

## Hannah Wigham

---

**From:** Hughes-Roberts, Deri  
**Sent:** 30 January 2017 21:46  
**To:** Singh Bhui, Hindpal (HMI Prisons)  
**Cc:** Carroll, Colin (HMI Prisons)  
**Subject:** RE: Brook House fact check

...just one 1. The definition is standard. Rather than using their definition and getting tied into problems with the adults at risk policy, might be better to say, we are construing safeguarding more broadly in light of the outcome of the Shaw Review into the welfare of vulnerable detainees and developing Home Office policy in this respect.

---

**From:** Singh Bhui, Hindpal (HMI Prisons)  
**Sent:** 29 January 2017 18:20  
**To:** Hughes-Roberts, Deri  
**Cc:** Carroll, Colin (HMI Prisons)  
**Subject:** RE: Brook House fact check

Hi Deri,

thanks, have completed. On your additional points:

1. Have asked Tamsin to confirm if we use a standard safeguarding definition in all reports. If so, we will just need to add a note to say that their definition is broader and that we used it.
2. Agree, also makes it convoluted and harder to understand for the lay reader.
3. Noted.
4. Amended, I should have spotted that too.
5. They will have changed this because it's an instruction from researchers to quote the exact survey question, and the question here is 'do you have a lawyer'. In fact, it's not a third who don't have one because there were a few percent who said 'don't need one'. So I've left as is to keep changes to a minimum. If you want to use the alternative figures from the detainee breakdown in future, that's fine but best to put in a short note saying so as the editors tend to use the main comparator.
6. I changed that rec after consulting Colin for consistency - I was uneasy about saying that they should always release on receipt of independent evidence, although the bar should be extremely high. A case where a release rec might lack credibility would be, for example, if they are on the verge of removing a high risk sex offender. I'm aware that it's a very fine balance between principle and credibility though, so we should discuss to be fully consistent.

Thanks!

H

---

**From:** Hughes-Roberts, Deri  
**Sent:** 26 January 2017 13:55  
**To:** Singh Bhui, Hindpal (HMI Prisons)  
**Cc:** Carroll, Colin (HMI Prisons)  
**Subject:** RE: Brook House fact check

Here it is.

Some points to note.

1. I have deleted the safeguarding definition they refer to, as they rightly say it is narrower than their definition of adults at risk (In fact, far narrower than we have historically interpreted it as it limits the group to detainees in need of community care).
2. I have rejected their two points that we replace references to levels of risk, with evidenced levels. They are splitting hairs and the only possible reason is an attempt to insulate their decision making from legal challenge.
3. I'm copying to Colin, as whatever line we take on these points needs to be consistent.
4. There's a problem I have come across before with editors trying to clarify technical points they don't understand and achieving the opposite. The particular example here (para 1.73) concerns the decision to maintain a torture victim because of imminent removal to a third country. Often I think technical language has to be used otherwise it can set hares running. In this case, the point was that the torture victim was being removed, but not refouled. Third country was changed to 'another country', which misses the point and is just meaningless in this context. Often with such changes the inspector drafting the report never gets to see the change and cannot correct it. I think we need to think about how we ensure these things don't happen.
5. Another change (para 1.60) see a negative statement - 'a third of detainees had no solicitor', made positive, 'two-thirds of detainees had a solicitor' How irritating!
5. On a related matter a casework recommendation has been changed to say that people torture victims should only be detained in very exceptional circumstances. That's a big change. My original recommendation was that they should be released. Not sure what our policy is here.

---

**From:** Singh Bhui, Hindpal (HMI Prisons)  
**Sent:** 25 January 2017 18:01  
**To:** Hughes-Roberts, Deri  
**Cc:** Carroll, Colin (HMI Prisons)  
**Subject:** FW: Brook House fact check

from a quick look, nothing much to trouble us here, but could do you checking Deri,

thanks,

H

---

**From:** Buchanan, Barbara (HMI Prisons)  
**Sent:** 25 January 2017 15:55  
**To:** Singh Bhui, Hindpal (HMI Prisons)  
**Subject:** FW: Brook House fact check

Hindpal

Please see the attached fact check response from Immigration Enforcement. I also attach the draft report. Grateful for your comments/amends when you can.

Regards,

Barbara

---

**From:** Foley Gillian [REDACTED] **DPA**  
**Sent:** 25 January 2017 15:40  
**To:** Buchanan, Barbara (HMI Prisons)  
**Cc:** Checksfield Clare; Detention Ops HMCIP Report Co-ordination  
**Subject:**

Dear Barbara

Please find Clare Checksfield's response attached, in respect of the factual inaccuracy check for Brook House IRC.

Kind Regards

Gill

Gill Foley  
Operational Support and Guidance Team  
Detention and Escorting Services Directorate  
Immigration Enforcement  
Home Office  
2nd Floor, Bedford Point, 34-35 Dingwall Road, Croydon, CR0 9XG  
[REDACTED] **DPA**  
[www.gov.uk/home-office](http://www.gov.uk/home-office)

\*\*\*\*\*

This email and any files transmitted with it are private and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed. If you have received this email in error please return it to the address it came from telling them it is not for you and then delete it from your system. This email message has been swept for computer viruses.

\*\*\*\*\*

\*\*\*\*\*