

BROOK HOUSE INQUIRY

Second Witness Statement of Nathan Dean Ring

I provide this statement in response to a request under Rule 9 of the Inquiry Rules 2006 dated 9 December 2021.

I, Nathan Dean Ring will say as follows:

1. I make this second witness statement pursuant to a Rule 9 request dated 9 December 2021. This statement is subsequent to my first statement which was filed in draft with the Inquiry on 5 October 2021 and should be read in conjunction with it.

Evidence

Use of Force Training

2. Throughout my employment with G4S, I (along with all other DCOs and DCMs) was required to do refresher training courses in control and restraint techniques. Prior to undertaking refresher training, I was required to complete a declaration confirming that I had no injuries and was fit to participate and I would then have to complete a declaration after the training to confirm that I had sustained no injuries. From memory, refresher courses took place over a day and consisted broadly of the same training given during our initial six weeks training; that is to say, various control and restraint techniques as well as self-defence.

The Role of a Case Manager (ACDT)

Witness Name: Nathan Dean Ring
Statement No: 2
Exhibits: None

3. I am referred by the Inquiry to examples of ACDT forms where I have acted as a case manager [CJS0072782 and CJS0072784] and asked to explain the role of a case manager. Only a DCM could act as a case manager and the primary function was to check that observations were being conducted and to report on the welfare of the detained person, noting any apparent causes of their distress and any changes in their temperament.
4. In the first example cited, the detained person appears to have threatened to kill himself following a failed bail application, he had been placed on ACDT and was under constant observation – the observations themselves appear to have caused further distress but were a necessary part of his assessed care needs. It appears that over the course of two days, his mood improved as a result of staff offering to assist him with a transfer request to a different IRC and that as a result, we were able to reduce the number of observations made to hourly intervals. I have no direct memory of this incident and do not recall how it ultimately resolved.
5. In this case, as with other cases, the case manager would also be present at review meetings where the Home Office, a DCO and a member of healthcare would also be present. The majority of observations would be conducted by a DCO and the case manager would speak with them, with the detained person and with healthcare to monitor the detained person's welfare throughout the time that an ACDT was open.
6. The frequency of observations was determined by everyone involved in the review (the Home Office, Healthcare, Religious Affairs, DCMs and DCOs) – multi-agency decisions were made at all times. If it was deemed that the detained person was at imminent risk of self-harm then observations would be very frequent or constant. As will be noted in the example discussed above, as a detained person's mood improved, we were able to reduce the frequency of observations.
7. When I acted as a case manager, I would make a point of speaking with the Home Office before I went to speak with the detained person; I would ask for an update on

the individual's case and whether anything new had happened which might trigger a decline in their mood or, indeed, might come as welcome news to them.

My performance as a DCM

8. I am referred to CJS0073663 and CJS0073673 which are two documents discussing my performance in my role as a DCM. I am also referred to CJS0074671 and CJS0073672 though I have not been provided with copies of these documents and am therefore unable to provide any comment.
9. The criticisms made of me in the documents to which I have been granted access, is that I was initially lazy and had poor staff management skills; this criticism was made of me by Michelle Brown who line managed me at Tinsley House and then Brook House. Michelle goes on to note however that when she managed me between June 2016 and May 2017, she had no concerns about my performance. CJS0073663_0004 explicitly notes that there were no concerns regarding my conduct toward detained people.
10. I do not accept that I was lazy at any point of my employment with G4S but I do agree with Michelle that my performance naturally improved over time as I learnt more and gained more experience in the job (I was a newly appointed DCM in Tinsley House). I also note that Michelle was promoted to Head of Tinsley House at the same time that I was promoted to DCM and of the newly Promoted DCMs, she selected me to go with her to Tinsley House; I understood this to mean that she must have held me in some regard.
11. My assertion that my performance continually improved is evidenced in some of the documents which the Inquiry has been able to obtain from G4S; for example, CJS006645 shows my improved performance between June and November 2015 with the review concluding by thanking me for my hard work. In the previous year, CJS006656 showed my improvement over the course of the year during which I returned to Brook House from Tinsley House; this review concludes by setting me targets to achieve in order to be considered for promotion opportunities.

12. I have not had sight of any more recent performance reviews but I do not recall any significant issues being raised with me about my performance in the lead up to or during the course of the Inquiry's Relevant Period. As is known by the Inquiry, I was dismissed by G4S in September 2017 as a result of the Panorama documentary.
13. On a personal level, I did at times find my work at Brook House difficult; I think that the vast majority of my former colleagues would say that Brook House was an extremely difficult place to work, it could be a dangerous environment and you would see, hear and smell things which most people would not encounter in their ordinary lives. I do not think I am alone in developing a black sense of humour as a coping mechanism; I do not think I am alone in feeling a sense of frustration at the unchanging cycle of problems which we had to deal with on a daily basis ranging from verbal and physical abuse to the fall-out from drug use.

Incident on 7 March 2017 involving D3548

14. I am referred to HOM003718, HOM003719 and HOM003723 which all relate to the transfer of D3548 on 7 March 2017. I preface this response by saying that I have no significant memory of the incident. From the papers available to me, it appears that D3548 was to be transferred from Brook House and that Steve Dix arranged a planned use of force to facilitate his transfer to TASCOR, the detained person having indicated that he would not voluntarily be moved.
15. It seems from HOM003723 as though D3548 subsequently made a complaint that Steve Dix had squeezed his testicles during the course of the control and restraint and that an investigation took place into this complaint.
16. It is evident that I was part of the planned use of force team and that I filed a report following the incident I have nothing to add to that report as, with the passage of time, I cannot remember any further details; I would however refer back to my first witness statement where I note that I never witnessed any DCO or DCM being physically

inappropriate or abusive with a detained person. If Steve Dix (or any other member of the team) had acted as was suggested, I would have remembered it.

17. To the extent that it is suggested that it was inappropriate for the transfer to go ahead either because D3548 had an outstanding appeal or because he was naked, it is not a DCO or DCM's position to assess whether a transfer can go ahead by reason of extant legal issues, we act on the instructions given to us by the Home Office and the SMT. As to the fact that the detainee was naked, it seems clear to me from the documents provided that every effort was made to maintain D3548's dignity by dressing him as swiftly as possible and changing the composition of the team involved so that female officers were either not in the room or assigned to watch D3548's roommate, with their back to D3548. I also note that Steve Dix gave D3548 two opportunities to agree to his transport without the need for any use of force – had D3548 agreed to this then he would obviously have been given an opportunity to dress himself before he was taken to TASCOR.

18. Finally, I also note that there was body-worn-camera footage of the incident which was reviewed by the police and who concluded that there was no evidence of an assault and that "the cell extraction was a legal use of force by officers during the course of their duty" [HOM003730_0006].

Incident on 20 April 2017 involving D489

19. I have been provided with access to CJS0072789, CJS000902 and CJS005551 which consist of a series of forms and reports relating to a use of force on D489 on 20 April 2017 which arose from a direction given to me, by the Home Office to obtain a fingerprint from D489. As with the previous incident on 7 March 2017, I do not now have any clear independent recollection of the incident and I am reliant upon the documents made available to me by the Inquiry.

20. It appears that I received a direction from Heena Patel at the Home Office to obtain D489's fingerprint in order to facilitate the production of emergency travel documents from the High Commission of his country of origin; my report of the incident

[CJS0072789] notes that Ms Patel had authorised me to use force to obtain the fingerprint if necessary.

21. My report notes that I spoke at length with D489 in an effort to persuade him to give his fingerprint voluntarily; I don't recall the specific content of these conversations, but it would probably have been to the effect of telling D489 that we had been authorised to use force if necessary and he might as well give the fingerprint voluntarily as it would have been much easier on him. It appears that my reasoning with D489 was partially successful and he was then willing to give the fingerprint voluntarily.
22. However, at the point of giving the fingerprint, D489 seems to have changed his mind and at that point, I held D489's hand whilst DCM Nick London applied first the ink pad and then a Home Office form to D489's thumb in order to procure the fingerprint.
23. After the fingerprint had been obtained, I appear to have noticed that D489 was low of mood and I placed him on to a raised concern document. A raised concern was a lesser version of an ACDT; it was a way of making sure that DCOs and DCMs would keep an extra eye on someone who might be more vulnerable but who fell short of requiring an ACDT – it might be used for someone who was particularly nervous at entering an IRC for the first time or, as in this case, where a detained person had acted unexpectedly but had fallen short of given any indication that they might harm themselves.
24. Minimal force was used during this incident and the use of force was authorised by, and in compliance with, directions given to me by the Home Office and the SMT.

Incident on 25 April 2017 involving D1527

25. On 25 April 2017, D1527 placed a battery in his mouth, I am shown on Panorama to make comments about him bouncing around like a Duracell Bunny and how he can use the battery as his dummy if he wishes to.
26. I am referred to the Home Office's report of the incident [CJS001107_0021] and to a transcript of undercover footage which was filmed on 24 April 2017 and which involves

Witness Name: Nathan Dean Ring
Statement No: 2
Exhibits: None

D1527 [TRN0000035_0018]. The footage on 24 April shows the steps which I had taken to try to help the detainee, that I had tried to facilitate him being moved back to his old room and that I had taken all appropriate steps to safeguard his welfare both in terms of how I interacted with him and with completing the requisite forms and reports.

27. Also on 24 April, D1527 attempted to strangle himself using a bed sheet as a ligature; I do not think that I was present for the discovery of this incident but I had asked two DCOs to check on D1527 who saw what he was doing and used force to cut away the ligature. The use of force reports are at CJS005538 and my entry on his ACDT is at HOM000152. On the ACDT form, I recorded that despite D1527 having previously ignored me during reviews, he engaged with me this time because he wanted to move back to C-Wing. I assume it was this conversation that prompted me to investigate the possibility of moving him back to his old room. It might be noted from CJS005538 that verbal reasoning may not have been attempted before force was used; I assume that this was because there was an urgent need to remove the ligature from D1527's neck.
28. The Home Office report found that my portrayal in the Panorama footage may be a misrepresentation as it had only shown me in a negative light whereas looking at the incident holistically, I had predominantly acted appropriately.
29. On reflection, I feel that the manner in which this incident was portrayed by the BBC is representative of the manner in which I was portrayed throughout the entire Panorama documentary; I firmly believe that I did my best to help and get along with the detainees generally. My sense of humour might not be to everybody's taste – particularly given the manner in which it was selectively edited by the BBC – but when it actually came to actions, I generally did what I considered was to be right and in accordance with my training and operating procedures.
30. I do not accept that I made the “Duracell Bunny” comments to the detainee, it is clear from the video clips that I made the comments to other members of staff, and I believe I would have taken care not to make them within what I believed to be the earshot of D1527. I had tried to build a relationship with D1527 to make both of our lives easier and I would not have undermined this by being abusive towards him. To the best of my

recollection, I was stood at the doorway to the cell on both occasions when I mentioned the Duracell Bunny comment whilst D1527 was busy with other officers and healthcare; this is clear from the second clip, but I think it appears as though I am closer to him in the first instance because of how Callum is positioned within the room.

31. Later in the day, it is well known to the Inquiry that a further incident arose with D1527 attempting to self-harm which culminated in the use of force to prevent him from strangling himself. I was not present during or immediately after this use of force.
32. I am referred to CJS005534 and asked whether I was present when, earlier in the day on 25 April, D1527 had attempted to self-strangulate in an incident that was dealt with by DCM Steve Loughton. I do not believe I was and I cannot remember this; I believe my only involvement with D1527 on 25 April was when he threatened to swallow the phone battery; I assume I would have attended at this point because there had been a call for assistance in relation to the initial self-strangulation incident.
33. Pages 10 to 11 of CJS005534 contain a report of injuries to D1527 arising from the incident dealt with by DCM Steve Loughton; I have no reason to suspect that this report is inaccurate particularly since the report of injuries appears to have been completed by a member of healthcare. At this distance of time, I cannot remember what injuries D1527 had caused to himself (if any) but reddening on the neck would be consistent with his attempts to self-strangulate.
34. I am then asked to comment on the accuracy of Callum Tulley's account of the incidents of 25 April, insofar as it concerns me, in his witness statement to the police [SXP000120]. Page 5 of the account seems to confirm my understanding from the documents, that I arrived at the scene either just as DCM Steve Loughton was leaving or just after he had left. Mr Tulley also appears to confirm my assertion at paragraph 30 above that I was not inside or substantially inside D1527's room. I reject Mr Tulley's recollection that I arrived and made several derogatory comments toward the detainee – I did not and this is evident in the footage of the incident at V2017042500021. I accept that I made the Duracell bunny comment twice and referred to D1527 sucking on his

dummy but as I have previously explained, I do not accept that these comments were directed toward the detainee.

35. I am then referred to SXP000145 and HOM032221 which are varying accounts given by D1527 of the events which took place on 25 April 2017 and I am asked to comment on those parts of his account which relate to me. I am unable to find any explicit reference to me or my actions in either of the statements.

36. To the extent that it might be suggested I am referred to at HOM032221_0011 when D1527 says "I know that people were talking about me and being rude to me, but I don't remember any of this...", I have already explained that I would not have intentionally directed any comment to D1527; I assume that his awareness of comments having been made comes from having seen the Panorama footage.

37. I do not recall making any notes of my involvement in the incidents on 25 April, I certainly did not take my own personal notes. Any note of what happened would, I assume, have formed part of D1527's ACDT record and it would be the responsibility of whoever was in charge of monitoring him that day to maintain this record as I had done on the previous day.

38. Finally, I am asked to comment on G4S finding that my comments on 25 April were not appropriate comments to be made to other members of staff, I am then asked to comment on whether it was common for derogatory language to be used by staff about detainees.

39. Brook House is not an office, nor is it occupied by people who find swearing anything other than ordinary language. Brook House is a difficult, challenging and often hostile environment where you constantly have to reason with people by speaking to them in a way which they understand and which they themselves communicate. I accept that the language I and every other person in Brook House used looks offensive when you're not in those surroundings, but the context is very different.

40. I'm sure there are a large number of examples which the Inquiry could refer me to where staff are appearing to refer to people in a derogative way but in my experience, it wasn't often intended that way nor was it received that way by detainees when it was directed at them – in precisely the same way that staff wouldn't take being sworn at by detainees in the same way as they would in other walks of life.

Risk of violence to D793

41. I am referred to CJS0072786 which is an email to me from Jason Murphy who worked in security for G4S. Jason told me that he had received a concern from D793 that he (D793) had been recognised by two other detainees from prison and that they had made a gesture threatening to 'shank' him. D793 had refused to give details of who had made the threats to him.

42. I do not, at this distance of time, remember the incident or the email but I am sure that I would have complied with Jason's direction, I would have spoken to D793 and probably anyone else (such as a roommate) who I might have thought knew anything about the situation.

43. If I had established that there was a credible risk then I would have reported back to Jason and may have opened an ACDT if the situation led to me having concerns about D793's state of mind, I would have also asked DCOs to keep an eye on D793. If I had been unable to establish any facts, then I would still have kept an eye on D793 and would have asked DCOs to do likewise.

44. Finally, I would have offered to move D793 to E-Wing for his own safety if he had wanted to or would have offered to try to facilitate a transfer to a different IRC.

Planned use of force on 27 May 2017 in relation to D1914

45. The incident concerns the moving of D1914 from his room to E-Wing ahead of his planned removal to Romania. I believe I was Oscar 2 on this shift and hence, was recording camcorder footage of the incident.

46. I am referred to CJS005651 which is the use of force report and asked why my name does not appear in the document. My name would not appear amongst the list of officers involved in the use of force because I did not use force, it is clear from the footage at V201705270020 that I am not in kit which would have taken on additional importance in this case given D1914's history of violent crime.
47. Contrary to the question asked of me, my name is listed in CJS005651 at page 10 where it can be seen that Steve Loughton was clearly intended to be the camcorder operator but for whatever reason (which I cannot now remember), I took his place, and my name is there as a manuscript amendment. The amendment appears to have been initialed by Steve Dix who had conduct of the incident and its planning. I note that Steve Loughton does sign a report of injury at page 35 of the document confirming that the detainee suffered no injuries so I presume he took some other role in the incident or was on e-wing when D1914 arrived.
48. I am then asked if I have any comments in relation to the incident; I have nothing substantive to add other than the use of force appears to me to be well planned and well executed with D1914 being treated respectfully by the officers involved and the minimum amount of force applied to carry out the Home Office's directions whilst healthcare monitored for any health risk to the detainee.

Conversations on 28 May 2017

49. I am referred to TRN0000078 which contains a series of transcripts which appear to be amongst staff only. I am asked if I was present in the discussion which takes place at V2017052800005 (page 2) and if so, what Sean Sayers meant when he said "we'll make someone's day fucking next week". I don't recall being present during this conversation though if the Inquiry wishes to grant me access to the footage then I will try to assist further; I do not know what was meant by Sean Sayers in his remark.
50. I am then asked to consider the transcript of V2017052800000 CLIP 2 which begins at page 6 of TRN0000078, and which largely consists of a conversation between Callum Tulley and someone called Gus about an incident which took place the previous day. It

is said that I am present during the conversation though I have not had access to the video footage.

51. I do not recall the conversation, or the incident being referred to but lines 178 and 179 appear to confirm that I wasn't present during the incident being referred to. If the Inquiry wishes to grant me access to the video footage, then I will try to provide whatever further assistance I am able.

Food and Fluid refusal policies

52. I am first referred to TRN0000079, pages 7 through 9, which deal with three conversations between me and Callum Tulley recording me crossing off detainees as having eaten when they have not; I have not been provided with access to the footage of these incidents, but I understand that they appear in the Panorama documentary.

53. I do not now recall the incidents, but I feel certain that I would only have crossed a detainee off as having eaten if I knew that they had eaten at some other time. There were a number of reasons why detainees might not eat at the set times which ranged from cultural reasons (some nationalities didn't eat at what had been designated as the meal times), that they had access to the cultural kitchen and were preparing food elsewhere or having it prepared for them or most commonly, that the food served to detainees was so bad that many preferred to eat food which they had bought from the shop.

54. With the benefit of hindsight, it might have been better for me to mark the register accurately and add accompanying notes to explain that I knew detainees who had refused food at set times were eating but this thought did not occur to me in the moment.

55. If I had any concern about the welfare of a detainee then I am certain that I would have opened an ACDT and if Callum Tulley had any such concerns about a detainee, then he ought to have opened an ACDT as well. I understand that in his oral evidence on 30 November 2021, Mr Tulley says that in acting upon my instruction to cross a detainee

off as having eaten, he was simply acting as envisaged by the BBC protocol [Transcript 29/11/2021 Pg67].

56. I am advised that page 6 of the BBC protocol [CPS000025_0006] sets out that if staff fail to provide good care then the operative (Tulley) must provide good care. I didn't open an ACDT because I would have had no concern about the welfare of the detainees in question; if Callum had concerns about the detainees' welfare (as he now says he did) then it was his responsibility to open an ACDT and the BBC protocol provides him with no defence for failing to do so.
57. Further in his evidence on 30 November 2021, Mr Tulley says that I did not record detainees food refusals because I took pleasure in the suffering of detainees [transcript page 69] and that I got a kick from it [page 70]. Nothing could be further from the truth and I absolutely refute the allegation. Mr Tulley has portrayed many of the former G4S employees as monsters but overwhelmingly, DCOs and DCMs tried to get on with and help detained people and that is abundantly evident from other aspects of the evidence which the inquiry has amassed (the Home Office's findings of my conduct on 24 April 2017 CJS001107_0021 being one example discussed elsewhere in this statement).
58. The great problem with placing too much reliance on the recordings made by Mr Tulley is that, by his own admission, they lack context – he only turned the camera on when he thought something film-worthy was going to happen; his recordings necessarily do not show the more mundane aspects of day to day life at Brook House nor did he seek to record occasions where staff were going above and beyond their duties to help detained people and understand their concerns.
59. I am then referred to TRN0000088 which contains a number of transcripts under the general heading of KENCOV1028 dated 1 June 2017 as well as CPS000066 which appears to be a note of the recordings made by Mr Tulley on 1 June in which he asserts that I instructed him not to check whether detained people on the top floor of the wing had eaten. I have not been provided with access to the footage and I have no independent memory of the incidents but I deal with each clip as best as I am able as follows:-

- a) V2017060100004 – It is not clear to me what is happening in this transcript, there appears to be two separate conversations going on at once, but I am unable to see that I directed Callum not to check the top floor for whether detainees had eaten or not. I may be able to assist the inquiry further if I am able to have sight of the footage. The transcript ends with Callum asking if a detainee should be crossed off (as having eaten) and I say that he should, I assume because I knew that the detainee had eaten.
- b) V2017060100005 CLIP 1 – Again, it is very difficult to understand the context of the transcript, it appears that we discuss a detained person in room 107 and that an ACDT had been opened because he had refused food; I then appear to make a telephone call on something which seems unconnected before Callum goes to speak to a detainee who confirms that he is eating. It could be that Callum has gone to speak to the detained person referred to in V2017060100004 who I said to cross off the food list; if so then this would clearly suggest that I knew the detainee had eaten. It could be that Callum had gone to speak to the person in room 107 or it could be that the person in room 107 and the person referred to in V2017060100004 are one and the same. It is impossible for me to be certain based on the transcripts alone.
- c) V2017060100005 CLIP 2 – The transcript shows that I say that a detained person from New Zealand looks and talks like a lesbian. I have nothing substantive to say about this other than that it was clearly not directed at a detained person. I accept that the comment is facetious and not one which I would make now.
- d) V2017060100005 CLIP 3 – The transcript appears to show that I am recording observations on the ACDT opened for the detained person in room 107, clearly the detained person has made some form of threat if he isn't transferred that evening and I refer to him as a "childish prick". If it is correct that I am completing the ACDT review then I am being shown to be doing the correct thing even if I may have been irritated by the detained person's behaviour toward me.

- e) V2017060100005 CLIP 4 – the clip begins with Mr Tulley asking me “what is the little boy saying now, you closing it?” I assume this is a reference to the ACDT opened on the detained person in room 107. I explain that I’m not closing the ACDT because Darren (?) believed that the detainee was going to hurt himself; I imply from the transcript that I disagreed with Darren’s assessment and did not think that the detainee was at risk of self-harm but I nevertheless was completing the ACDT records appropriately. At lines 80-81 of the transcript, I am recorded as saying:

“...I wasn’t supposed to be doing this. Darren has fucking written it that the geezer is going to hurt himself. Don’t fucking write it in the document. [Laughs].”

I feel certain that I meant ‘don’t write it in the document unless you have good reason’. I would never have taken issue with anyone opening an ACDT and the transcript clearly shows that despite the fact I disagreed with one being opened in this case, I nevertheless administered to it properly.

Finally, Mr Tulley made much in his oral evidence of always asking DCOs and DCMs open questions whilst he was covertly recording in order to give them every chance to reply appropriately. The opening question in this transcript may well be open but it is also leading and framed in such a way as to try to elicit the most negative response.

- f) V2017060100006 CLIP 1 – The transcript shows that I ask a detainee if he is “talking to English cunts today” I then explain to Callum that the detainee had previously said to other officers that he wouldn’t speak to “English cunts” and Callum calls the detainee a “fucking prick”. The clip finishes with me saying that the detainee will speak to English cunts when he wants something. I assume I am asked to comment on my use of the phrase “English cunts” though it is clear from the context available that those are the detainee’s words which I am quoting back and not my own.
- g) V2017060100006 CLIP 2 – The substantive element of the transcript appears to be me discussing a detainee (D149) who Callum is not allowed to see, I note that the

detainee doesn't like Callum. I'm not sure if this is the same incident but I do recall that Callum was accused of sexually assaulting a detained person and this could be the same detainee. It appears that the detainee has been or shortly will be transferred to E-Wing and Callum appears disappointed because he likes playing pool down on E-Wing. I say to Callum that he should go down and see the detainee, do a peace sign going past the window – the stenographer then writes that I make three hand gestures, a peace sign, a wave and then a 'wanker' gesture.

This is clearly jokey banter and not a serious suggestion; it was also clearly taken as such by Callum given his response of "I am tempted to go down and see him, yeah."

- h) V2017060100010 – This four page transcript appears to concern a fight which has broken out after a detained person of Jamaican origin has had some of his hair ripped out – it is thought by some of the officers in attendance that the fight has arisen from a dispute over drugs. I appear to be only very peripherally involved in the incident at line 257 I appear to be speaking to D544 respectfully and sensibly in an effort to defuse the situation and then at line 343, I appear to be asking either "Male Manager 1" or "Male Manager 2" when they are going to get their hair sorted; again, this would, I imagine, have been a joke to lighten the mood and try to defuse the situation.

60. In relation to the events portrayed in the aforementioned transcripts, I am asked to set out my understanding of the self-harm policies at Brook House. Very simply, my understanding was and remains that if a detained person was considered to be at risk of self-harm or suicide then an ACDT should be opened and the ACDT process should run its course with input from all relevant people such as healthcare.

61. Finally in relation to events on 1 June 2017, Jason Murphy (G4S security collator), sent an email to me and others notifying us that information he had received suggested that shoes may be a new method of getting drugs into Brook House. I am listed as a recipient of the email and assume I received it though I have no memory of it now.

62. The drug supply to Brook House was an impossible problem to solve because every time one route of entry was closed down, another opened up. I can remember tennis balls being packed with drugs and hit over the fences; I remember collecting the balls before detainees were allowed into the courtyards. I remember spice being incorporated into paints or paper and what looked like children's pictures being produced – the detainees would then rip off strips and smoke them.

63. One point on which I am confident is that no officer would have done anything to facilitate the entry of drugs to Brook House; nobody hated the drugs problem at Brook House more than the DCOs and DCMs who had to deal with the fallout from drug use.

Incident on 11 June 2017 involving D368

64. I am referred to CPS000025_32, TRN0000067 and TRN0000068 which are collectively Mr Tulley's notes and video diaries relating to a medical response following D368 having smoked spice. I am unable to find any reference to me having been present at the incident and I do not recall it; I feel confident that if I had been present, Mr Tulley would not have omitted to mention my presence.

Incident on 14 June 2017 involving D1275

65. I am referred to the video footage at V201706140015 and V201706140016 as well as TRN0000068 which is Callum Tulley's video diary of the events. The footage concerns D1275 having smoked spice, the first clip shows the immediate response whilst he is in the courtyard, the second clip shows me and others dealing with him once he has been taken to a room. In giving this response, I have also had regard to the transcript of the entirety of Mr Tully's recordings that day at TRN0000092.

66. I became involved in the incident after D1275 had reached a room, at line 1194 of the transcript [TRN0000092_39] I say "does your face taste nice because you appear to be chewing it off". Toward the end of the recording and transcript (line 1443) I am recorded as asking the detainee how his name is pronounced, I assume he is unable to tell me as the stenographer has not been able to decipher his response to the question

and I reply, “we’ll stick with div”. I do not accept that my comment about D1275 chewing his face of was offensive; it is a common turn of phrase for the facial expressions someone might exhibit when they are high on drugs. In relation to both comments, it might be said that my comments were facetious, but it is apparent from the footage and transcript that D1275 was receiving appropriate care.

67. In V2017061200016, I am shown to encourage D1275’s singing and then, when asked by Mr Tulley how to deal with him, I say that some cold water would sort his heart right out. Finally, Tulley asks me what the detainee is doing now, and I say that he’s probably gurning, checking out the inside of his skull. Again, my comments may be considered facetious, but I do not accept that I have been particularly offensive directly toward the detainee nor do I accept that my actions in any way compromised or acted to the detriment of the level of care D1275 was receiving from, particularly, the healthcare staff. My comment about cold water was clearly not made in anything other than jest.

68. I think that my comments in this incident were largely born out of an enormous sense of frustration; if I remember correctly, I had spent time with D1275 in the preceding days after he had last taken spice and had tried to reason with him about staying away from it in future. I thought I had gotten through to him but clearly, I had not.

69. I am then referred to a separate incident on 14 June 2017 which is recorded at CJS0072783, and which concerns an attempt by D1722 to stab me with a plastic knife whilst I conducted ACDT reviews. I do not particularly remember the incident which of itself, perhaps speaks to how frequent it was for staff to be subjected to violence, but it appears from the second page of the document that by the following day, I had noted that he had calmed down and no longer presented a risk to himself or others to such an extent that he was allowed to return to A-Wing.

Incident on 15 June 2017 involving D149

70. I have been provided with TRN0000093 which is a transcript of Mr Tulley’s recording of D149 having a bad reaction to spice. I am unable to find any indication that I acted

or spoke inappropriately. If issue is taken with me saying that D149 was “throwing his ring up” then no malintent was underlying the comment, it is simply a phrase I would ordinarily use when somebody is being heavily sick. Throughout the remainder of the transcript, I appear only to give instructions on locking down the wings and to assist and comply with healthcare’s instructions.

71. I am then asked to consider TRN0000069 which is Mr Tulley’s video diary for the day. I assume it is intended to draw my attention to the sentence at page 5 of the document where Mr Tulley says “the usual smears from the managers and the officers can be heard.” If so then it is clear from the transcript that I did not make any joke or smear and therefore, I assume Mr Tulley was not referring to me.

72. I have no particular recollection of this incident; as can be seen from Mr Tulley’s video diaries, spice overdoses were a frequent occurrence at this time but from the documents provided to me, I do not consider that I have acted inappropriately in any way. The transcript appears to show that D149 was dealt with appropriately by healthcare.

Incident beginning on 25 June 2017 involving D1606

73. CJS0072785 and CJS002553 relate to an incident where D1606 had smashed the observation panel in his room door and made superficial cuts to his arm – as he did so, he made threats to kill himself and the documents are the ACDT records which I opened. I have no independent recollection of this incident and am reliant on the documents made available to me.

74. CJS002553_0008 records that D1606 was seen by healthcare immediately.

75. I am asked why D1606 was interviewed by Alice Wragg and I can only think that this was part of the ACDT process; I have had some difficulty in deciphering Alice’s handwriting, but it appears as though it was the fact that D1606 was being detained that was causing him mental anguish rather than anything specific to Brook House.

Complaint of 7 July 2017 against DCO Tomsett

Witness Name: Nathan Dean Ring
Statement No: 2
Exhibits: None

76. CJS001480 contains a file of papers relating to a complaint made by D1399 against DCO Darren Tomsett; D1399 complained that having requested curtains for his temporary room in B-Wing, DCO Tomsett was rude and aggressive toward him. The complaint was assigned to me by the SMT to investigate.
77. I do not now recall this incident, but the detail of my investigation is contained in an email to Karen Goulder at page 12 of the document. I spoke with DCO Tomsett who denied that he had been aggressive or rude, DCO Tomsett said that he had explained to D1399 that there were no spare curtains available at the moment but that in any event, D1399 would be moving to the residential wings that same day and hopefully to a room with curtains.
78. DCO Tomsett went on to say that D1399 had later the same day, come to apologise for the manner in which he had spoken to DCO Tomsett; this conversation was witnessed by DCO Milburn.
79. In the circumstances, I found the complaint to be unsubstantiated given that there was no corroborating evidence to support D1399's allegations and, to the contrary, there was evidence supporting DCO Tomsett's version of events.
80. I prepared a draft response to the complaint which was submitted to Karen Goulder and ultimately approved by Stuart Povey (page 10) who was then head of safeguarding. Following Stuart's approval, the response was sent to the detainee.
81. I am unable to recall being aware of any specific policy relating to curtains which may have been in force at the time this complaint was made.
82. I do not now recall what records I made of conversations I had during the course of my investigation but naturally, I do not have any such records in my personal possession.

83. I believe that the complaint was dealt with appropriately and I have no concerns about the manner in which I undertook the investigation based on the documents which have been made available to me.

Complaint of 24 July 2017 made by D490

84. D490 arrived at Brook House on 22 July 2017 and left for the Verne on 27 July 2017. It appears from the complaint file at CJS001493 that there were no mobile phones available upon his arrival though he was issued with a phone on 25 July. On 24 July, D490 had complained about not having been issued with a phone. The complaint was assigned to me to deal with. Again, I have no recollection of this incident and I am reliant upon the documents which have been made available to me.

85. It is evident from the complaint file that this was a paper-based investigation which had largely been conducted by Karen Goulder before the complaint was passed to me (see her email to Stuart Povey of 28 July 2017). The complaint was passed to me via email dated 31 July 2017 with an instruction to formulate a response.

86. It is a simple matter of record as to whether D490 was issued with a phone upon his arrival or not, if he wasn't then the question is whether it was right that he wasn't; my instruction from Karen is clearly that it was compliant with whatever performance target or contract provision was in place and so the complaint was not upheld.

87. It appears that I prepared a response (substantially based on the instructions given to me by Karen on 31 July) and returned it to her on 5 August, she tweaked the response, and it was approved by Stuart Povey on 8 August – I presume it was then sent to D490.

88. As to the content of the response, the information about the availability of landlines would have come from my own knowledge; I don't think that I would have known that Brook House was only required to provide 1 in 10 detained people with a mobile phone and it is included in the response either because it formed part of Karen's instruction to me or because she added it as the tweak referred to in her email to Stuart Povey of 8 August.

89. I do not now recall the detail of any policies about mobile phones save that detained people were given mobile phones as soon as they were available if they did not have their own. I know that the phones had to be basic, and smartphones were not allowed, and I believe detained people were also given credit for the phones. I imagine that the relevant policies from the time are a matter of record and are available to the Inquiry.
90. The supply of phones was not consistent with the rate of intake of new detainees and there might be a delay of a few days when any new detained person arrived. I would guess that part of the problem was that Brook House's population had increased and/or was increasing; the phones are issued to detained people on loan so if you have more people arriving and less people leaving, there are less phones to recycle into the system.
91. Over and above this, phones were continually broken, lost or stolen and it was extremely difficult to keep up with demand particularly as the SMT were reluctant to purchase them. I believe that SMT were reluctant to use their budget to purchase new phones because of the perception that the detainees were responsible for the shortage, either through losing them, breaking them or stealing them when they left the centre.
92. I believe that in the round, my response to the complaint is appropriate – I don't think I would have voluntarily included the statistic about only being obliged to supply 1 in 10 detainees with a phone because I don't think it's particularly relevant to D490's concerns. The thrust of the response is that D490 was provided with a mobile at the earliest opportunity (two days after his arrival) and that there were landline options available to him in the interim – I think that this is appropriate.
93. In the letter of response, it is noted that D490 had refused to take an induction tour upon his arrival at Brook House. I do not now recall how frequent refusals to take the tour were but I would say they were neither common nor uncommon and would depend on the temperament of the person when they arrived. I note that D490 was only at Brook House for five days, if he knew he would be leaving imminently then perhaps he didn't think it worth taking the tour.

94. Even when someone did not wish to undertake the induction and/or tour, they would still have had basics explained to them (such as where to go for meals, medical assistance, welfare etc) and I think that they may also have been provided with some form of literature. I am sorry that I cannot be more specific at this distance of time.

<u>Statement of Truth</u>	
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	Nathan Dean Ring
Signature	<div style="border: 1px dashed black; padding: 20px; text-align: center;"><h1>Signature</h1></div>
Date	25 January 2021