

Chronology of matters related to David Waldock and Speak Out

- On **25 January 2017** Vanessa Smith (Home Office) emailed Paul Gasson (Home Office) about David Waldock's rudeness to Guyatri Mehraa (G4S DCO), and the general unhelpfulness of G4S Visits staff (including David Waldock).
- On **25 January 2017** Paul Gasson emailed Caz Dance-Jones (G4S) forwarding the complaint and asking for reassurance in this area.
- On **26 January 2017** David Aldis (G4S Detainee Custody Manager) circulated an email to the G4S Operational Management team requesting that 'for the foreseeable future can DCO David Waldock NOT be detailed in the visits area.....'
- On **28 January 2017** David Waldock returned to work and noted he was detailed on the wings rather than visits.
- On **1 February 2017** Paul Gasson (Home Office) sends an email to Ben Saunders (Centre Director), Steve Skitt (Centre Deputy Director) and Caz Dance-Jones stating that the Visits corridor is still an issue and provides a list of concerns from their internal team meeting.
- On **2 February 2017** Steve Skitt met with David Waldock and Caz Dance-Jones. David Waldock was told of the complaint from the Home Office and was told he was going to be moved out of visits. David Waldock requested that an investigation be carried out. He strongly denied that the Home Office would have heard anything and requested an investigation, which was refused. During this meeting Steve Skitt told David Waldock that he was going to be subject to behavioural monitoring.
- Subsequently Caz Dance-Jones informed Dave Roffey (David Waldock's line manager) that Steve Skitt required David to be performance managed, the main concern being around David saying things that he shouldn't. Caz Dance-Jones stated that Dave Roffey was unsure of what he needed to do and intended to go the HR for guidance.
- On **3 February 2017** Caz Dance-Jones confirmed to Paul Gasson that DCO Waldock has been moved from visits and is currently being performance managed, and detailed measures taken to address Home Office Concerns.

On **9th February 2017** David Waldock telephoned the Speak Out hotline. The key points recorded by the call handler were:

- David Waldock had been reported by another employee
- Because of this, Steven Skitt, the Deputy Director told him "if you make any more trouble you will be terminated".
- David Waldock does not know what he had been reported for.
- Ben Saunders, the Director, might also be involved.
- The caller wants this to be investigated and therefore be contacted directly by G4S.

On **13th February 2017** David raised a grievance at Brook House which also covered this ground. This was to be heard by Sarah Newland, G4S Head of Tinsley House IRC, and as such no further central action in relation to the Whistleblowing was deemed necessary at that point although they took a watching brief. For various reasons the grievance investigation took a long time to complete and on 15th April 2017 David sent an email to Ashley Almanza text in red below:

Dear Mr Ashley Almanza

I wish to bring to your attention the incomprehensible levels of bullying that is going on at Brook House and the levels of corruption being used by all levels of staff including DCO right through to the Brook House Directors and the unhealthy connections used between these people and the in-house Home Office.

This takes the form of, if we like you and your face fits you will be in our club, if we don't you will be sacked if you make a mistake or bullied until you reach a level where you can take no more and leave, the following list, gives the names of people involved, what they do, the cover up's placed to protect them and the laws and company policies broken to protect them.

On the 05/02/17 I inform H.R that I would be taking a grievance out on Mr Steve Skitt following an informal meeting in his office which was held on the 02/02/17, on the 13/02/07 I handed my grievance by hand to H.R Brook House, I will not go into much into this at this point as all documents relating to this are available from Brook House and myself and can be provided for reasons of investigation, but I will make a statement at the end of this letter.

I will now make the following statements which will include the names of people involved, what they have done and company policies and laws broken.

Ben Saunders, Brook House Director.

- Covering up bullying
- Telling people to watch what they say when making a complaint about bullying. i.e. warning them off from making their complaint.
- Changing statements of complaints made to make it sound like the officer complaining is the one in the wrong for making a complaint. i.e. you make a complaint and it is changed to you shouting your mouth off, being rude, "slagging off officers" and talking about other officers behind their backs.
- Non-compliance of company policies and procedures and employment laws.
- Deliberately holding up company policy to allow more time, i.e. stalling investigations to allow further bullying to take place.
- Ignoring and covering up complaints made about officers that he wishes to protect.
- Running a two tier system for different officers, people are held or not held responsible for their actions or non-actions as the case maybe, or fits.
- Covering up, ignoring clear bullying, known throughout the centre.
- Deliberate allowing bullying to carry on in Brook House when this is commonly known though out the centre.
- Accepting bribes and inappropriate gifts.

Steve Skitt, Brook House Deputy Director.

- Non-compliance with company procedures and employment laws.
- Deliberate and purposeful bullying.
- Twisting facts to protect himself and others.
- Deliberate lying and falsifying evidence, Covering facts, figures to protect himself and others.
- Use of threats to undermine employees of the company.
- Non-compliance of company procedures and working laws.
- Deliberately holding up Procedures so to be able to make more time for bullying.
- Making up policies, rules and procedures for his own purpose.
- Colluding and setting up false statements to collude constructive dismissals.
- Lying during meetings to twist the facts in to what he wants it to say.
- Refusing persons in his office their working rights, i.e. refusing them to give their side of a story, refusing them to see a complaint made against them and refusing to hold investigations in to complaints made, " if it's in a complaint it must be true"
- Holding a complaint meeting and refusing the other person to talk or say anything though out the whole meeting.
- Bullying of witnesses.
- Supplying no evidence to support anything he is saying during meetings even when asked to do so.
- Making speeches in the morning meeting which are clearly aimed a statements made in a grievance complaint.
- Ignoring clear CCTV evidence.
- Intimidation of officers.
- Calling an officer disgusting whilst in the visits hall and standing in corridors using intimidating behaviour to undermine officers.

- Homophobic and deliberate acts of discrimination.
- Refusal to take all accounts and facts into account i.e. only using the ones he wants to hear to fit his purpose.
- Handing out punishments in informal meeting
- Non-compliance with company disciplinary procedures.
- Handing out non-company punishments i.e. his own, made up punishments, not within company policy,
- Bringing up peoples home life and using it against them.
- Using irrelevant comments to help fulfil his own wishes.
- Taking inappropriate actions against officer to intimidate them.
- Using threatening behaviour towards officers.
- Receiving contraband and prohibited items.
- Breaking company policy and working rights of employees.
- Using unacceptable behaviour in order to bully intimidate, humiliate, undermine fellow employees and their working rights.
- Instructing with menace other officer to intimidate other in the company.
- Accepting bribes and inappropriate gifts.

Loraine Higgins. Brook House P.A to Mr Steve Skitt.

- Colluding and setting up false statements to collude constructive dismissals.
- Non-compliance with company policy.
- Deliberately lying to help people make false statements.
- Accepting bribes and inappropriate gifts.

Gayatri Mehrra. Brook House DCO

- Asking Home Office to lie and cover up her mistakes and make false alibis.
- Having Home Office officials as personal friends in and out of work i.e. going to parties, drinks, dinners as their guests.
- Falsifying documents with Home Office officials for her own purpose.
- Working with and not disclosing personal levels of friendship with Home Office officials which may interfere with work policies. i.e. Vanessa Smith being one of her best friends.
- Threatening officers to do as she says or she will go to top management and have their jobs.
- Talking in her native tongue with Vanessa smith when they don't want people to know what's going on.
- Using company time to do personal and home stuff at work i.e. online shopping for food etc.
- Asking other officers to lie for her to cover up.
- Refusing to adhere to company policies.
- Refusing to following instructions given by personnel above her grade.
- Refusing to work in roles given to her, i.e. November one, wings, etc.
- Falsifying documents, i.e. daily visits sheets, SIR's, IR's statements,
- Lying about what she has done and where she was at the time of an incident, as proven by cctv.
- Claiming to have done stuff she has not and taking credit for such items.
- Deliberately doing things to drop other officers in trouble.
- Calling detainees druggies, rapists, racists, shouting and screaming at them daily.
- Starting arguments on visits gate and then writing SIR reports blaming others for the actions taken.
- Arguing with Solicitors, GWG, IMB officials, officers, detainees, ACO's, DCO's, managers and blaming others for her mistakes.
- Calling and referring to detainees visitors as slags, prostitutes and their children as 'drug children'.
- Intimidating detainees and guests during their visits.
- Removing toys from visits hall, against instructions of senior management and officers and also against home office rules.
- Misuse of cctv.

- Interfering while other officers are trying to sort problems out, undermining them and starting arguments with the detainees etc.
- Starting fights, arguments with other people and then walking away and leaving other officers to sort out the problems she has made.
- Bringing on to the premises contraband, inhibited goods and passing them around with no security checks.
- Using bribes to influence other upper management and home office officials.
- Never being asked to go to the office to explain any complaint about her actions, i.e. no complaints made about her are ever investigated.
- Laying down rules that she has made up which override home office and company procedures.
- Using other friends and officers to intimidate humiliate and belittle others.
- Refuse to work anywhere in the building apart for visits because she has upset so many people she is too scared to go through the building (detainee side) on her own. She won't cover lunch breaks, locking up time cover, work on wings, medical officer, activities, November one or any part of the building that has detainees access.
- Lies to officers when ask to do something and says the call has told her to tell them. i.e. can someone go and cover it for 5 mins she send other people even though the caller has asked her to do it.

The levels of disruptive behaviour and company non-compliance are far too many to list but investigations would bring these all to light. but approximately 10 to 20 complaints a month are made (about her).

Vanessa Smith. Home Office Officer.

- Lied to cover up bullying by Gayatri and falsifying a complaint (proof can be provided)
- Knowingly having a friendship with a DCO officer at Brook House and using it to influence decisions.
- Accepting bribes and inappropriate gifts.

Nas Chowduary, Hafeez Akutar (both also known as Gayatri's sons) and **Steve Payne** all officers at brook.

- Deliberately bullying officers at Brook House under Gayatri's instruction, as reported to Anne Warrilow, Oscar two at the time.

G4S Whistle Blower Line

I tried to report this to them and was asked at the time who the complaint was about, I told them that it involved Ben Saunders, Steve Skitt and Gayatri, I was told they would get back to me within 5 days to date they have never tried to contact me ? So what is the point of this service, if you mention management, it gets lost or forgot and never looked into. This service is there to protect personnel and to report wrong doings.

As I stated earlier in my letter I would come back to the grievance that I have placed against Steve Skitt.

This was done on 13/02/17 which has been deliberately held up, stalled, interfered with and corrupted by the officers names above, I have proof that the original complaint was corrupted by Vanessa Smith who made the original complaint.

I have also had a constructive dismissal arranged by Steve Skitt and his p.a. Loraine Higgins, this was proved and the complaint has been dropped but there is still a copy of the complaint.

I believe that a second constructive dismissal has been arranged and that if the company fail to adhere to arrangements made there will shortly be a third.

As of to date the company has fail to meet five dates it has set to comply with my grievance, under company policy this should have been done in twenty one days, it now stand as of the 11/04/17 at fifty eight days, which is when I received a further letter telling me they were going to take more time with no ends dates mentioned, they are already 2.76 times over the company policy for which another four days can be added at this point, but by law as this is a bullying complaint it should have been done in seven days so makes it 9.14 times the legal time set.

All the time this has been going on I have worked every shift I have been given but have had to do this under enormous pressure and continued bullying from people mentioned above, but I'm not going to be pushed around by bullies, out of my job and have stood hard against this pressure and kept doing my job just to show that bullies can't win against the truth. I am more than willing for you to look at all my files that are held on record and to be able to look at a statement I gave to the company about problems that I had had at home, which I did not have to do, I thought I would be honest and supply them with what has happened, I would never had done this if I knew Mr Skitt would throw it back in my face. I also asked Mr Tom Thorne to act for me and as to day all his letters have been ignored.

After what happened at Medway, the company asked people to report and act upon bullying which is what I have done and this is how I get treated for doing so.

I have made a statement as to what happened up to my grievance was heard and am happy to make a further statement to the company about what has happened since that date to help any investigation that is carried out

I have had no time off since working at Brook House, have never been taken into the office for any disciplinary action, and have never received any written letters or warnings about anything I have ever done, whatsoever. Yet I'm being told by Mr Skitt he's had loads (about me)?

I am willing to give you the company policy to get this matter back in hand which is fourteen days to investigate and seven to conclude which is the twenty one days allowed and hope this matter can be dealt with in the correct fashion, in house by G4S, but I will not take responsibility if this is not dealt with and outside sources have to be informed.

I hope you are able to deal with this matter as I feel this situation has gone too far now, I have followed all the correct procedures to do with this matter, and have been as lenient as I can, but I will not allow this to just be brushed under the carpet and I am determined to make sure the people responsible for this are held to accountable for their actions.

I'm sure I do not need to list all the laws, Company Policies that have been broken but these are just a few, Company Policy, British working rights. European working rights, Human Rights act article 3, Human rights act article 8, Union policy, basic laws including further laws around Discrimination, Humiliation Intimidation, Corruption and many rules and regulations laid down by Parliament and the Home Office.

Yours

D Waldock

P.S. Can I make you aware that Gayatri has had another complaint made against her by Mark Earl stating, she will take his job just like she did mine, this only goes to back up what I have said about her behaviour.

This was reported to H.R Brook House at the time and was tagged to my complaint, this has now been dropped for Oscar One to deal with, as it was said to be not important in the case ? even though I was mentioned, as of this date it has not been dealt with. which means it is over the 21 days allowed by company policy

On **20th April 2017**, the email sent by David Waldock to Ashley Almanza was added to the whistleblowing application.

Nick Sheppard met with David Waldock at Southside on **28th April 2017**

Richard Allenby was assigned to lead the investigation, with support from Andrews Seddon (C&DS H&S Lead) and Stephen Cotter (UK&I Risk & Assurance Manager)

The scope of the investigation (specific to David) was agreed as:

- 1) The circumstances relating to the complaint about David Waldock received from the Home Office.
- 2) The elements of David Waldock's grievance that were not upheld
- 3) David Waldock's concerns around management behaviour at Gatwick, bullying and cultural aspects relating to both the Centre Management and specified colleagues.

Delivery of the Investigation:

- Stephen Cotter and Andrew Seddon met with David Waldock at the G4S Southside office on 31st May 2017.
- Richard Allenby met with David Waldock at Brook House IRC on 7th June 2017.
- A series of meetings with Brook House Management and staff, and reviews of relevant documentation were undertaken during June and July.

My summary and conclusions from the report (as specifically relevant to David) were:

It was not appropriate to issue an instruction to move David Waldock from Visits before advising him of the complaint.

It was also not appropriate to introduce 'behavioural monitoring' of David Waldock. This is not a recognised element of the performance management process. It was not communicated to David Waldock in writing and in practice does not appear to have happened as his line manager was not clear what was required. There was no correspondence on David Waldock's personnel file in relation to the behavioural monitoring and it was initiated without the input of the HR team.

It is recognised that G4S was under considerable pressure from the Home Office in relation to the Visits operation during this period, and needed to demonstrate a proactive approach to issues raised by the Home Office. It is also noted that David Waldock had been the subject of a previous complaint where he was alleged to have remarked to a Home Office visitor, "you're the one we need to shoot then?" This matter was dealt with informally, with David Waldock being advised to moderate his behaviour. The matter could equally have been dealt with formally given the nature of the remark to a representative of the customer and may well, if proven, have led to formal action against David Waldock.

David Waldock contacted Speak Out initially because he felt his position at G4S was under threat and he alleged he did not know why. He subsequently put in a grievance in respect of the way G4S Management at Brook House handled a Home Office complaint against him, which was handled by local management. He perceived the delays in expediting his grievance were unacceptable and subsequently emailed Ashley Almanza with his concerns. David feels that the conduct, approach and behaviour of a fellow DCO, Gayatri Mehraa, is at the core of his concerns and the way he perceives he has been treated.

David Waldock has been a credible witness in interviews, is keen to work at G4S and enjoys his role. It should also be noted, though, that he has displayed a propensity to make comments inappropriate to his surroundings in the work environment, and has been encouraged, informally, to moderate these comments and his manner by both management and colleagues. One of these comments, to a visiting Home Office representative, was dealt with informally by G4S when it could easily have been dealt with formally.

This investigation finds that the complaint received from the Home Office in respect of David Waldock was handled clumsily. Management actions were initiated without a formal investigation. They should not have been. There was tacit acknowledgement to the Home Office of the validity of their complaint, without it being investigated, by G4S confirmation to the Home Office that David Waldock had been removed from Visits and was being performance managed.

In summary, David Waldock's grievance was found to be substantiated to the extent that actions had been taken against him that would normally have only resulted from a formal investigation. This is fundamental and is an acknowledgement of the poor handling of the matter. The grievance outcome noted that action should be limited to an investigation into the complaint. The fact that G4S has, in effect, acknowledged to the Home Office that their complaint about David Waldock was valid, along with the passage of time (meaning CCTV is not available) means that an investigation is neither practical or expedient. This is an unsatisfactory outcome.

The findings of this investigation do, however, give credence to many of the concerns that David Waldock articulated about Guyatri Mehraa.

On one hand Guyatri is a dedicated, hardworking employee who is well thought of by Home Office staff and is valued by G4S Management for her drive, organisational skills, and willingness to work extra shifts at any opportunity.

On the other hand Management, during this investigation, have acknowledged Guyatri has exhibited poor behaviour. Her EDR at the end of 2015 noted that she can cause friction with some staff and detainees through

her manner which can be blunt and flippant at times 'and this needs to improve with immediate effect.' A grievance brought against Guyatri by a fellow employee in 2015 for bullying was investigated but not substantiated, though the investigation noted that Guyatri "is a strong character that will tell you if you have done something", and witness statements variously noted her as 'mentally challenging and a bit hard to work with', and 'bossy'. During the course of this investigation two employees in Visits complained to HR about Guyatri's rude and abrupt behaviour. There have been no management interventions to attempt to address Guyatri's behaviour.

This investigation concludes, on the basis of the above, that Guyatri has indeed, to a degree, been protected by Management. When the complaint about David Waldock was received by the Home Office, the investigators view is that Management took the 'easy option' to take action against an employee who was not well thought of by the Home Office, rather than initiate a timely and objective investigation into the matter.

My report recommended that an action plan is presented by Centre and C&DS Management in response to the findings of this investigation. The action plan (as relevant to David) to address the following:

- David Waldock to be written to by Management to acknowledge the mishandling of the complaint against him and to initiate a work plan for David that meets both his and the company's needs going forward.
- David Waldock to be given relevant and appropriate feedback (in lieu of a grievance appeal outcome) on the findings of this investigation by a member of the investigation team.
- Guyatri Mehraa's approach and behaviour to be formally raised with her in order that it can be moderated and for mediation between David and Guyatri to be considered in order that an effective working relationship can resume.
- Management to review how the Visits area is managed / supervised going forward. Employees assuming roles, with the best intentions, in a 'first amongst equals' environment has, and continues to be, a key causal factor of the relationship issues that have manifested themselves in the Visits area.
- Learning points for the Gatwick IRC Management team as a result of the findings of this investigation.

I met with David on 15th September 2017 (the meeting was also supposed to be with Ben Saunders but Ben was on administrative leave by then post Panorama) to debrief him on relevant aspects of my investigation. The meeting was cordial although David disagreed with me on a key matter. He felt Steve Skitt should be charged with gross misconduct because of his handling of the matter. I said that was not going to happen.

Several days later David wrote a very strongly worded email which included threats to take the matter to a range of external agencies. I responded to him on a range of matters. As part of the debrief I asked him whereabouts in Brook House he wanted to work. He said E wing and a transfer was arranged for him as soon as was possible operationally. He responded again with further demands for information which it was not appropriate for him to have.

David was also the subject of an investigation as a new member of staff alleged that he had made rude and derogatory remarks about Steve Skitt and Guyatri Mehraa in open forum. I discussed this with Lee and said it was entirely appropriate for this to be investigated as a discrete matter. Whilst I have ensured that David does not suffer detriment from the act of whistleblowing (and he has not) he needed to understand that he does not have licence to misbehave simply because he has raised a Speak Out. The investigation into the conduct of Guyatri Mehraa did not progress as she resigned.

Richard Allenby was very concerned that if David Waldock was not encouraged to moderate his behaviour he would continue to get into trouble, risking his future at G4S. RA therefore asked Tom Thorne (General Secretary of the G4S Care & Justice Staff association) if we would discuss the matter and if Tom could speak with David in an effort to de-escalate David's behaviour.

Around this time David Waldock submitted an early conciliation claim to G4S via ACAS. Nick Sheppard responded to ACAS initially simply to try to ascertain what David was looking for from this, in order that Nick could discuss with / advise the business. This was made clear to Tom Thorne in order he could make clear to David Waldock. There were no conditions, assumptions or pre-judgements made about David's continuity of employment

Tom Thorne confirmed to Richard Allenby on 3 January 2018 that David wanted to draw a line under any action and move on. Richard Allenby thanked Tom for his approach in explaining matters to David and said he hoped David would continue to have a long and fulfilling career at Brook House. It is understood David has also taken on role as a Staff Association Rep at Brook House IRC, and so would be in regular contact with Tom.

On **10th September 2018** David Waldock submitted an email to the Brook House IRC HR lead within which he stated that:

- the grievance he took out against Steve Skitt was never concluded, and that he had on many occasions asked for the formal results of his grievance and the company has refused to reply.
- He wanted his folders under FOIA;
- He is aware of further bullying (allegedly against him) that he believed has come from people in higher management, including more fake untrue complaints.
- He is fully aware that the company has made moves to block any forward movement of his employment, putting him at a disadvantage
- As a union rep he believed that obstacles were being put in his place to hinder the union carrying out its duty.
- He wanted his grievance concluded in the correct manner and in compliance with the law.

On 12th September 2018 Lee Hanford (Interim Centre Director, Gatwick IRCs) met with David Waldock to discuss the above. Lee then contacted Richard Allenby to ask if Richard would write to David in respect of the concerns David was raising about his original grievance never being closed off.

Richard Allenby wrote to David Waldock as follows:

Dear David,

I hope this note finds you well.

Further to a meeting that I understand you had with Lee Hanford on Wednesday 12th September 2018, Lee has asked me to write to you to confirm and update on matters relevant to you. This is the purpose of this note, but please make contact if you have further questions of me.

You will recall we last met on 15th September 2017. The purpose of that meeting was to give you a verbal debrief on matters relevant to yourself following the completion of my investigation report. At that meeting I gave you my view that the Home Office complaint against you had been poorly handled and that you were a credible witness, and that fundamentally your subsequent grievance had been upheld. You accepted this at our meeting and it is my view that this closed the matter of your grievance. I noted at the time that we agreed to disagree in respect of follow up action. I confirmed there learning points for the Brook House management team from this situation. You felt that disciplinary action should have been taken against one member of the management team in particular.

I referenced certain outstanding matters were being looked into in relation to Guyattri Mehraa, although it was not appropriate to provide you with further detail. In the event of an investigation proceeding in relation to Guyattri I understand you may have been called as a witness. You will be aware that Guyattri resigned from G4S and as such those matters are closed.

You then raised certain points with me in writing, on the 19th September 2017. With regard to the G4S Whistleblowing, I can confirm that we continue to identify actions that we can take to improve the caller experience. You articulated your desire to return to E wing as the earliest opportunity. I advised this to Brook House management and they duly effected your transfer from 16th October 2017.

I gave you my assurance that you would not suffer detriment from the act of whistleblowing, and I stand by that assurance. You used the phrase 'witness protection' to describe your situation. I said that this phrase did not convey your situation and we had a discussion around the need for everyone at all times to be mindful of how even an innocent remark can be taken out of context. I am aware that you were interviewed in relation to an alleged incident involving a verbal altercation with another DCO but that the matter has been closed. The matter was handled entirely independent of your whistleblowing and was unrelated to it.

I am aware that you have discussed your grievance and subsequent matters with Tom Thorne and also you were in touch with ACAS but believed and hoped that you felt that there were no outstanding matters. I hope your conversation with Lee has further given you assurance. I am very pleased that you continue to work for G4S and long may this continue.

Best wishes
Regards
Richard

Richard Allenby
Director of Risk, Assurance & Compliance
G4S Care & Justice Services

Lee Hanford then emailed Richard Allenby on 1st October 2018 as follows

Hi Richard
I met with David last week – he advised that he is happy with your response. He has also received a response and an apology from his line manager who did not 'close off' a previous meeting relating to absence.
He will have closure this week on another outstanding issue, i.e. a local investigation – so everything will be resolved to his satisfaction.
Thanks you for your support – I have now handed over Gatwick to the new Director, Phil Wragg.
Regards
Lee

Lee Hanford

Director Gatwick IRCs

On the basis of the above Richard Allenby recommended the matter be closed (the email sent by David Waldock on 10th September 2018 had been logged on Speak Out as a Managers Report Form and as such the Regional Ethics Committee had visible, and agreed to close the matter from their perspective.

Richard Allenby has had no further direct contact with, or in relation to, David Waldock since the last matter was deemed closed

Richard Allenby
7 April 2019