and were not disruptive. They were quick to get behind their doors because they were concerned about what was happening. It was a joint effort. That was the only medical response that I witnessed at Brook House, and the only time I witnessed a spice attack.

129. I am pretty sure the medical response took place on the same day that the Deputy Director of Brook House, Steve Skitt, mentioned at the morning briefing that there was a new illegal high going around the prison estate and that the staff needed to be on high vigilance. That day, there was one medical response after another. It was happening all over the centre. Staff were running to a medical response on one wing, then a first response on another wing, then a medical response on a different wing. Even detainees were asking what was going on. There was always a conversation about what was happening and where. It was an exhausting day.

130. I heard a story about a detainee who was high on spice and was swimming on the floor of the wing. He was shown footage of himself, and in conversations after that he was adamant that he would never do spice again. Other detainees said, 'never again', but they did it, I think out of boredom. Spice was a serious problem more so because the reaction to it was so unpredictable. Sometimes you could tell that a detainee was high on something, but everyone reacted differently. Unless a detainee had a serious reaction, it was difficult to tell what they were on. Also, detainees would not necessarily walk around the wing if they were taking drugs, they would hide in their room or stay off the wing. With so many detainees, it was very difficult to monitor.

131. I never saw anyone taking spice, but I saw detainees smoking cannabis. I remember one occasion when we had to lock A-wing down, I did a room check and there were about four or five men in the room smoking (there should have been two to a room). I closed the door and locked it and reported it to a DCM (I cannot remember their name). The response was that it could be worse; it could be spice. I submitted an SIR regarding the incident.

132. I have no knowledge of the availability of drug rehabilitation/support. During my time at Brook House, I recall meeting one or two detainees who had to take methadone and would go to Healthcare to get it at specific times of the day. From memory, detainees with drug issues were typically located on E-wing so I had very little contact with them to know what rehabilitation/support was available for them.
133. My understanding of the role of Chaplaincy was to lead religious services and be available as a source of support to detainees in a similar way to how they would be in the community. The Chaplaincy never raised any concerns regarding individual welfare to me specifically. I do not know whether concerns were raised by the Chaplaincy to other DCOs, DCMs or the Senior Management Team.
134. If a detainee self-harmed, they would be relocated to E-wing, an ACDT would be opened, they would be searched to ensure they had nothing in their possession to harm themselves (e.g., razors), and they would be placed on constant watch for an agreed period of time. If they required treatment, we would call a medical response, write an incident report and open an ACDT. Any member of staff could open an ACDT and explain the reasons for doing so (it was not limited to self-harm). We would have a conversation with the detainee to understand the issue, and the time this could take would vary. The ACDT was passed to a DCM, and we would conduct hourly observations to start with. This was reduced to every two or three hours depending on the person and what they were feeling/experiencing. The DCM would decide how regularly the ACDT should be reviewed. ACDTs were reviewed by a member of wing staff (DCO), a DCM, a member of senior management, Healthcare, chaplaincy and perhaps welfare. Detainees who self-harmed would remain on E-wing until it was decided they could return to the other wings. I witnessed a detainee self-harm only once. I can no longer remember what the policy was on self-harm in order to comment on whether or not it was effective.

135. If an individual refused to eat, it would be noted on the register and in the wing diary. The wing diary was checked by DCMs throughout the day, and a duty director might review the diary daily or once every few days and add a note that they had looked at it. I cannot remember exactly how many meals needed to be missed, but after a certain number (e.g., at least two meals in a day for three days in a row), an ACDT would be opened. Staff would have conversations with the individual to find out why they were not eating and try to encourage them to eat something. If an individual was placed on an ACDT for food refusal, we would have to make a note of it in the ACDT booklet if we witnessed them eating something. I think it was difficult to monitor because detainees would take food from the servery and go to their rooms. There was not enough dining space on the wings for everybody to sit and eat. A lot of the times detainees complained about the food being “shit” and would not want to eat it so they would take it and throw it away. Detainees might refuse to take food from the servery but would buy food from the shop and eat that instead (e.g., noodles and other canned foods).

136. There were some occasions when officers or managers responded to detainees by not taking them seriously, perhaps because of a perception that the detainee was trying to manipulate a situation in their favour. For example, a detainee might say they were going to cut themselves, and the response from an officer might be “go on then, you’re your own man” (this is not a specific recollection of an incident, but an illustration of the kinds of comments that were made). In the moment, it was banter. Some detainees would threaten self-harm to try to get something they wanted or to avoid removal, but ultimately the staff acted on behaviours and not threats. Now that I can reflect on it, I see how this could have affected detainees. At the time, I had no opinion about the appropriateness of these kinds of comments. I never made comments like that. In my experience at Brook House, detainees who were going to self-harm did not voice it, they just did it. In most instances, if a detainee threatened self-harm, they would be put on an ACDT.

137. I am asked to consider a security information report concerning D287 making threats to use razor blades to prevent his removal to prison [CJS004654]. I initiated this report on 3 April 2017 and recorded the following in the body of the report:

“...D287 was sitting on the table by the door and asked for some advice on what ‘tricks’ to use to stop him being returned to prison before he had just refused. I explained to him that there aren’t any tricks and immigration will reset the move for another day and most of the time it is easier to comply with what is being asked of him rather than resisting it. ... D287 continued to ask the best trick to stop him being moved back to HMP. He said that he had been told by ‘other sources’ that razor blades would be the best thing and asked if I have seen it work before because he really does not want to go back because he wanted to apply for bail. I told D287 no and that the best thing to do would be to put in a request to speak with immigration. D287 continued to ask if threat of razor blades would work to stop him being sent back to prison because if it would work then he might have to do that. Again I said no it is not worth it and went into the wing office.”

138. I did not consider D287 to be threatening self-harm. He was trying to find a way to stop himself from being transferred and was trying to find out security information about this transfer as well as the best ‘trick’ to stop the transfer from happening. I did not open an ACDT, but I recorded the details of the conversation in the SIR. I confirmed in the report that I had informed my line manager of the content of the report. I do not know whether D287 was referred to mental health services. I am not aware of what action was taken after I submitted the report, and I did not follow-up on it. [My line manager and/or the security team] would instruct me on any further action they wished for me to take regarding that detainee. I cannot now recall the identity of the detainee, but I would have continued to observe his behaviour and report any noteworthy conversations between us.

139. D287 remarked that ‘other sources’ had suggested ‘that razor blades would be the best thing’. My understanding is that D298 had spoken to other detainees who managed to stop themselves from being transferred and the most common answer he had gathered was to have razor blades in his possession and to threaten to use them. I did not take any action regarding other detainees because I was not aware from whom he got this information.

140. Detainees were able to get razors from the wing office (I cannot recall whether they were able to purchase them from the shop). If a detainee wanted a new razor, he was supposed to bring the old razor to the office to dispose of it and get a new one in exchange. This was not an effective process because detainees would use their razors in their rooms, discard them in the bin, and come to the wing office to ask for a new one when they needed it.

141. Legs, bolts and bars (“LBB”) checks were carried out on a daily basis to ensure that detainees did not have items in their possession that could be used for self-harm. LBB checks involved going into every room on the wing, checking that there was no damage to furniture and no signs of attempted escape. We were also expected to scan the rooms with our eyes and remove anything that detainees were not supposed to have, for example, excess bedding (which could be used as a ligature), excess fruit (which could be used to brew hooch), or excess razors (there should have been one per detainee in the room, which was no more than two for most rooms, but three on the ground floor rooms after the additional beds were added). I thought LBB checks were effective, although detainees could hide items, so prohibited items would not necessarily be found.

142. I am asked to consider an entry I wrote regarding detainee, D87 on 24 March 2017 [CJS001453 at page 6]. I recorded the following:

“D87 has been very abusive towards B-Wing staff all day today. His first issue was that he did not have any clothes and had filled out a clothing request which

was allegedly signed 2 days ago. This was not the case. D87 threatened to 'mash up the place' and then somebody will have to bring him what he wants straight away. He demanded that the clothes were brought to his room straight away otherwise he would strip and walk around naked if it was not done instantly. At dinner time D87 became very aggressive stating that the food was 'shit' and a load of 'poison'. He demanded that he speak to a manager there and then and threatened to throw his plate in somebody's face if he keeps beings served 'dead' food."

143. Based on the contents of this entry, I confirm that I witnessed D87's behaviour throughout the day and provided details about his behaviour within the report. I made this entry over four years ago, and I do not now recall any further details about this incident or the detainee's behaviour on that day. I cannot provide a description of what happened, who was involved or the outcome. I cannot confirm who D87's remarks were directed towards. I cannot explain what action was taken against D87. I cannot recall whether I reported the issue to my line manager or other management. I cannot comment on whether there was anything about management support in relation to this issue which caused me concern or difficulty, as I cannot remember.

144. I am asked whether this incident had any impact on me or my attitude towards working at Brook House. From reading the entry in CJS001453, I do not think this incident would have had any impact on me or my attitude towards working at Brook House. By that point in time (24 March 2017), I had been employed at Brook House for long enough to understand that behaviour like this often came from a place of frustration. Detainees' frustration was mainly directed towards the Home Office because they had no idea if or when they would be released. When detainees used verbal abuse or sometimes threatened physical violence, I empathised with their situation. I was aware of how frustrating it was for them and appreciated that sometimes they needed to be given space to vent their frustrations.

Detained Persons as time served foreign national offenders (TSFNO)

145. I did not work in reception.

146. My understanding of a TSFNO is somebody who has been to prison for a period of 12 months or more, is therefore liable for removal from the UK, and is of Home Office interest. A lot of the detainees I met at Brook House were TSFNOs who had been to prison and served their time but because of the length of their sentence were now fighting immigration for the right to remain in the UK. There were very few non-TSFNOs in Brook House and the general understanding was that non-TSFNOs were placed at Tinsley House. My approach with detainees did not differ between TSFNOs and non-TSFNOs because regardless of people's offending history, everybody was facing their own struggles with the Home Office and my job was to make their time at Brook House as stress-free as possible.

147. I do not think that the co-location of TSFNOs with other detained persons caused difficulties in managing the welfare and/or behaviour of those detained at Brook House. On the rare occasion there were non-TSFNOs in Brook House, they seemed to get on fine. There were some big personalities in Brook House, and I think the co-location of quiet/timid individuals made it difficult to manage their welfare because any issues could easily be missed unless they approached us with their issue, or another detainee brought it to our attention.

Abuse of Individuals Detained at Brook House

148. I had no concerns about the abuse of detained individuals by staff at Brook House. I never witnessed anything of the kind while working there, so watching the Panorama programme when it was aired was very disturbing to me.

149. I had no concerns about the abuse of detained individuals by other detained individuals at Brook House.

Complaints

150. If a detainee wanted to make a complaint relating to any issue, they could fill out a complaint form and put it in a secure box by the wing door. This box was emptied (I think by the internal Home Office team) and any complaints not relating to the Home Office would be passed on to senior management to investigate.
151. My understanding of the process for internal investigations by G4S was to gather the facts by speaking with the person/people involved, any witnesses and looking at CCTV. They concluded the investigation with an outcome of disciplinary or no further action.
152. I have no knowledge of the process for investigations carried out by the Professional Standards Unit. I do not know what this unit is or that it even existed when I was at Brook House.
153. I never received any complaints that required me to refer them for investigation. On a number of occasions, I told detainees to fill out the complaint form if they wanted to raise an issue, but I was never made aware of a complaint about mistreatment or anything that I felt needed to be escalated.
154. At paragraphs 69 to 86 above, I have provided details of two investigations that I was involved in - the first in relation to the incident in August 2016 with DCO Bonnie Spark and the second relating to the incident in April 2017 with detainee D119 I found the investigation process to be very long and far from professional. In my opinion there was bias and senior management lacked the ability to identify inconsistencies in the witness statements of others. For example, witnesses to the incident with Bonnie claimed they could not remember very much because the incident took place a few months before the investigation. They could

barely remember much of Bonnie's behaviour and what she said to me, but they vividly remembered everything about my behaviour and what I had said.

155. A similar issue arose in the investigation into the incident with [D119]. The original complaint made by [D119] did not raise any issues about my behaviour, but in his interview with Michelle Brown, he said that he heard me tell Will Fagbo "*that prick over there had an argument with your Dad*". I told management that I knew nothing about an incident with Babatunde Fagbo, and that I had been off shift for two days, but nobody seems to have checked the staffing rota to confirm I was telling the truth.

156. Detainee [D720] claimed to have witnessed me antagonising [D119] but in the minutes from the investigation meeting he stated that he did not see what happened in the D-wing office as his room was on the first floor. From my knowledge, CCTV was not checked to confirm that he was not present.

157. Another inconsistency from this incident involved DCO Hutton-Mawdsley, who told DCM Phil Page after the incident that he "thought the situation was volatile" and "did not feel that Will and I would back it up if it got violent". However, during his investigation meeting with Michelle Brown, he said that he did not want "to back somebody up who acts like that" [INN000005].

158. The process could be improved by having investigations carried out by external sources or even by the internal Home Office staff. As I mentioned, there were a lot of friendships and intimate relationships between senior management, DCMs and DCOs which, in my view, led to an inability to separate business from pleasure and handle situations in a fair and professional manner.

159. From what I can remember, any complaint that a detained person had about anything connected to Brook House was to be placed in a secure box by the wing

door that would be emptied on a daily basis and could only be emptied by the internal Home Office team.

The Panorama Programme

160. I sometimes worked the same shifts as DCO Callum Tulley. He was activities staff so we would pass each other in the corridor and there were a few occasions when we worked on wings together. We got along well, and he was a very supportive colleague when I first went into my DCO role and throughout my time at Brook House. We would often do shift swaps with each other when we needed days off. Callum seemed to get along well with everyone.

161. I did not appear in the Panorama programme. I was not involved in any of the incidents shown in the programme or indeed any similar incidents that may have occurred in Brook House.

162. I was suspended when the programme was aired. I am not able to comment on the impact that the Panorama programme had on staff morale.

163. I was suspended when the programme was aired. As I stated above, since leaving Brook House, I have bumped into people who were detained there at the time. In the year following the programme, they would say things like, “we [the detainees] knew what was going on but nobody cared” or “that place is full of racists, I don’t know what made you want to work in there”. Detainees sometimes said similar things to me when I was working in Brook House, but I never witnessed any detainees experiencing racist behaviour. If they did experience racist behaviour, they did not report it to me.

164. I was not involved in the incident involving the detainee who said he was underage for detention. I remember only one time when a detainee’s age was

disputed. He was relocated to E-wing, and I did not see him after that. From what I remember, he was released but I do not know how long it took for that to happen.

165. I cannot comment on any changes at Brook House following the Panorama programme as I was still suspended and then dismissed.

Specific Individuals

166. I have been asked to comment on whether I worked with the following individuals and/or witnessed them using offensive language or being involved in incidents of verbal or physical abuse:

- (a) Nathan Ring – He was a DCM and would either be Oscar 1 or Oscar 2. I rarely had to speak with him when I was on shift. Our working relationship was cordial, but I kept my distance and only communicated with him when necessary. This was due to his friendships with other DCMs and DCOs who had made my time at Brook House miserable. I did not engage with Nathan enough to have concerns about his personal views or behaviour. The Panorama programme shows quite a good example of my experience of Nathan's personality and how he was in general; however, I never experienced him speaking to a detained person in the way shown in the programme. I never witnessed any incidents of verbal or physical abuse.
- (b) Steve Webb – He was a DCM and my line manager following my return to work after the first suspension. Our working relationship was excellent, and we got on very well. Steve was a very fair and understanding individual and did what he could to help both staff and detainees. I had no concerns about his personal views or behaviours and never witnessed him make any derogatory, offensive, or insensitive remarks about detained persons. If anything, he was a popular DCM with detainees. I never witnessed any incidents of verbal or physical abuse.
- (c) Chris Donnelly – I vaguely remember him. In my first few weeks of being a DCO, I had one encounter with him, which I referenced in my complaint

[INN000005]. He accused me of being late to bring some detainees to a Home Office appointment, but the mistake was not mine. From what I do remember of him, he was quiet and barely seen. I think we worked opposite shifts which might be why I hardly saw him.

- (d) Calvin Saunders – I hardly knew him. I remember meeting him during his two-week shadowing but never really saw him after that.
- (e) Derek Murphy – I worked with Derek a handful of times and when we did work together, I did not witness any incidents of verbal or physical abuse.
- (f) John Connolly – He was a use of force instructor, and the only time I worked with him was during my use of force training during the eight-week training course. John was known for using what could be described as politically incorrect language. I never experienced him using inappropriate language with detainees, but it was more so when speaking with other members of staff. I described at paragraph 57 above when John referred to females as ‘udder swingers’ in a conversation about me becoming a use of force instructor. I also remember him referring to people as ‘coloured’. He used outdated language and I put it down to his age. I also thought that if I said something, nothing would be done. I never witnessed any incidents of verbal or physical abuse.
- (g) Dave Webb – I do not remember this person.
- (h) Clayton Fraser – I worked with Clayton on a few occasions. We typically worked the same shifts but would usually be placed on different wings. Our working relationship was great, and we got along very well. He was significantly older than most other DCOs. From what I saw of Clayton, he got on well with detainees and was quite gentle with them and had a caring personality. I had no concerns about his personal views or behaviours and never witnessed any incidents of verbal or physical abuse.
- (i) Charles Frances – I worked with Charles a handful of times on E-wing and our working relationship was good and we got on well. He was always staffed on E-wing and seemed to be the perfect DCO for that wing. From what I saw, Charles demonstrated a caring personality and got on very well with detainees on the wing. He was experienced and knew what to do to ensure the wing ran

smoothly. I had no concerns about Charles' personal views or behaviours and never witnessed any incidents of verbal or physical abuse. If anything, Charles was very good at being able to diffuse situations. I was shocked by his comments on the Panorama programme because I never witnessed any comments like that from him.

- (j) Aaron Stokes – I worked quite a few shifts with Aaron on C-wing. He was generally quiet and focussed on getting tasks done. Our working relationship was okay. There were times when Aaron would appear fed up with the job, but he never said very much when he was around me. He got on well with detainees and I had no concerns about his personal views or behaviours. I never witnessed any incidents of verbal or physical abuse. I was shocked by Aaron's reaction on the Panorama programme too. I would not have expected him to be laughing and joking about other staff's behaviour towards detainees in the way that he was.
- (k) Mark Earl – I worked with Mark a handful of times in different locations in Brook House. Our working relationship was good, and we got along well. I had no concerns about Mark's personal views or behaviours and never witnessed any incidents of verbal or physical abuse.
- (l) Slim Bassoud – I worked with Slim a handful of times, and he was a very laidback, easy-going individual. He was one of few DCOs from an ethnic background and we got along really well. Slim got on well with detainees and was very helpful to everybody he engaged with. I had no concerns about his personal views or behaviours and never witnessed any incidents of verbal or physical abuse.
- (m) Sean Sayers – I do not remember this person.
- (n) Ryan Bromley – I worked with Ryan a few times before my second suspension as he had recently joined as a DCO. Our working relationship was good, and he was always very helpful to both staff and detainees. I had no concerns around Ryan's personal views or behaviours and never witnessed any incidents of verbal or physical abuse.
- (o) Daniel Small – I do not remember this person.

- (p) Yan Paschali – I worked with Yan a handful of times and our working relationship was okay. From what I remember, Yan often appeared fed up with the job, but got on with what needed to be done. I had no concerns about his personal views or behaviours and never witnessed any incidents of verbal or physical abuse.
- (q) Daniel Lake – I do not remember this person.
- (r) Babatunde Fagbo – I was rarely placed to work on the same wing as Babatunde as he was C and D-wing staff. Despite this, we had an excellent working relationship. Babatunde was a very welcoming and supportive colleague, especially when I first went into my DCO role. I used to refer to Babatunde as my ‘work dad’ and would often speak with him about the issues I was having with other DCOs and DCMs. He would always be prepared to listen and would give positive words of encouragement and was always looking out for my wellbeing. Babatunde was a very popular DCO amongst detainees and he got along very well with them. He was always in a good mood and would have positive banter with everyone. Babatunde was a well-respected DCO. I think this was because of the way he engaged with detainees and was always willing to offer a helping hand. I had no concerns about his personal views or behaviours and never witnessed any instances of verbal or physical abuse.
- (s) Nurse Jo Buss – I do not remember this person.

Suggestions for Improvements

167. The only suggestion I have to improve Brook House is shorter working hours for DCOs and DCMs. When I was working there, our shifts were 13.5 hours. I think for a lot of people that was too long and as the day progressed, they got fed up being there.

Any Other Concerns

168. I have nothing further to mention relating to the culture of G4S at Brook House, or the treatment of individuals detained at Brook House. I have mentioned it all.

169. I believe the following people who work (or worked) at Brook House will be knowledgeable about the matters mentioned in my statement: Dave Roffey, Michelle Brown, Steve Skitt, Jack Bannister, Steve Dix, Ben Shadbolt. There are others but at this point, I cannot remember their names.

170. I loved the job at Brook House, but the people who I worked with made me hate it and my time there was quite horrible. The impact of being dismissed was significant, and I burned anything I had at home that related to Brook House.

171. As a final point, I have provided full details about the incident and investigation that led to my dismissal by G4S. The incident was completely unconnected to the Panorama programme. Nevertheless, my name has been included in a list of staff who were associated with the Panorama programme and the incidents shown. I feel that this is extremely unfair and damaging. It implies that I was somehow involved in the mistreatment of detainees, which could not be further from the truth. As I said above, I worked at Brook House for only about four weeks of the period under investigation by the Inquiry, and I did not feature in the Panorama programme at all. This issue is causing me significant worry and anxiety.

Statement of Truth

I believe that the facts stated in this witness statement are true. I understand that proceedings for contempt of court may be brought against anyone who makes, or causes to be made, a false statement in a document verified by a statement of truth without an honest belief in its truth.

I am content for this witness statement to form part of the evidence before the Brook House Inquiry and to be published on the Inquiry's website.

Name	SHAYNE MUNROE
Signature	Signature
Date	7 th FEBRUARY 2022

Witness Name: Shayne Munroe
Statement No: 1
Exhibits: INN000001 – INN000005