Introductions of staff present by Steve Skitt

SS: Thank you for coming. The reason for the meeting is we are carrying out a disciplinary hearing. Have you received the letter?

SM: Yes

SS: Are you fit and well?

SM: Yes

SS: Do you understand why you are here?

SM: Yes

SS: The disciplinary hearing is based on the findings into the investigation Dan Haughton carried out. I am aware you have had mediation and as part of this process and nature of the allegation it is to be heard at this disciplinary hearing. MF present to take notes and advise on HR process. It will be salient points and not verbatim.

SS: You are entitled to be accompanied by a TU Rep and you have brought CE as your workplace colleague. Conway do you understand your role?

CE: Yes

SS: If you wish to adjourn at any point let me know – both nod

SM: Yes

SS: Are you happy to continue?

SM: Yes

SS: Have you had a copy of the report?

SM: Yes but not all of it

MF: Who is missing and I will get these to you

SM: SM, TE, NK, and LW.

Meeting Adjourned 10.00am

Meeting Reconvened 11.18am

SM: Yes

SS: As before do you understand your role CE?

CE: Yes

SS: I work to a level of the balance of probabilities and not beyond reasonable doubt. It is alleged inappropriate language towards a DCO colleague. I have received the investigation report. It is your opportunity to present new information I am not aware of between the investigation and now. It is your opportunity for any mitigation. Once we have gone through this we will adjourn and then reconvene and conclude.

Do you understand?

Both nod and say yes.

SS: It's your open narrative to talk through the allegation against you, the words said between you and BS. Talk me through that.

SM: She came into the office and questions why myself and someone else were not doing what she was doing. Her assumption was we were going home when we were completing ACDTs. We had more than enough staff on the wings so we can go home quicker. She came in and queried obs. She said you need to do your job, I said don't speak to us like that I am not a child. I said I would slap her in the mouth whilst walking through the door.

SS: What did she say back?

SM: She said go on then. Someone came to stop me and said to calm down

SS: And that was Teyron Evans

SM: Yes

SS: What was the incident, why were staff called to C Wing?

SM: A detainee was causing a nuisance in the shower. Why additional help was called I am not sure. We were all upstairs; I started locking on the middle floor but not sure if the others did. NT felt it was necessary to get additional help. It was manageable with 4 members of staff.

SS: You were detailed to C Wing?

SM: Yes

SS: So in the showers a member of staff thought it was necessary to call for back up and extra staff attended. You and the other staff were in the office whilst these staff attended lock up – is that true?

SM: Yes

CE: You locked up yours

SM: Yes, I counted and got people up and down and did wing observations. There was still people in the showers.

SS: If we call for extra staff is this not a priority?

SM: Yes which I did.

SS: So the wing staff have gone back to the office. The perception is I'm doing my bit and the wing staff are in the office

SM: I wouldn't sit in the office doing nothing. It could have been perceived I am not doing what I am meant to

SS: If you get called and look round what would you think?

SM: I would think what are they doing but not assume they are doing nothing

SS: The conversation between you and BS, there was an altercation and you alleged BS called you a fucking black cunt

SM: Yes

SS: Was it those words?

SM: I believe I heard this

SS: Did she say her comments first?

SM: We were both saying stuff; she said do your job then

SS: You then said you would slap her

SM: Yes I walked out of the office; TE was behind me to stop me from going out of the wing

SS: What happened after?

SM: I spoke on the phone to someone

SS: Do you have anything else to say?

SM: Not based on what happened

SS: Anything else?

SM: There were a few questions that should have been asked but were not

SS: In what respect

SM refers to her book

SM: It is mainly on peoples statements:

My work ethic is challenged

It is said that I am too friendly with detainees by DK

If these are issues managers are aware of why are they arising now as a result of this incident?

My poor attitude when asked to do things, if managers are aware and have notified each other I should be aware of this

SD said this and DR mentioned my work ethic

DK said BS complained before

The terms and conditions of suspension said no contact with any staff

SD went to BS home to post an SIR through the door. The SIR is accessible on the public drive and had been altered.

Why is the way I talk to detainees a problem for anyone else.

DR said BS blamed me for a few things and there have been underlying issues. As a line manager why haven't they been address prior to now?

DK has provided an exchange however he wasn't in the office at the time, how can this be to the best of his knowledge?

SS: Do you have anything further to add in relation to the allegation?

CE: The interview with TE we don't have a copy of the notes. Did it take place?

SS: Yes, my understanding was when it took place at the end of it she was there

CE: Most of the interviews only recount what BS said, they have selective hearing.

Was BS told not to contact staff?

SS: Yes

CE: She was seen at a party

SS: She has been informed not to make contact. We can't stop people doing things in their personal life. We can't control staff however with SD it will be part of this process.

DR called SM as line manager in one statement and a witness on another

DH said he would go through the 2nd part of the letter and this has not occurred

SS: Why I am here today is to hear the disciplinary and the allegation. I am not aware of other conversations that have taken place.

CE: NT statement only hears SM having a go but he couldn't hear BS

SS: I wasn't there

CE: We have not been privileged to TE statement, NT car shares with BS and AP is BS exboyfriend. SB statement and TE statement we are interested in.

Broghan Kosla Rule was not spoken too. Nathan Harris name has come up. In TB statement she has said BS said she a shit. Why have none of the other DCOs heard this?

AP says SM wants to smack BS and nothing else?

There are claims that BS had SD password - how can this occur?

SS: That's separate from here

CE: BS was asked to go on to C Wing that doesn't mean you have the right to argue with another member of staff.

Meeting Adjourned

Meeting Reconvened

SS: There are a number of issues raised by yourself and CE. In summary it is my expectation that any staff that participate in any investigation are honest and have integrity. Their view may not be the same as others views. There were things raised around performance and this will be addressed outside of this. It doesn't fit in to the responsibility of the allegation. MF and I will address this with those individuals.

Your inference that if this had been addressed this incident would never have happened. It is difficult to establish that.

With the doctoring of the SIR there is no inference that you had part of this. It was on a public drive and appears to be custom and practise here. I am ensuring everyone has their own email account and own user drive.

The suspension has specific requirements and staff may bump into someone. All employees are duty bound to report this

From the investigation and from what you have said I do believe an altercation occurred and words were exchanged. I cannot establish there were racist comments in this. EP took notes at TE meeting and EP recalls he interview and these specific comments were not made. The initial part of the altercation it is difficult to establish if it was aimed at you or just generally and then it became personal. However it is deemed inappropriate and unprofessional and should not have happened.

However the exchange did take place and we have different avenues to deal with this, through line management structure or at a later date. I accept mediation was part pf this. The charge is proved and I am issuing a written warning and for you to attend acting inclusively. Therefore the award is generally dealt with at Gross Misconduct level and is lesser,

From today your G4S suspension is lifted and the matter is concluded...

You have the right to appeal with n7 days of receive the letter,

Meeting End 1.45pm