



Prisons and Probation Ombudsman
PO Box 70769
London
SE1 4XY
Recorded delivery

And by email to: **DPA**

Dear Sir / Madam

D687

Appeal against decision of Home Office Professional Standards Unit
Home Office reference: 17/1555/1557/26

We are advising **D687** and his authorisation is **enclosed**. Please treat this letter as an appeal against the decision by the Professional Standards Unit (PSU) notified by letter dated 18 April 2018 from the Detention and Escorting Services.

Please note that we also act for our client in a Judicial Review ('JR') of the refusal of the Secretary of State for the Home Department (SSHd) to announce an independent inquiry into the alleged abuses of detainees at Brook House Immigration Removal Centre ('Brook House') as revealed by the BBC Panorama programme, "Undercover: Britain's Immigration Secrets" which was aired on 4 September 2017.

Please find **enclosed** copies of the following documents:

1. Our client's complaint form, 21 April 2016;
2. Letter G4S Security Manager to Our client, 26 April 2016;
3. G4S DAT forms, 17 February to 8 May 2017;
4. G4S self-harm incident investigation, 13 May 2017;
5. Redacted Letter of Claim, 12 September 2017;
6. Redacted Letter of Claim re: our client, 17 October 2017;
7. Letter PSU to Deighton Pierce Glynn Solicitors ('DPG'), 5 December 2017;
8. Email DPG to PSU, 5 December 2017;
9. Detainee custody officer statement, 7 December 2017;
10. Detainee custody officer statement (2), 7 December 2017;
11. Detainee custody officer statement, 11 December 2017;
12. Letter DPG to PSU, 20 December 2017;

Deighton Pierce Glynn and Deighton Pierce Glynn Solicitors are trading standards for Deighton Pierce Glynn Limited. Company No. 07382358
Authorised and regulated by the Solicitors Regulation Authority. SRA No. 552088

Deighton Pierce Glynn
382 City Road
London EC1V 2QA
DX 146640 Islington 4

t: **DPA**
f:
e:
w: dpglaw.co.uk

from friends or they could use violence." After we provided the witness statement the investigator sent further questions by email of 30/01/18 requesting specific names of officers who were abusive to our client together with dates and times of these incidents. In an email of 20/02/18 we replied:

"Para 13 – details of officers who were abusive

The abuse occurred mainly on 'C' wing where 6 or more officers were regularly abusive and used racist language. When 'C' wing closed our client was moved to 'A' wing, as were some of these officers. The level of abuse was worse on C wing than on A wing.

The statement gives details of the white male manager called 'Steve' and a female detention officer with black curly hair called 'Maria'. In addition there was a male detention officer with ginger hair (our client does not know his name), a black male officer called something like 'Mtundee' who was short and wore glasses (he may have just been on A wing), a black female officer (name unknown). The others who were abusive were white male officers whose names our client does not know."

22. As will be seen from the above, the investigator's comment that **D687** *made allegations against all the officers on C and then A Wing...* (emphasis added) is simply incorrect; at no point did he suggest that all officers on those wings had been abusive.
23. Moreover, at no point did he say that he suffered abuse only from white DCOs. Nor did his evidence of abuse from non-white and female officers contradict his earlier evidence that he also experienced abuse from white male officers. The suggestion that, *"these white male officers had become a ginger haired white male DCO, a black male DCO and a black female DCO"* is an obvious mischaracterisation of our client's evidence.
24. A further illustration of the unfairness in the investigator's approach to the evidence is highlighted by this comment from the summary report:
- In interview, you were unable to describe the officer who had accused you of "taking the piss out of our country. Fuck off back to your own country" or those who would "provoke you to get you so they can restrain you and take you to the block."*
25. However, the interview record shows that the first comment was made by our client at 1.08.00 and the second statement is at 1.10.06 and on neither occasion did the investigator ask our client for the name of the officers or for our client to describe them. Therefore it is unfair to characterise our client as being unable to do so in interview.
26. There also appears to be an attempt by the investigator to try to re-shape our client's evidence to suggest that the particular officers he complains of only