

## 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



decision was made that it would be done at the next unlock, which was 17:00 hrs.

It was explained that prior to 17:00 hrs all the detainees would be out of their rooms, but at 17:00 hrs they would be locked back in their rooms, which would make it a safer environment for the move to take place. Ms Edwards said that the reason that everyone would be in the PPE was because it was a planned removal, and it was to protect them for Health and Safety reasons. She said Mr [D87] was a very sizable gentleman; and he had made comments around the fact that given the chance he could destroy them all. She said he was very intimidating; so basically at 17:00 hrs the team was kitted; the removal was led by DCM Brackenridge, but she decided it was potentially best to have a C&R instructor there, which was DCM Trott.

Ms Edwards said if Mrs Shipp had seen the CCTV footage, she would see that there was no way that Mr [D87] was going to decide to walk out of his room. She said had he have broken free that could have been quite an incident. She said she was there, so she could hear what Mr [D87] was saying, and yes everyone was in kit, but he knew why they were in kit. It was explained to him, and he was given the opportunity to walk on a number of occasion; in fact potentially a longer period of him being given the opportunity to walk than normally would happen. She said he was talked through; it was explained to him quite clearly what was going to happen, what the reasons were; he chose to not do that, he chose to react.

Mrs Shipp said from the CCTV, she witnessed that Mr [D87] was refusing but without actually saying no. He made out that he was going to do it, as he was slowly putting on his socks and trainers etc, and appeared as though he was going to do, She said that Mr [D87] said it was only once he saw the officers in their full PPE kit that that aggravated the situation; and as a result of him seeing them that was when he kicked off.

Ms Edwards said she would suggest that the officers were in view; she explained that she was standing near to the Wing Office and had a direct view of his room; Mr Brackenridge was at the door, and the officers were a team of three, just to one side. She would suggest that Mr [D87] could clearly see the officers, when they were at the room door. She explained that that was the intention, for the detainee to see the officers' and decide actually do you know what, I'm going to walk, this just is not worth it. So as much as she could appreciate that he probably thought... Mrs Shipp said that was when he started to question if they had come to fight with him, and doing his hand motions.

Ms Brown said she had had some experience with him from the day that he arrived, and had spoken to him a lot. She said that Mr [D87] really liked to feel in control; so when he was collecting signatures off everyone in the Centre, he was the main person doing that; he was the one that went round and said that's me. She said when Mr [D87] was challenged about another incident, he initially told everybody not to lock down and then once the staff had got onto the Wing and got a hold on the situation, he then said '*Come on, let's support*



*the officers'*. She said when Mr [D87] smashed up Healthcare, and the girls were locked in the room, he said that was the Healthcare's fault. She said he does not accept responsibility; so when they challenge him about his behaviour, and he was told that he had threatened to take someone hostage, he says that he's not violent; so they say well actually they know that he is, he still says no. So he does not take responsibility, but he feels like everything needs to be at his time, he is the one who makes things happen and likes to be in control. She said in terms of having lengthy discussions with him, he will not answer a direct question, he will by pass it and put the conversation to where he wants it to go. She said he was extremely manipulating; she had dealt with 150,000 detainees in her time, and he was probably one of the best she had seen, as he was very good. She said there would not be acceptance for his behaviour, so he had an option there as to whether he was going to walk through and accept that he had made the threats, which despite there being a number of reports, he still denied and said he did not make any threats. He chose at that time whether to walk through or not; and the risk to staff would be so significant; based on his history that was considered the safest way to move Mr [D87] from A to B.

Mrs Shipp said that Mr [D87] had said that he was walked through on a previous occasion by two DCMs; and therefore he questioned why the difference at that time. Ms Brown said that Mr [D87] was walked through at that time because he was not fully aware of what the allegation was. She said prior to him going to Rule 40, his Wing DCM said that he was really worried about Mr [D87] and he could see him escalating; his behaviour indicated that something could have happened that day. She suggested that after talking to all the right people, the DCM should go to Mr [D87] to explain that they could see a change in him at that time, and ask him what they needed to do to prevent him getting to where they did not want him to. Mr [D87] had said he was not happy with the Home Office. She said they thought they had done a great piece of intervention work; and then Mr [D87] made a statement about smashing up the CCTV cameras footage, so they decided that as he was not taken heed of where they were trying to steer him, and then by the afternoon he had made the reference to hostage taking.

Mrs Shipp asked at what point had Mr [D87] been walked to the CSU previously. Ms Brown said on that day, when he originally went, he went down there and he was told that they had received various reports, his behaviour had been escalating, and they had received a report that he alleged to take someone hostage, so he needed to go down to the CSU and he was told that she would go and speak to him. So she said Mr [D87] took it on the leverage that he would have access to her, as Head of Security. She said they had worked on it all afternoon, to try to get Mr [D87] to the CSU; and she was really pleased with the DCM's work when they did manage to walk him down, because it was not what Mr [D87] wanted. She said it was Michael Yates who had a really good relationship with Mr [D87] that they used; as there were other DCMs that he did not like.

A discussion was had around the fact that Mr [D87] liked certain staff and not others. Ms Brown said for example Mr [D87] liked DCM Dan Houghton



because he took him out of the CSU, but he he did not like her because she had put him into the CSU.

Mrs Shipp said what she wanted to be able to do was to explain why the decision was made for the officers to attend in full PPE as opposed to just the DCMs taking him there. She said they had just talked about that and it was down to staff safety, and because it was a planned removal then it would automatically be carried out with officers in PPE, irrespective of the circumstances of the detainee.

Mrs Shipp said in addition, Mr [D87] said that DCM Brackenridge and DCM Shadbolt held a personal grudge against him, which was why he was treated in the manner he was. Mrs Shipp said this was just Mr [D87] opinion, and she suspected there would be no evidence of that.

Mrs Shipp asked if it was those two DCMs dealing as they were the ones on duty at that time. They both said that Dean had not dealt with Mr [D87] before, they did not know whether Ben had or not. Ms Edwards said that DCM Trott did not know Mr [D87] either. She said that Mr [D87] had threatened Dean that morning, and he was present when the threats were taking place.

Mrs Shipp said that Mr [D87] had also alleged that for several hours that same afternoon he was in the office 'chatting' to Sean Sayers and Aaron Stokes, and there was no anger coming from him. He therefore questioned why an hour or so later he was being relocated for the reasons stated, when there had been no issues all afternoon. Ms Edwards said she would suggest that the relocation took place at the time it did for the reasons she had already explained regarding safety; and secondly was it possible that he was in the office being nice with Sean and Aaron, yes because as already discussed he has a particular dislike for some officers, and he liked others; and he was very manipulative, which she said was the only answer she could give.

Ms Brown added that both Sean and Aaron worked on Mr [D87]'s wing, C Wing; so they would have that relationship. Mrs Shipp accepted why officers would build rapport with detainees as that was in everyone's best interests.

Mrs Shipp said that Mr [D87] also stated at interview that he had always complied with officers, he had a 100% record of zero non violence, and that he had never been violent towards any member of staff. Mrs Shipp said that she had already seen several things that contradicted that (in the Annex A document that Mr Skitt had provided and Ms Edwards had also brought one with her); so she was happy that was not the case, and that it was Mr [D87]'s perception.

Mrs Shipp did explain that she thought Mr [D87] was referring to the fact that he had never physically punched anybody, which seemed to his level of him not being violent, and maybe he did not see the verbal threats or his mannerism as being violent.



Ms Brown said that the impact of his behaviour had resulted in a member of Healthcare staff being so frightened that she was now off with PTSD, with no date to return. Ms Edwards added that the impact of Mr [D87] behaviour on the day of the incident, has led to two officers being injured, and they were off for a significant period of time.

Ms Brown said that when Mr [D87] had actually left the Centre and moved to a Prison, he was still making significant threats towards herself; so he clearly focused on individuals. She thought he had a lack of acceptance or responsibility for his own behaviour.

Mrs Shipp asked if Ms Edwards had any observations regarding the first incident and the way in which the staff dealt with it; whether good or bad. Ms Edwards said to be fair, her only concern would have been, which was not necessarily a concern because you never know how those things are going to go, but the fact that Mr [D87] managed to get himself out of the room, the way it was dealt with at that point was slightly prolonged, purely through his size and his power. She said in an ideal world would it have better to have contained him within his room for everyone concerned. She also added that personally she would not have spoken to Mr [D87] for as long as the DCM did, as to her it was apparent quite quickly that he was not going to walk, which was giving him more opportunity to gather himself.

With regards to the second incident, Ms Edwards confirmed that she was still the Duty Director who had approved the action taken. Mrs Shipp asked her to talk her through the decision behind the actions taken, and to make reference to the timings, as she thought that there was time delay in between it being noted that Mr [D87] was potentially trying to take his own life, and the officers entering his cell.

Ms Edwards said as Mr [D87] was relocated into the CSU, he blocked his spy hole, and put his mattress up against the window that you can observe through from the outside; and he was saying that he had torn a t-shirt up and put it around his neck. She said you could just see through the gap between his mattress that there was a piece of cloth that appeared to be around his neck. She said for a considerable period of time he was shouting and swearing and feeling quite aggrieved about everything that had gone on, and he was directing his behaviour at Dean Brackenridge, herself, Dan Houghton and Michael Yates, who he did have a very good rapport with; and then all of a sudden he went quiet.

Ms Brown said Mr [D87] had exposed himself to one of the staff. Ms Edwards said she would talk about that shortly. Mrs Shipp advised that Mr [D87] had denied doing that.

Ms Edwards said because Mr [D87] had blocked up his spy hole and was threatening to hurt himself, obviously they then needed to go in again with another kitted team; so they got another team together. She said all the time that Mr [D87] was talking that was not really necessary, he was fine and he was talking; they had eyes on him from both sides, through the gap, but not



the spy panel as he had completely blocked that up. She said that Mr [D87] then went completely quiet; so at that point obviously the team entered his room to preserve life.

Mrs Shipp said she was not under the impression that the team did enter straight away; she thought there was a considerable time delay in between Mr [D87] going quiet and the team going in, like 20 minutes or more. Ms Edwards said she did not think it was that.

Mrs Shipp advised that Mr [D87] had said it was one hour, but she was certain it was not that long. She said that in his eyes, he was potentially 'dead' and he was attacked and treated that way. He believed that an Manager or a Healthcare staff member should have gone in alone to check he was okay; and then he would have been able to have repeated his request for food and water.

Both said that they had eyes on him at all times; and there were cameras on him at all times, listening to everything that was going on. Ms Edwards said that Mrs Shipp should be able to tell from the length of time between him screaming and shouting, and then when he goes quiet. She said obviously they needed to get Healthcare in attendance etc.

Mrs Shipp said she was certain she had not received that footage; all she had was from the debrief and from the point when the team entered the cell. Ms Edwards confirmed that a camera was recording throughout; she said one of the DCMs had the camera on all the time, recording all the threats.

Ms Edwards said that Mr [D87] argument was that he had never threatened anyone, never been violent, never been aggressive; and for them it was clear that he is the way he was as demonstrated on the camera. She said she knew that was how he had behaved. It was agreed that Mr [D87] appeared to recall what he wanted to.

Ms Edwards said they could see him because he had managed to lay himself on the bench under the window, which you could see this thing that he had said was tied around his neck because of what he was going to do. She said they could only see the end and not that part of it, so they were basing it on the fact that he was shouting and screaming and making threats, so at that point you are fine. But he then suddenly stopped. She said the team were getting kitted up in the office ready anyway, and then they went in. She said he had laid himself flat on the bench against the wall, so when they used force it was minimal anyway, as Mr [D87] had no leverage; he had laid himself flat and his arms were trapped under the shield, so he could not do anything.

Mrs Shipp asked if that was normal. She said her issue was that when she had watched it, it did appear a little bit heavy handed, especially as it turned out he was only doing it for attention because he had been asking for food and water for hours and was not being given any. Mrs Shipp said that Mr [D87] had done that so that someone would open the door, ask if he was okay, and then he would be able to say yes, but ask for some food and water.



Ms Edwards wanted to put it into perspective; she said that Mr [D87] had eaten at lunchtime. His next evening meal would have been at about 17:30 hrs. It was agreed that the first incident took place around that time, so it was unlikely that Mr [D87] would have had his evening meal beforehand. She said he would not at that point have been offered food and water, as they would have presumed that he was going to be given his evening meal once relocated. She said Mrs Shipp was right, he did do it for attention because he clearly stated that afterwards, which was all on camera as well. She said they have to preserve life; they presumed he had done something to himself; they could not fully see the situation, through his own doing.

With regards to being offered food and water, Ms Edwards said yes.

Mrs Shipp asked at what point, as Mr [D87] had said it was until much later that night that he was given any by the night shift DCM, from Mr [D87] own room. Ms Edwards said he had refused the rest; and agreed that it was not that he was not offered it, but he refused. She said he did have like a mini shop, which he said he wanted; so he was given that. She said that a lot of stuff was taken from his room so that he could not harm himself with it; the minute he calmed down, they had to make sure he had bedding, a mattress and all the rest of it; but they also needed to look at the risk to him, and what he can do with it.

Mrs Shipp said that Mr [D87] had said he did not get any of it back until the 'nice' officer brought it back to him. Ms Edwards confirmed that the night staff start at 21:00 hrs. She said that Mr [D87] was very manipulative and he would say that no they have not done this and that because that is what he wanted Mrs Shipp to believe. She said he was not, as he says, a violent person, he has never done anything wrong; she said she would suggest that this proved differently; and the same as he would say that he was treated badly, but in reality, he was seen by Healthcare at that time, and he was not responsive to them, he did not want to know, he was shouting and screaming and being extremely abusive, and was very threatening.

Ms Brown said Mr [D87] had a significant history, and the threat that he had made to take someone hostage still exists; so when he was relocated, bearing in mind he had been non compliant with the removal, and had made a statement. He was not actively self harming; the risk to staff would be significant in view of his violence and his threats to hostage take; so to open the door to give somebody a cup of water would be fairly extreme in terms of that violence. The priority would be preservation of life and to get those items away from him.

Ms Brown said during that period of relocation, it was reported that Mr [D87] had made significant threats about wishing cancer on people's families, he was going to 'fuck' people up, he had exposed himself to another female DTM, so his behaviour during that period, from relocation to them going in the second time, was actually escalating as opposed to deescalating, so for the safety of going in and having that intervention, there was a process of identifying new staff to be kitted, to be prepared on standby. She said to be



fair they would stand there for a number of hours, pending... (there was a knock on the door, which Ms Brown dealt with).

Ms Edwards said that when they were getting the team together and talking it through, all of them were of the opinion that they believed Mr. D87 was doing what he was doing because once he had gone into the CSU and he was observed for a period with somebody at the door all the time, filming what he was saying and what he was doing, he was limbering up and puffing his chest out, they all believed that his intention by his then actions, i.e. saying he was hurting himself, was as he later stated just to get them in the room, so he could have a fight, so that he could injure people.

Mrs Shipp said he told her it was because he wanted food and water, which was why he wanted to get someone in the room. Ms Edwards said if Mrs Shipp thought about it, they had someone who was pumped up, flexing their muscles, who was screaming threats through the door, why would they then open his door to give him food and water, and put somebody in that position.

Ms Brown added that the video footage was evidence that at no point did Mr. D87 ask for some water.

Mrs Shipp asked Ms Brown if she could have a look into why that video footage had been excluded from the footage she had already seen.

Ms Edwards said they knew and thought that Mr. D87 wanted them to open the door and go in. So therefore they needed to be in the strongest position possible to prevent injury to the staff and to him; but also achieve what they wanted to achieve, which was why they did not go in until he went quiet for a period of time; it was not an hour; and it turned out that that was what he wanted because he wanted attention.

Mrs Shipp said that the point of going in with the shield and pinning him down with it, just so that they could take the ligature away from around his neck. Ms Edwards yes; and added that Mr. D87 then said that he did not have anything around his neck. They then said to him that they could see a piece of cord, he told them what he was doing, he blocked up any visible means of them being able to observe him, and then he suddenly went silent after a considerable period of abuse. What were they expected to think. Mr. D87 said he just wanted attention.

Ms Brown asked Mrs Shipp what her log said in terms of timings. Mrs Shipp said she was unsure if the timings on the recordings were correct; she said one recording began at 18:45 hrs on the time stamp. She said that she thought the timings were one hour out. Ms Edwards asked what time Mr. D87 was relocated from Eden Wing to the CSU. Mrs Shipp said it was around 17:35 hours.

Ms Edwards said a point to note was that from the moment Mr. D87 was relocated from Eden Wing through to the CSU they had a camera on him,



observing him at all times; he was not left alone for any period of time. She said the behaviour started immediately he went through there.

Mrs Shipp said from the footage she has, the camera is turned off once the officers have exited the cell in the CSU and closed the door, and Ms Edwards was saying that the footage continued. Ms Edwards said Mr [D87] immediately started to be abusive and aggressive which went on for a considerable period of time. It was established that that footage was recorded and Mrs Shipp did not have a copy; she said that she just needed that footage, not all the footage she already had.

Ms Edwards said that that went on for a long period of time, and Mr [D87] had not blocked up his spy hole etc. She said it could be that 18:45 hrs was correct because she said it was for at least an hour that Mr [D87] was like that, and it was then that he said he was going to harm himself and when he blocked his spy hole.

Mrs Shipp said she had another recording of DCM Brackenridge from 18:30 hrs saying that Mr [D87] had been relocated, he was heavily resistant; he was being watched constantly, he had blocked his viewing panel and officers were engaging with him; he was now on a four officer unlock, and his room will only be unlocked in a case of preservation of life.

Mrs Shipp said she then had a recording of Healthcare introducing themselves; and then the one of DCM Robinson asking Mr [D87] to remove the covering off, and that was the point at which seconds later the door is opened and the officers go in, which was at 18:51 hours on the recording stamp. It was established that the video footage missing was the period before that. Mrs Shipp advised that she was in no doubt that what they were telling her was the truth, but she acknowledged that it would be good to evidence it for herself.

Mrs Shipp explained what she had said to Mr [D87] and what he had said in response regarding flashing himself at the female officer who was outside the window. In summary, Mr [D87] said it was bullshit and rubbish, and whoever had said that was a liar.

Ms Edwards said it was a Security DCM that had completed an Incident Report regarding the matter. Mrs Shipp said she believed her, as she would have absolutely no reason to make it up. She said it was just another example of Mr [D87] not accepting responsibility for something he had done.

Ms Brown said that Caz would have no previous dealings with him, so there would be no reason for her to tell anything other than the truth. Ms Edwards said that Caz had a camera on too, but you would not have seen it on the camera. It was explained that the external window is frosted for decency, and then there were the bars, but you are able to see properly. Ms Edwards said as that was happening Caz was doing a running commentary of what was happening in that room on the camera. Mrs Shipp asked Ms Brown if she



could check for that recording too. Ms Brown did not think she would have had a recorder in her role as Security DCM.

Mrs Shipp said she thought the bottom line was that Mr [D87] was completely disputing that he behaved in the manner in which everyone else was saying he behaved, and he had a history of. She said there was no doubt that Mr [D87] behaved in that way, it was just interesting that from his perspective he did not do it.

Ms Brown said that Mr [D87] was fascinating to talk to because you get round to challenging his behaviour, and you tell him he has a history of violence, and he is adamant that he has not.

Mrs Shipp said she thought with the whole thing and certainly with the second incident, she wanted to be able to explain to Mr [D87] from him telling her that he was potentially dead and he was attacked and treated in that manner, but why when as far as he thought you were concerned he was killing himself, so why would you treat somebody, in his eyes, in such an abusive and threatening manner, when he felt that someone should have just opened the door and asked him if he was okay because there was no response from him. She said Mr [D87] did not expect the officers to go charging in with the shield.

Ms Edwards said that Mr [D87] had said that a couple of days later; he said he did not get it, but it was explained to him quite clearly actually they had had to use force on him earlier, he was a man of significant strength, they needed to protect staff and officers, some of which had been injured. She said they explained why they went in like that; they explained the behaviour and what he was saying he was doing to himself.

Mrs Shipp asked if Mr [D87] had accepted the explanation, which she presumed not. Ms Edwards said in one way he sort of did, but in the other way said as far as they thought, and he thought, he was dead. She said but actually he then said he only did it to get their attention, so in which case he could have been at such a level, he suddenly goes quiet to get attention, they go in, and that was exactly what he wanted; and then he could have pounced; and you could not have put officers and Healthcare people in that situation, without being in kit, even if it would take an hour because of what he had just done.

Mrs Shipp said from Mr [D87] perspective, he said fast forward it a couple of hours to when the 'nice' officer, the night shift DCM came on, and he was talking to him, they had the door open, they were letting him come and go; so Mr [D87] feels like he was treated differently by different officers.

Ms Brown said that that DCM was individually tasked with de-escalating Mr [D87] and he was still on a four officer unlock that next day; so when she came on duty the next day, it was her and he was still on a four man unlock. She said that Jack Banister did go down to talk to him, because Mr [D87] liked him. Ms Edwards added that Jack, who has left now, was one of her Tinsley



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



forced too and it wasn't that they were willing to do it because they were his friends, and he felt a sense of betrayal. Mrs Shipp said she understood that.

Mrs Shipp said Mr [D87] had also said, which she could see would have elements of truth in it; that Sean and Aaron also said that they had told Dean that they were willing to go and talk to him because they get on with him, and they were sure if they had spoken to him that he would have listened to them, which Mr [D87] said was absolutely true. Mrs Shipp said she presumed that this was not an option to take. Ms Brown agreed.

Mrs Shipp asked if either officer would have had the opportunity to have visited Mr [D87] that night, given he was on a constant watch; or did they know what time the officers went off shift. Ms Edwards said there was nothing to suggest that they did, but equally there is nothing to say that they could not have popped down there at some point.

Ms Brown said the ACDT should reflect that they visited if they had. She said herself she had gone down to speak to someone after an incident, as you may need to open the door to them the next day, so you would want to start building your relationship back up. Mrs Shipp said she understood that but she believed that if it did happen, it may have been taken out of context a little.

Mrs Shipp said that Mr [D87] also alleged that once he was relocated into the CSU he was constantly asking for food and water, but he was ignored and not given any. She asked if this was true, would it be written in the log or noted anywhere else; i.e. was there anywhere that could prove or disprove that he was constantly asking for food and water.

Ms Edwards said the recording; and Ms Brown said that the ACDT would not have been opened at that point because he had not self harmed.

Ms Brown said that Mr [D87] was a very articulate chap; she said when she sat and spoke to him, he knew the Detention Centre Rule, and asked her under what section he was there.

Ms Edwards said she thought regarding the food and water point was that it was the point when potentially they would have been bringing his food, or unlocking the rest of the Centre for food; unfortunately he was behind his door being extremely abusive and aggressive, and threatening to harm himself; so it was that hour that he would have been fed, but he wasn't due to what he was doing. She said had he have sat for five minutes he would have been given his dinner.

Mrs Shipp asked if they had any additional information to add that they thought may help with the investigation; for example, anything relevant relating to Mr [D87]'s history whilst in the Centre that they had not already told her about.



Ms Edwards said obviously they had said about getting the CCTV around the events; and she did not know if Security had any other information, she just had the Annex A document. Mrs Shipp said that document in itself was enough in itself; the fact that Mr [D87] alleges he was 100 per cent compliant, and non violent etc.

Ms Edwards said that the only thing that was not on the document, as far as she could see, was what Mr [D87] was in prison for. Mrs Shipp said she had that information from CID. Ms Edwards said it was just relating to his history in the Centre, but she thought his prison history was quite significant and to be fair if glancing at it, it was violence i.e. threats to kill etc; and there was a history of hostage taking and possible ABH, which Mrs Shipp would have to check. She believed that he went to prison for violence, so it may be something that Mrs Shipp would want to add in. Mrs Shipp said she thought she had plenty.

Ms Brown just added that Mr [D87] was a real influential person in the Centre; he had been on their Detainee of Interest meeting for a number of weeks, due to his nature and his influence amongst other detainees.

Ms Edwards said that she did have another point, having glanced at the complaint and having read through it. She said some of it was not factually correct at all; she said he stated that what happened that day was a continuation of what was caused by Michelle Brown; but none of the decision making process, none of the reasons he was moved involved Michelle at any point whatsoever, in relation to these two incidents.

Mrs Shipp said they were back to if Ms Brown did not have the issues with Mr [D87] that he believed she had, then none of it would have happened, as he believed it was as a result of the initial stuff that escalated into these incidents, hence he still blamed her whether it was her fault or not.

Ms Edwards said the only other thing she could say was that it was not 13 officers that entered his room for the second incident. She said she thought it was two team of three, one went in and one was a back up. Yes there would have been a Manager there and she would have been in the vicinity; and there would have been Healthcare present. Mrs Shipp said she believed there would have been 13 people present in total, but not all in his room.

Ms Brown felt it was bravado, so that Mr [D87] could say that it took 13 of them to restrain him.

When asked Ms Edwards and Ms Brown had no questions for Mrs Shipp, and nothing else to add. Ms Brown said that she would obtain the SIR re the DCOs conversation; and it was confirmed that Mrs Shipp should be able to take it away with her that day. Ms Brown explained that the camera footage may take a lot longer because she was working through a lot of camera forage at that time; but she would aim to get it to Mrs Shipp in the next day or two.



Mrs Shipp provided her contact details; and explained what happens next; she thanked them both for their time, and concluded the interview at 11:27 hrs.