

## Interview Summary

Person interviewed: Sara Edwards – Operations and Residential Manager at Tinsley House  
(Duty Director at Brook House IRC on the day of the incidents)

Date of interview: Tuesday 29 August 2017

Place of interview: Brook House IRC

Time commenced: 10:30 hours

Time concluded: 11:27 hours

Interviewing Officer: Mrs Kim Shipp

Others present: Colleague – Michelle Brown – Head of Security for Gatwick IRCs (Tinsley and Brook House)

At the beginning of the interview Mrs Shipp explained the purpose of the interview.

Ms Edwards was happy for Mrs Shipp to proceed with the questions, as she was aware of the role of the Professional Standards Unit.

Mrs Shipp explained after having interviewed Mr [D87] completing his interview summary, reviewing the CCTV and camera footage in full, and reading all the documentation regarding both incidents, she did have a few additional questions, which she required answers to.

Mrs Shipp made it clear from the outset that she had absolutely no issues with the way that the officers involved dealt with Mr [D87] or the control and restraint used; in fact she advised she would be recommending that the officers are commended for the way they dealt with a very difficult situation.

Mrs Shipp explained that she required some additional information in order to provide a full response to the issues Mr [D87] has raised, hence the reason for the meeting.

Mrs Shipp said that they would begin by discussing the first incident regarding the relocation from Mr [D87] room to the CSU.

Mrs Shipp asked who had made the decision to relocate Mr [D87] on 30 June 2017 from his room on Eden Wing to the CSU. Ms Edwards said it was herself and Mr Skitt, and they made the decision on that day. She said that the history was that Mr [D87] had come out of Rule 40, either the day before, or the day before that. She explained that they have a Disruption Policy, where basically the idea is that they manage the individual, rather than putting them in an area where they are isolated. She said Mr [D87]'s behaviour had been extremely compliant over the previous few days, so he was given the opportunity to come out of the CSU and be placed on Eden Wing for a period of observation; and it was made clear to him that obviously

he needed to address his issues and what he had been doing, and the threats that he had made to staff.

Ms Brown interjected to add that she had reviewed Mr [D87] the day before; she said he had made suggestions that if he was to remain in Rule 40, if he was taken out he would not be taken back to his room; and he had suggested that staff were trying to get a reaction from him by keeping him in there, almost forcing him into becoming violent, which is documented in the Rule 40 paperwork. So he was almost aggrieved that he was remaining in Rule 40.

Ms Brown explained that Rule 40 meant Mr [D87] would have been behind his door, whereas in Eden Wing he would have association time with others; it is used as part of a reintegration programme, so it is made very clear that the individual is still being monitored in their behaviour, they are being tested for compliance, and if he continued with his threats he would go back into Rule 40. She said that Mr [D87] had subsequently made threats throughout that day.

Ms Edwards said so basically that morning Mr [D87] was on Eden Wing, and there had been a number of reports in. She said he had got quite an aggressive arrogant attitude and nature in the sense of if he did not get what he wanted, the actions that he takes and the words that he uses, and the behaviour he displayed, coupled with his size, was how he went about getting what he wants to happen.

Ms Edwards said through the course of that morning, leading up to just prior to lunchtime, Mr [D87] was questioning the fact that he had been placed in Rule 40 two days earlier, and she had said to him that she did not know the nature as to why he was in there, but she could go and speak to the person who put him down there, which she then went off to do. She said it was Dan Houghton.

Ms Edwards said Mr [D87] was very verbal, very aggressive about it all; saying what he was going to do, and then he made significant threats to a number of officers, including Dan Robinson; he spoke about how he was going to get his family and murder various members of his family. She said Dan had recently lost his brother a couple of months earlier, in quite tragic circumstances, so it was very raw for him. She said Dean Brackenridge was there when he made the threats; and the Chaplain, who 10 minutes or so before Mr [D87] had made threats to all of them, he had had a face to face row with the Chaplain.

Ms Edwards said he had basically been allowed out of Rule 40, and given the opportunity to address his behaviour, that clearly was not happening, so the decision was made to relocate him back through. She had spoken it through with Mr Skitt, and they decided that the actions were correct and they would move him back through to Rule 40.

Ms Edwards said because of the time that it was, it was not feasible to get a suitable team together in all their PPE equipment, before unlock; so the

DCMs and was also a C&R instructor, so that was the purpose in him being deployed to the CSU for the night to have that interaction with Mr. [D87] he still went to the door with a number of officers. She said did PPE potentially escalate Mr. [D87] if that's what he was saying; however the reasons for them using PPE were fully justified through the whole of it. Mrs. Shipp said she agreed. Ms Edwards said Jack was used also to give Mr. [D87] the chance to calm down, speak rationally, but with someone who was there and qualified to deal with it if necessary.

Ms Edwards confirmed that Mr. [D87] would have had his bedding etc returned. Ms Brown said she went to his room the next day to review him, and he had everything in his room. She said there was some nervousness around it, as he still had to go out for exercise and shower etc, how were they going to manage that, and a worst case scenario they needed to plan for. She said it worked; on the Friday evening, particularly for her as the Duty Director on the Sunday, who checked he had everything on the Saturday. He went out for exercise, he went out for fresh air, he had a shower, she believed he was given a television, or he was given his stereo that he wanted.

Ms Edwards said that Mr. [D87] always maintained that if they let him out, he would not go back in; but they looked at it and risk assessed; he was entitled to all the things mentioned, so they had to give him the opportunity, but if he had refused to go back in then it would have been a whole different ballgame. She said that kit was not used, but he was still with four officers at all times whilst unlocked.

Mrs Shipp said regarding the next question, Ms Edwards may not be able to answer, and if so that was fine. She said that she had requested written statements from DCO Sean Sayers and DCO Aaron Stokes in relation to it before going on leave. She said that Mr. [D87] had alleged, which again she thought was down to him potentially believing he manipulates staff, and was friendlier with some than others; Mr. [D87] said the three of them were very friendly, they were nice to him, they got on and chatted often. On the date of the incident Mr. [D87] had stated that both officers visited him in the CSU to apologise for the way he had been treated. He said they came back and said to him [D87] *we didn't want to do it, and we were both threatened with disciplinary that if we don't do it, we will be disciplined*. Mrs Shipp asked if she thought there was any truth in it.

Both Ms Edwards and Ms Brown thought it was a lie. Ms Brown said that Sean had said he did not want to see him again.

Mrs Shipp said from Mr. [D87]'s perspective the fact that those officers said that to him made him think that they were in the wrong because they had apologised. Ms Edwards said that Sean Sayers was part of the first team; he got injured, and at the point when it was going on it was not a noticeable injury; she thought what happened was, was that he had hurt his shoulder but felt he was okay to carry on, and did not feel the need to go to hospital; but then over the course of the next couple of days it was different, and he then

had some time off for his injury. She said once the incident had happened, he was pretty shaken up because he had obviously been injured. She said he was the fella that was the big chap, that Mr [D87] lifted off his feet; and she thought he was in shock by what Mr [D87] was capable of doing.

Ms Edwards thought it was because Sean was quite a big fella who probably thought he was able to look after himself, and do his C&R and she thought for him he was probably surprised by Mr [D87]'s power and his potential to do harm. She said that Sean came out and was like he was never going to do it again, don't ask him to do it again; he did not want to be part of a team C&R because it had shocked him so much, because he had been injured.

Ms Brown said that she had an SIR that she would provide to Mrs Shipp that was submitted regarding concerns about condition of those two staff with Mr [D87]. She said she had tasked the security team to go back and just do some soft touch work in terms of speaking to them about what had been said, and their thoughts etc, on what they thought then and now, and what they were trying to achieve; and ask if they thought there was an element of conditioning in there.

Mrs Shipp said for her, she thought that it had probably been taken out of context; she did not doubt that the officers may have apologised to him, but not in a way that they believed they had done something wrong, but some officers apologise for having to have reacted the way they have, but it was in response to the detainee's actions.

Ms Edwards said the only thing she would say about that was that she knew for a fact that she would not have made a statement like that, but actually was it made by a DCM that was getting them to kit up, she could not answer that one; and the person that would be would be Dean Brackenridge if anybody.

Mrs Shipp advised she had originally asked to speak to Dean, but as they knew he was and is still off sick.

Ms Edwards said had he gone to them and said he needed them to get kitted up because they needed to move Mr [D87]; and they've said we don't want to do it because he is a very big man etc; and then at that point has Dean said anything like that, she would like to think not, but she was not there.

Mrs Shipp said it did seem like an odd statement for Mr [D87] to have made up. Ms Brown said what she thought that Mr [D87] did not want to understand was that they were his good guys, and he did not want his good guys to be against him. Mrs Shipp agreed and said that Mr [D87] had said that Sean had become quite emotional when they chatted about it, and was upset about what had happened.

Ms Edwards said she could not imagine Sean being emotional. Ms Brown said she thought it was more Mr [D87]'s self belief that actually the staff were