

Mr [D668] Interview summary

20 December 2017

Start: 12:37 hrs

End: 16:06 hrs

Present:

Helen Wilkinson, Investigating Officer (IO), Professional Standards Unit, Home Office

Mr [D668], Complainant

Puja Nandi, Senior Caseworker, Representative from Duncan Lewis:

IO Wilkinson provided background to the Professional Standards Unit. IO Wilkinson explained the investigation process, regarding Mr [D668]'s time at Brook House Immigration Removal Centre (IRC). IO Wilkinson referred to Mr [D668]'s solicitors letters of 19 and 29 September, in which they complained that on 29 June Mr [D668] had been taken from Brook House for a removal and was brought back to Brook House, and the complaint was about the conduct of staff on that day, so IO Wilkinson would be looking at that. Mr [D668] also mentioned about the conduct of healthcare staff on 2 occasions when he went to see the doctor, so IO Wilkinson would be clarifying dates with Mr [D668]. There was an early July one and a September one. IO Wilkinson stated that she could talk to healthcare but could not enforce anything. If it was about procedures IO Wilkinson could make recommendations and those would be sent back for healthcare to look at. IO Wilkinson asked for descriptions to identify the people involved.

Then there were 2 occasions on the second week of August when he was in D wing and the water being poured on him and then on 17th or 18th of August the other detainee who was on the stairs, how he was with you and what G4S did about that. IO Wilkinson would be focussing on what the officers were doing as that is what the investigation was for today.

IO Wilkinson would also be looking at 24 August, when Mr [D668] had a visit with his brother, and the DCO on that visit. Mr [D668] had mentioned the toilets and the lock up procedure at Brook House, IO Wilkinson would be taking some further details about that and it would be looked at wider as there are some other reviews taking place that were specifically looking at those. IO Wilkinson would take any information that Mr [D668] had and feed that back into those reviews.

IO Wilkinson stated that after today's meeting, using the information Mr [D668] provided and from other areas of information, that IO Wilkinson would be able to identify, from incident reports and any other information, who these officers were. IO Wilkinson doubted she would be able to obtain the CCTV, as too much time had

passed, but would still request it. Once IO Wilkinson had obtained all her information she would arrange to speak with these officers directly and speak to them about the concerns that Mr [D668] has raised, and find out from them what was happening, what action they did or did not take and their justification.

Once IO Wilkinson has looked at all the evidence she will put together an investigation report, that will talk about her findings in terms of his complaint. She will look at each area and make a decision looking at the evidence she has collected. The decision will be on the balance of probability so that is the civil level, not criminal level. IO Wilkinson will be deciding whether the complaint is substantiated or un substantiated. Once she has completed her report, she will write to Mr [D668], so he will get a letter from her, saying she has investigated, what she has looked at and what her findings are and her reasons for that. If after Mr [D668] has read that letter, there are any areas that he is not satisfied with, say he wants to appeal any of the findings that she has made, then he can do that to the Prison and Probation Ombudsman, because they have oversight of the work that they do in the Home Office, on the detention side of things. Mr [D668] will be sent a letter that goes through what he can do afterwards.

IO Wilkinson asked that Mr [D668] provided his own answers. She explained the process of the meeting today. IO Wilkinson explained the use of the digital recorder. IO Wilkinson explained that a summary would be made of the interview and this would be sent out to Mr [D668] or his representatives.

Mr [D668] asked about all the names, of the security, who have responsibility for what has been done at Brook House. What happens to them, will you be able to give them the sack or are they going to be prosecuted?" IO Wilkinson explained that she would put recommendations at the end of her investigation report. If she found that an officer has behaved inappropriately, that would be passed back to G4S to look at misconduct, whilst IO Wilkinson can raise issues and in serious cases can revoke their accreditation, they would have to follow their own internal misconduct process. Given the seriousness of the allegations the PSU would have oversight of that, they have a section within the department that checks whether recommendations are taken forward. G4S would follow their own internal misconduct process and they would be looking for an independent manager, who wasn't involved in the complaint, to conduct that disciplinary. With the disciplinary process, it would then go to an Employment Tribunal and then there would be oversight from the tribunal.

Mr [D668] explained that if he or other detainees had broken the law, or made criminal acts, that means that they are criminals, they must be prosecuted and put in jail, because of their own law, that they use at Brook House, they put in for detainees, about the G4S staff, this said that any abuse to our staff, assault,

threatening or abuse, all detainees will be referred for a criminal prosecution from the police, they will be prosecuted and certainly you will be put in jail.

IO Wilkinson explained that she had not mentioned that when they have allegations like these, that anything with a criminal element is referred to the police. So Sussex Police are aware of the allegations that have been made and are happy at this stage for the PSU to look at it. (*Clarified post interview: The police have not been notified in this case as the issues relate to conduct rather than criminal matters*). If at any stage IO Wilkinson finds anything that she feels is criminal, she will refer to the police and they may take over the investigation or they may be happy for IO Wilkinson to continue and review her investigation at the end. So she works quite closely with the police.

Mr [D668] explained that his situation is about the 6 or 5 G4S security regarding the BBC Panorama, he needs to [inaudible] for a long time, then [inaudible] one of the colleague made him take the camera and give it to the BBC Panorama. They were suspended. What they have done was worse. When they were suspended the G4S officers were saying they would go anywhere, that mean [inaudible] they don't make them to take notice about what they could have done badly to detainees, so they need to be prosecuted to make them stop and behave. Stop what they have been doing to all these detainees.

IO Wilkinson clarified what Mr [D668] was saying; that there were some G4S officers after the Panorama programme who said that colleagues' dismissal would not affect how they were behaving and they would carry on.

Mr [D668] stated that only 2 weeks ago, outside, one man fainted, he called Mr [D668], he had stayed at Brook House, that state, he had been abused, so Mr [D668] told him to speak to a solicitor. 2 weeks after his complaint, he and some detainees were put in segregation for 1 week. For 2 days he was texting Mr [D668] saying he was dying, they had not given him any food or water. He still has them to show. They had taken away his phone. His name is [D1249]. IO Wilkinson explained that Mr [D1249] needs to fill in a complaint form.

IO Wilkinson reads from [D1249]'s phone: Hey brother, I am here for God, without food and water they never give me. Something to eat soon I will die here, this is my message to you, thanks.

IO Wilkinson stated that this was a very serious message and asked what contact Mr [D668] had since. Mr [D668] stated that they had transferred Mr [D1249] a week ago, to the centre behind Heathrow Airport, he had been moved to Harmondsworth. IO Wilkinson advised that Mr [D668] asked Mr [D1249] to put in a complaint, that she couldn't look at it as part of Mr [D668]'s complaint.

Mr [D668] wanted to clarify this point, to probe whether the abuse still carried on, he still has some friends there and nothing has changed, he was there to ensure that they are told that if they don't take proper steps and it carries on then you will go to jail. He felt that was the best way to make it stop.

Rep Nandi asked how long it would be before they received the report. IO Wilkinson stated that they were looking at mid to late February, they had a tight timescale to do that, which involved getting hold of officers, after Christmas. Rep Nandi asked whether the staff were aware of these complaints or had it been referred only to PSU. IO Wilkinson stated that it had come through PSU straight away and they were liaising with an independent person who doesn't work at Brook House to obtain all the evidence. Rep Nandi asked whether that had already started, IO Wilkinson confirmed that she had already asked for evidence that she was aware that she needed to get hold of.

Rep Nandi asked whether IO Wilkinson would like a copy of the witness statement, IO Wilkinson stated yes. Rep Nandi confirmed that this was a more detailed version.

IO Wilkinson stated that as already notified there are 2 other independent reviews also taking place. These are looking at the wider issues of staff culture at Brook House, the toilet and the lock up process, so those are going on at the same time. IO Wilkinson felt that these were due to finish after her investigation and so would be feeding things into those investigations.

Rep Nandi asked what these 2 reviews were. IO Wilkinson explained that Sir Steven Shaw was taking another look at the previous report that he did and there was an independent review being done by Kate Lampard, looking at things, so there was quite a lot of scrutiny. IO Wilkinson stated that she would seek to obtain the names of those involved in Mr [D668]'s investigation and seek to prevent these things happening again.

Rep Nandi sought to clarify whether the other reviews were being done to look at the general conditions at Brook House off the back of general litigation. IO Wilkinson confirmed this was correct. IO Wilkinson stated that she would be looking specifically at Mr [D668]'s complaint.

Mr [D668] starts from 29 June. It was painful, making him cry, you try to forget what troubles you, but he wants to speak out. He feels very angry, he has some feelings of hate. On 29 June the day before they told him that he had to fly back to Ivory Coast. He was in shock, so he didn't have any sleep. On the morning one officer came to his room he told Mr [D668] that he had to pack his stuff. They said his flight was at 4:15. They came at 8 o'clock and told him that he had to pack his stuff,

because they would come to pick him up to go to the airport. He called his solicitor, she said that she had to work on his papers to go to the High Court to get an injunction to block the flight. She told him to relax, that she would do her best. He sat waiting for her call back. Around 10 another officer came and said that he had to go to the airport. He said ok one minute, let me take my stuff. It was like rushing, "Get your stuff and get out there".

He was in shock, "Take your stuff, get out there". So he was worried about the way they were going to remove him, because he still had a reason to live in this country and this officer was talking to him like that. So he gathered himself, packed his stuff and went down to the induction wing. He took his stuff and went down to reception. The lady told him that he was getting in a car and go to another centre, it is for G4S as well, he has forgotten the name, they wanted to take 2 other detainees as well, one from Canada and one from another country. You will arrive at Gatwick Airport for around 12. His solicitor told him that when he got to the airport he should ask for a telephone as they will not be able to call him. He had given back his G4S phone. So when he arrived at Gatwick Airport he asked for the phone, they gave him a phone, he put his SIM card in, after 1pm his solicitor called him. She said that she had done the paperwork, that she was sending it to his caseworker, everything will be done, that she knew he was very, very down and she would do her best to get him out of there. At 2 o'clock she called him back and said she had sent all the paperwork to his caseworker, in Croydon, so before 2 o'clock they may send you back to Brook House because they had done a Judicial Review.

She asked how things were. He told her that they were still putting pressure on him, to get ready, because the plane was down there, that he had to pack his stuff. She told him that he did not have to go because they had an injunction, that his caseworker had to call them to tell them that they had to take him back to Brook House.

They came back to him again, they asked him if he was ready. He said no, he didn't have to go, his solicitor had just called and said "that, that, that". They said ok, they don't deal with solicitor only the Home Office, they had to take him to the plane. Then if the Home Office tell them, they are to remove him on another date, that they were doing their job. Mr [D668] told he respected that was their job, they was their right, but he had his rights as well, his solicitor told him that he didn't have to go, they cannot force him and she would speak to someone at the Home Office. They said ok, we are with you, we have to wait. So after waiting 10, 20, 30 minutes he didn't see anything from his Home Office caseworker, so he called his solicitor back and explained the situation. She said OK, ask the G4S man there for the fax number, she would fax them there to show them the proof, then they would leave it alone. Mr [D668] told them that his solicitor called and needed their fax number to send the papers. They said they did not have a fax number, they don't have a fax. He said

"What!" he was in shock, he saw the fax was on the table there, why they didn't want to give the fax number. So he called his solicitor back. She asked Mr [D668] to put the officer on the phone. So he tried to hand the phone over but they wouldn't take it. He told his solicitor that they wouldn't take the phone. She said OK, if they came to pick him up, don't go, stay there, they can't do anything. If they tried to force him, that would end in a fight, because he has seen detainees come back who have been beaten up, so he asked his solicitor what he should do. She said to not say anything, if they try to attack him, to save himself. He said that to save himself he would have to fight and he did not want to do that. Because that would be very bad and he didn't want to do that. She said OK, calm down and she would call the caseworker back and get back to him.

The officers came to him again and said that he had to go now. He said he did not want to go. They said ok if you do not want to go they would force him to go. He said OK, I will go to the toilet and come back, so he went into the toilet and locked the door. So he was waiting for his solicitor to call him. She called her caseworker at the airport. They came to unlock the door, he went out, there was someone from the Home Office who wanted to speak to him, she said that he had been in the country since 2009 so he couldn't do anything about his case, his caseworker had to tell them that he needed to be sent back to Brook House, that they didn't need to remove him, they were still waiting for his caseworker to call, before the plane took off. The plane was going from Gatwick, Morocco and the Lagos. So he was still waiting, they didn't say anything.

Then they said they had to go to the plane. He said that he had already told them that he didn't want to go. He told Mr [D668] that if he didn't want to go he would take him by force, that he didn't think that he wanted to do that, because something as simple as that, giving him a fax number, he didn't know why they didn't give him the fax number. He told them that they didn't want to listen, did they have the papers, they only wanted to take him to put him on the plane, without him being willing to go.

One of them called the others into another office and came back to him, called him into another room and told him to sit down. He was so distressed he was shaking, he had hurt himself on the door when he was rushing to lock it. There was blood there and they saw it so they gave him something to block the blood coming out. They asked him why he didn't want to go, he said he explained to them already, his solicitor was sending a fax, how did they want him to explain something again. They said ok they would write everything done, to pack your stuff, you go back to Brook House, so he called his solicitor and informed his solicitor about the decision. She say ok follow their decisions, so he packed his stuff and they went back to Brook House.

When he got to Brook House, there was another scenario again, someone who came from [inaudible], he was seeing them fighting, he was in shock, he didn't know where he was. He had stars in his eyes and didn't know where he was. When he got back to Brook House, one of them who was sat at the table there started laughing, so he looked at them, one said oh he was coming back, so he was like speechless, he didn't know what to say, so he looked at them, he felt very down. He asked himself if he deserved to live. In his head was if they try something again, he was going to do something very, very bad. When the officers were laughing when he was brought back, Mr [D668] felt powerless. He only had his eyes to express himself, tears. He sat down, they kept some of his stuff, because they told him that he was not allowed to take it onto the wing. They took some fingerprints and pictures. He was waiting for hours. He went back to his wing and dinner time was over, so he didn't have food on 29th. He didn't feel like eating. The roommate that he was sharing with in the morning told him "I knew that you would come back. Did you eat something?" Mr [D668] told him no and he got some croissants at the airport at around 1 o'clock. He asked if the staff had given him anything to eat, he said no. Even if he were to eat something, he wouldn't feel it, in case maybe he felt sick after. Maybe after midnight he should not eat anything. His roommate said that he had to eat something. Mr [D668] went to his room. He was waiting until 7:30 for the papers to tell him that he wasn't to be sent back. These papers followed him to Brook House. He saw the papers and was crying, he realised they played games, they didn't send the paper to tell him at the airport. So they had the papers, so with any reason they wanted to send him, notice that is unlawful.

He was frightened, he realised that they were playing games. Why they didn't they give the papers to the airport, why was it when he came back to Brook House after 7:30, they gave him the envelope with the paper. He got the decision about the Judicial Review at Brook House rather than at the airport.

Then he called his solicitor to say he had now received the papers, she said ok, when he called the Home Office around 3, before 4, one HO officer at the airport said his flight was at 6:30, he don't them not to play with him, his flight was at 4:15 not 6:30.

IO Wilkinson stated that in terms of the unlawfulness of the removal, she would not be able to look at that but that he could write into his caseworker about that and they would have to look into that. It would be something separate. IO Wilkinson stated that she would look at the reactions of the officers when he came back and the officer in his room earlier, before he went.

After a couple of days in the reception wing, they sent him to D wing. Whilst in Brook House he went into induction, then went to D wing and stayed in D wing from there. He was in D wing in the first week of July. He had a head problem, a headache and

depression with flash backs of the torture in Ivory Coast. He felt the same torture, psychology, the same way when he was in Brook House, he lost sleep, he wasn't sleeping and it was bringing back memories. He called his solicitor to explain this, his solicitor at the time said that she had to go to healthcare and explain to the doctor, they had to help him with his stress, depression and flashbacks.

Then his kid brother called him and said he had contacted Lambeth MP Helen. She wrote to the Home Office, Immigration and explained his case, that they had to look at his Rule 35 and follow procedures before they do something at the last minute. His brother told him if he went to healthcare to book a Rule 35 assessment. That was the second week of July. He went to healthcare that time. Healthcare surgery was open 9:30 to 11:30. So he went there about 11, something like that. He went to see the nurse and then the doctor to explain his case and ask for Rule 35. When he arrived at the door, the nurse had already closed the door, so he had this mobile and check the time, the nurse came to the door and asked him what he wanted, he said he had to get in, she said it was full. He said there were places there, it wasn't full, plus he still had time to get in. The nurse was very nervous and very rude. Just like that, he was on the phone, she was standing on the other side of the door, she didn't want to open the door. He stood out there, trying to get in. In the end she opened the door and let him in. When he got in she closed the door. So anyone else coming would have the same problem. As soon as she closed the door she went to him and asked for his reason why he had come to see the nurse. Do you imagine, in front of the other detainees. This was in front of the other detainees, it was confidential, why did he have to explain what he had come to do, if he had come to healthcare, it was to do with his healthcare and it was something personal/confidential. You don't have to explain why you have come in front of other detainees.

He asked her "What is wrong with you, why are you doing that" she didn't answer to him, she went back to another detainee, his brother in Christ, they pray in the same church in Brook House. She went to this man and asked him the same question that she had asked Mr [D668] before. He also asked her why she behaved like that. She went away to the offices and closed the door. Mr [D668] asked him "You see why she has done this?" he said "Yes he saw it", Mr [D668] said "I have to make a complaint". Then he said he wouldn't bother because other people have told him the same story, the service provided by healthcare has been worse, so he didn't want to waste his time, filling out the complaint form. He had gone to see the nurse, his Rule 35 explained about his stress and depression that he is still having. Mr [D668] does not know the name of the nurse who was rude. She was of Spanish descent. She was the only nurse there who hides her ID, the ID is inside her coat. If he saw their pictures he could point her out. The same one came back and did the same thing again on 7 September. She had the same hair as IO Wilkinson, so brown, was of Spanish or Portuguese descent. He could not remember how long her hair was. A lot of people have complained about this nurse. A colleague of the nurse told him this

when he had asked for this nurse's name. She was between 40 to 45 years old. She was a little bigger than IO Wilkinson but about the same height (five foot four inches).

She was the nurse in reception but he saw a different nurse because he was the last person there to make a Rule 35 appointment.

He thinks this was the morning of second week in July, the same day that he asked for his R35 appointment. After a week or 10 days he went there to do his assessment for Rule 35, he also saw the doctor who prescribed the anti depression tablets. His solicitor started with him in July and told him to write down everything that had been happening. He tried to find the nurse's details on Google in August but didn't find anything. The G4S staff who have abused people have got their names there. At that time he didn't have the nurse's name. After that he did his Rule 35 appointment on 24 July.

In August he got the water in the bucket. He was sitting down on the canteen on D Wing, it was past one. Lunchtime was between 12 and 1:30, so he went out. When they open the doors, he doesn't like to go early because you hear people screaming, shouting, fighting, some jump the queue, G4S staff there don't say anything because they are frightened of the detainee trouble makers. If you go later, you get to sit down and you can eat. He was there at one. He went there, he was sat with his friend [D450], [D1249] was the one who was put in segregation for one week) and they were having some lunch on D wing. There is an eating place, a servery and tables. There were 4 people at the table and there was food on the table. They were sitting and chatting, sharing their feelings when suddenly, "boom", all of his body and the food and water inside. It hit both him and his friend. There was plenty of water, it hit both of them. When they looked up he saw one person run away. So he looked at his friend and said [D450], we have got to go up there and find out who did this. Mr [D668] went first and [D450] followed. He got his roommate, he said don't go there because they are very trouble makers, we are going to fight. Mr [D668] said he wanted to find out who did that to report to security. So they went there to where the water came from. When he got there he had an idea who it was who could do that. He said there were two rooms and the trouble makers were in these rooms, everyone knows that. There were 2 trouble makers.

When he got there, the person had ran away with the bucket, the water drops from the bucket, led from where the water had been thrown, back to this man's room. He saw the bucket which was still wet inside. He confronted the man, who argued with him aggressively. He doesn't know the man's name, he was Jamaican, a drug dealer who had come from prison. So he started aggressively, he noticed that the man was ready to fight so he told [D450] that they should calm down, go back to explain to security. So they went and explained it to security. Security told them to calm down

and they would find out who did that. He told security they knew who did that. He asked them what they were going to do, they said they would check on the CCTV. He said OK that's the proof, you will see who did that. So they were waiting there, go to check on the CCTV and take action right now, to make us feel safe, to make us feel justice, then they could go back to their room, change their clothes and continue their journey.

They went out and came back, saying the CCTV room was busy, they would come back to them as soon as possible. So [D450] told them not to go, that they should stand there until they did something about the person who threw the water. So they waited for 10 to 15 minutes, for nothing. So he went back to see the security staff again, because they knew what they were complaining about. So they said calm down, they were going to sort it out, don't worry, they were going to check the camera and get back to them. So he said [D450], no point waiting that they should go change and come back. So he went back to the table to pick up his food and throw it away. He went back to his room and got changed, and sat down in his room. He called his solicitor who told him later to write everything down. [D450] came and told him to go back to the office.. This happened 12 August. at 1:20pm. [D450] had noted the date as his solicitor had asked for this as well.

Mr [D668] described the officer as English of Irish descent, Brian or something. He is well built with a tattoo on his left upper arm of a dragon or something. [D450] knows his name. They went back to reception wing to see him and spoke to his colleague there. He worked in the security office at G4S. He told them that he had finished his shift and that he had to go. So his G4S colleague in reception would deal with the matter. There was a small office on the gate. When you get on the wing there was a small office. The security officer had passed it on to his colleagues on D wing office to carry on with enquiries. He did not know the names of the D Wing officers.

Mr [D668] then went to church, [D450] is [Sensitive/Irrelevant] then after that he went to the library or IT room. Then the IT was crap and they went back to the library. Then before dinner he went back to his room. Then before 4:30 he called Mr [D668] and told him they had to go to their room. So they went there and he asked about the person who had thrown the water. The officers said that they had seen the person. They asked who it was and were told that they couldn't say. [D450] asked why they couldn't say, they said that if they gave them the name of the person they would go and fight him. Mr [D668] and [D450] said no, they didn't want to fight, they wanted to know who it was that they were going to take action against. They (G4S) said they were going to deal with it. Mr [D668] knew who had done it but wanted G4S to tell them. But they didn't say. He wanted action to be taken to feel secure. Mr [D668] felt very frightened, distressed and unsafe, so he didn't bother himself to go the food hall to eat, he asked his roommate to bring him up some food.

Mr [D668] could not remember the room numbers of the people involved, trouble makers. Viewing the first floor, it was the 2 last rooms on the right. No on the second floor. On the left is the exit door, the rooms were on the right.

The officer who said he was finishing shift, spoke to them in the afternoon, before 4:30. He was a security officer. The officers he had spoken to were D wing officers.

He didn't eat there for 2 to 3 days. He knew who had done it and expected something to be done about it to stop it happening again and nothing was done. He felt unsafe. That was 12 August. The issue was he had complained and nothing had been done about his complaint so he felt unsafe.

Between the stairs, he was coming from the church, between the stairs there is a camera. What was shocking him was, that day everything was on camera, even the drug dealers, deal their drugs on the stairs, some take their Spice there. The camera is there. They ask themselves what does the camera mean, everything goes on there, on the stairs. They sell their drugs on the stairs everybody knows that. They take drugs and Spice on the stairs. They are vomiting there, they lie on the floor there. The security do not come, it is for them to go down the wing or go to the library, then go out the exit door, to go to the library, you have to call security in the library to let them know someone is lying on the floor there, like a zombie, vomiting. So they run away and call healthcare staff.

What shocked him is that the camera is there, which means that they know what is going on. They don't see the security come, or if somebody runs away, because the camera, one of the corner of the camera saw something to call over the radio on the stairs that someone is lying there on the stairs, they just dropped there, nothing, it is us, we see them and tell security. There is no action. So they keep quiet. Because if you over there and they attack you, what happens to you. Because they have a weapon, a knife, somebody uses a can, a milk can, one of the caps, they took it off and kept it in their pocket, it is very sharp. Made out of the lid of the tin. Security don't give you the security staff so you have to keep quiet. Even bullying you have to keep quiet. It says you have to report everything for your safety, or your welfare you have to keep quiet. It is like a jungle. He confirmed that when he raised something nothing was done, so he doesn't raise anything because the detainee could attack him with the tin lid and security would do nothing, so he says nothing.

The staircase is the one you use to go to the library, IT room or the church or the church or to the shop. On D wing all the detainees use it to pass out this way. There is only one stairway for D wing. There is a camera on there. He was coming from the church to go to the library. So he wanted to take the stairs. On the first platform there was a guy from East Europe, from Albania. There is different criminal groups there;

an Albanian team, a Jamaican team, an Afghan team. All the thing that he has said, the G4S team already know. There are groups and they know that. The Jamaica team control the drug traffic. And that was the gentleman who poured the water on him.

The guy on the staircase on this occasion was from the Albanian group. Mr [D668] was trying to get out down the stairs and the Albanian guy was coming up the stairs, with his 3 or 4 friends. Mr [D668] was on his own. The Albanian was in the middle of the stairs. Mr [D668] was managing his route, but they both went the same way, so Mr [D668] automatically recognises that the man wanted to trouble make. Mr [D668] managed to avoid the hit by swinging his shoulder away from the man. He looked back at the man and asked him why he did that. The man faced him and used the f word. Once he used the f word, Mr [D668] thought "wow", so he showed his finger. So he came back to Mr [D668] to attack him. One of his friends grabbed him but he still came close to him to assault him. Mr [D668]'s friend [D1249] was coming through the door and saw the incident. So he grabbed the guy and took him out up the stairs. The guy was shouting. [D1249] told [D668] to go. [D668] was in shock. He didn't know whether to go or stay. [D1249] said let's go. G4S security called Dember from Gambia. He said [D668], [D668], no fighting. Come here don't fight. Mr [D668] said he wasn't fighting, this guy shoved him on his shoulder, he assaulted him. Dember said that the Albanian was a trouble maker and not to mess with them. Mr [D668] told Dember that he was not messing with them. It was just that he was there and the Albanian guy tried to attack him. Dember told him to go to his wing and make a complaint. Mr [D668] said he was going to go. He went to the library and sat down. He was thinking. Then he went to his room and made the complaint. He went to security, and told them what happened to me. He made a verbal complaint. That was on 17/18 August. Mr [D668] does not remember who he spoke to in security office, or what he looked like, it was just whoever was on duty that day. Dember usually works on B wing, but was on D wing that day.

The security office is on the right hand side when you open the door onto D Wing. Every wing has a security office. They have a room down there. Each wing has a security office and it is opposite the kitchen. That is separate to the office where the wing officers sit in the staff office.

Mr [D668] explained that the Albanian guy was walking past and used his shoulder to push him out of the way. He shoved his shoulder against Mr [D668]'s shoulder. What struck him, that type of person is known to them, because they are fighting all the time on the wing. This one is known for fighting Afghan detainees. They know already that this is someone who is very violent. A dangerous person. He carries on because they don't take proper action against him.

When Mr [D668] reported the incident security told him that they would deal with the incident. He heard nothing since then. This Albanian guy is carrying on. The next day, when Mr [D668] went to have his food, the Albanian guy came and sat opposite him. He looked Mr [D668] in the eyes and tried to fight him. Mr [D668] took his food and left. The Albanian tried to intimidate Mr [D668]. The main thing was that no action was taken, Dember was aware of the incident on the stairs and Mr [D668] informed security and no action was taken. Dember works on B wing, but it is security on D wing who have to do something. They needed to go to Dember and ask who the guy was, or go to Mr [D668] and ask him, get his feedback, but they didn't get his feedback.

Mr [D668] knew Dember's name from the library. He saw him in the library and saw his name badge. Some officers have their name badge's visible, some hide it. Dember had his name badge visible. The ones who hide their badge are hiding something, they are concerned about something. Dember was not hiding his badge.

IO Wilkinson asked Mr [D668] to obtain [D1249]'s full name, pass it to his representatives and they can pass it on to her.

IO Wilkinson asked Mr [D668] if he wanted a break or was alright to carry on. Mr [D668] asked the time, IO Wilkinson advised him it was 5 past 2, he said "OK, because I have an appointment at the doctor at half past 4." IO Wilkinson said "ok, we'll keep going then, if you do need a break you can have one."

Mr [D668] stated that the Albanian had come from prison, drug dealers. All the trouble makers come from prison. What was striking Mr [D668] was how they can put all the drug dealers from prison with asylum seekers they are trying to remove. Personally he does not have a criminal record. Most of them have a criminal record. His friends, roommate don't have a criminal record and mixing the 2 is very dangerous. You have to take notice. G4S know, because they have the background of all the detainees. You have to put people from prison on another side, you have to put people who have not come from prison, asylum seekers, you have to put them on another side. You put us there, because it is a safe place, outside, communities and families, but you put us in danger there, you fail us. You realise that you are putting us in a very difficult situation, you have to deal with jobs, criminals, you feel like they have put you in somewhere, they want to hurt you, you have to see life with your instincts or your brain.

Regarding 18 August, Mr [D668] also complained about something where he was a witness. IO Wilkinson explained that she could not look at that, she was only looking at incidents where he had been directly affected. This was about his friend being assaulted by security staff. IO Wilkinson suggested that his friend made a complaint. Mr [D668] spoke about his friend's T-Shirt being stolen. His friend [D1249] was

attacked. A security man came to separate the detainees. The G4S man who assaulted his friend, nothing happened, Mr [D668] was scared the same thing would happen to him. IO Wilkinson stated that Mr [D668]'s friend needed to make the complaint. Mr [D668] asked for IO Wilkinson to take his witness of the incident into account. Mr [D668] said that the G4S officer assaulted his friend and this was abuse. He was shocked and went back to his room. He felt that G4s were ready to do something to him, so he was ready to do something to them as well. IO Wilkinson restated that as he was a witness the friend needed to make the complaint. Mr [D668] stated that he was involved, the guy who was selling the T-shirt, asked the guy to give back the T-shirt and he refused. He attacked my friend. The security guy came to back up the guy and grabbed my friends neck. IO Wilkinson stated that she understood what Mr [D668] was saying but she could only investigate the incidents that directly affected him. Mr [D668] stated that he felt unsafe. IO Wilkinson stated that she could take that part of what was happening within Brook House but she could not investigate it. She strongly suggested that his friend needed to report it as it needed looking into.

IO Wilkinson stated that she could only look into what his representative had put forward in their letter, so the events of 12 and 20 August, about the other detainees, [D1249] in segregation, she asked that Mr [D668] speak to [D1249] about putting in his own complaint as she could not look at these.

Now looking at the visit with Mr [D668]'s brother. It was the same security guy, he was the one on 29 June, Darren Tomsett. IO Wilkinson showed Mr [D668] some two pictures. He was shown Darren Tomsett. The Darren Tomsett Mr [D668] is talking about is English and has a beard, is bald. This picture is not clear. IO Wilkinson showed him a picture of a different Darren. The only other Darren at Brook House. Mr [D668] stated that this second picture was not the Darren that he was talking about.

IO Wilkinson clarified that the first picture was the right Darren but he had a beard when Mr [D668] knew him. He was the one who was also on duty on the day Mr [D668] left on 29th. Darren Tomsett was the one who came to Mr [D668]'s room on his removal day and told him to get out.

Mr [D668] did not know who the officers were on reception who were laughing at him when he came back from his removal. They do not work on the wing, they are only on reception. He could not provide their names or what they looked like. IO Wilkinson stated that she would find out who was working on reception at the time he came back and talk to them.

Darren Tomsett was the officer on duty when Mr [D668]'s brother came to visit. His brother called him before he got to the detention centre, it is a long procedure to get

in, so Mr [D668] knew when he would arrive. Mr [D668] went to the IT room, it is close to the visit room. When the visitor sits down they announce your name on the microphone, so when he heard his name he went there. When he saw it was this officer, he was feeling nervous because everybody knows that this officer is racist. Mr [D668] has heard that he is racist, the way that he treated Mr [D668] on the first day was racist., He did not know it at that time. In July after a couple of months, August, when he did that to him, when his brother came to see him. Other detainees on the A wing said that the way he talked to them, he sometimes used a racist word. Mr [D668], the first time he had a word with him, was on 29th. So when they said, he never had this man again] until his brother came to see him. He went in the room and saw him (Darren) and was very nervous. The only things he told Mr [D668] was "Come here". The way he said "Come Here" was very, very rude. Any other time he has seen security on a visit, they have been so nice. "[D668] Please come forward", there was no please, no hi, it was aggressive, come here straight away. Mr [D668] was really aware what was going on. He did not know how it was going to end. He wanted to leave, he had all his paperwork there to show to his brother. He was told to stand with his hands away. The way he touched my body, I felt very abused. He was very, very rough when he searched Mr [D668], like using force. Mr [D668] has experience of being searched at visits, they were gentle, they searched his pocket, and the way they touch is very gentle. The way that he (Darren) was, was very aggressive.

Darren Tomsett had his hands out in front of him and was almost squeezing together, as he checked Mr [D668]. He started from the top down. Before he reached the middle Mr [D668] complained "Why are you doing that, like that", he told Mr [D668] to shut up, he was doing his job. Mr [D668] was in shock. Mr [D668] had seen Darren tell an Afghan detainee to shut up, when the detainee had questioned how he was dealing with his release papers. [D500] witnessed this and was told to shut up. He would provide [D500]'s details, email address.

Mr [D668] was speechless in shock, he looked at Darren. There was a G4S security lady from Pakistan, she called him [D668] and said "Come [D668], don't say anything, come, your brother is waiting for you. " she witnessed this as well. She was in visit at the same time. She came to say [D668], come here, don't listen, take your stuff, your brother is waiting for you".

Darren was fighting badly with [D500] with words, using the f word. When [D500] asked him why he had done that, Darren told him to shut up.

When Mr [D668] saw his brother, he was crying. His brother asked what happened and Mr [D668] explained to him. So his brother was very nervous and asked where the guy was. Mr [D668] said no, it's him, you have no worries, so just take the paper, when you go there will you go to MP place on Wednesday, so he told Mr

[D668] on Friday, he was able to see Mr [D668]'s MP to explain what he saw on that day. On release on 4 October, next week on Friday because she had an MP surgery, every Friday, she got was Helen MP for Lambeth. On 10 Friday she came close to his house, so he went there, so they explained everything and she wrote it down. No, no, on 13th October, because he got out of detention on 4th. The following week he went to see her to explain everything.

Darren was on the visits area and the Pakistan lady. She knew that his brother had come to visit him. She knew him, the way that he had come to see his brother, or he had got some friends, so she noticed his name badge. When he had a visit he went there, she was very nice, she saw him, so when you saw the security guys you felt safe, you felt good. He said some officers were very nice and polite, Darren was rough.

G4S staff know each other, they are colleagues. They knew who is the worse, they know. If you tell some of them about an issue, you ask and they tell you what other colleague, how it is, how he is with detainees, some of them do not want to talk, they keep quiet. IO Wilkinson said that officers are asked to express concerns during the investigation. This officer knew what this officer Darren was like.

Dember has witnessed a lot of things, he has a lot of memories, he is very good as well, because sometimes he gave advice to detainees. If you look properly, is one of the security guards, 7 detainees like him.

Mr [D668] provided a witness statement which stated that he was spoken to rudely by a security officer on 13 September. IO Wilkinson asked Mr [D668] if he knew this officer's name. Mr [D668] stated that he had put the name in the witness statement. [searching] Bonnie, a female, maybe 20 or 22 years. IO Wilkinson understood that at the time Mr [D668] was on the phone to his solicitor, it was lock up and she said "Just get back into your room", so she was urging you to get back into your room, but the way she said it, Mr [D668] felt was rude. IO Wilkinson asked Mr [D668] to explain what he meant by that, rude. In his statement Mr [D668] said that he was spoken to as a child... Mr [D668] stated that he was on the phone, and when they came to lock the door, they had second floor, first floor, his room was 114. So he was standing in front of the door, if he went in he would have lost the network, so he was standing outside, talking, in conversation. The officers were going door by door, they go to his room, they came a second time to double check, because some people are late, some people take a shower. So by 5 o'clock, that is the afternoon lock in. It was 5 or 4:50. They did the first round and came back for the second one. Mr [D668] was still on the phone, so she told him first of all, to get in the room and she would lock the door. So after they left after the first time asking him to get in his room, he went away to the bathroom area. He had wanted the time to finish the conversation and come back. She went past the bathroom, she came back to the

room to double check. He was nearly finished so he told his solicitor. It is not expected that they would have to be in their room on the first occasion, but should be on the second. If they are not in their room on the second time you wait for them, they pick you up and they put you in your room.

IO Wilkinson confirmed what time this happened. Mr [D668] confirmed it was either 12 or 5. She pointed out that it said 12 o'clock on the statement. Mr [D668] took a look at the statement to check it. He stated that it was the 4:47, not 12pm. IO Wilkinson amended it. IO Wilkinson asked Mr [D668] what he meant when he said that the woman was rude. He stated that when she came back for the second time, he was still on the phone, to his solicitor. So he told his solicitor that he was going back in his room and that if he was cut off he would call his solicitor back, he would call back at 5:30 when he got out. He was walking, waiting for her, she was 2 room before his room. He was walking quick, when he arrived at his room, she was only one room away. When she saw him she said "Don't do that anymore, you saw me and you went away." He told her that he was on the phone and did not have a network in his room. She said "That's the last time", so he kept quiet and didn't say anything. When she locked the door before his room, she went there and said "I told you, that's the last time, if you saw me don't walk away". He said "you only came to the second room", "I said we were having a conversation I don't have a network inside". She said it again and spoke to him as a child. She thought that he had walked away from his room on purpose to avoid lock up, when he was actually on the phone and was trying explain that to her. But she didn't want to know, she started shouting, she was with a colleague who also knew Mr [D668], he asked her to tell her colleague to stop shouting at him, he is not a child. The colleague did not say anything. The first woman opened the door and said "Get in right now!, Get in right now!". It was too much for him, so he told her not to talk to him like that, don't talk to him like that. Even if he had to get inside, you have to say please, don't say "get in right now!".

IO Wilkinson stated that she would try to include this in her report, but as it was not in her original complaint that the solicitor has put forward, she could not investigate it. This was not within her terms of reference to investigate. These other incidents after the letter from the solicitors, would need to be put in a separate complaint. Mr [D668] asked why, IO Wilkinson explained that she was tied with the terms of reference that she had been given. Her terms of reference are "these are the areas that you are looking at, and these are your terms of reference, that is what you are commissioned to look at". These other areas that have been raised in Mr [D668]'s witness statement, because they weren't in the original complaint, she could not look at them separately, so she couldn't go to this other officer and talk to her about her behaviours, but if he put in a separate complaint about these other things they could be looked at separately by a different investigating officer. IO Wilkinson explained it was just the way that the procedure worked. That she could ask for the terms of

reference to be expanded, but there was a possibility that they can say no. She would ask the question, but what she was saying was that she may not be able to look at those, she would be able to say that there were other incidents that he was unhappy with, but she would not be able to go and speak to these officers, because they were not in the original complaint that they were asked to look at.

The representative asked if they wanted to raise a couple of points that came after their original letter, would they just need to put it in a letter to IO Wilkinson. IO Wilkinson stated that the best thing to do would be to write in again stating that in addition to the issues already raised, there were other elements that happened after that date that they would like to be considered.

That once that came in, then would either expand IO Wilkinson's terms of reference, or may look at it as a separate investigation. The representative told [D668] that they would look into that. IO Wilkinson stated that she would check if there was anything she could do with regards to that. This was the first time that she was seeing this additional information, so there was that one and there was the other one, 26/27 September, Mr [D668]'s belongings were on the floor and he raised that.

IO Wilkinson said that she could take the names now, so that she didn't need to speak to Mr [D668] again. Mr [D668] mentioned that he spoke with a security officer about his money going missing, his sim card with £10 on it going missing that day and that he told the manager of the wing. IO Wilkinson asked who those officers were; the security officer who Mr [D668] told about the missing SIM card and the manager who he also spoke to. Mr [D668] could not remember. IO Wilkinson said that this was fine that it was about the 26/27th September.

Mr [D668] stated that also that day they said they had the name, they knew the person who it was but they would not tell me. They only said to check if he had lost something and let them know. So he checked, told them what he had lost, but they didn't reimburse his SIM card, they didn't give him any feedback, even his roommate as well. Stuff was thrown on the floor. His roommate was [D3238]. IO Wilkinson thanked him for the information.

IO Wilkinson summarised, that someone had been in his room, taken his SIM card and he had raised it with security, the manager then came and spoke to him. Mr [D668] stated that he told the manager everything, because on the table, and everything on the table had been messed up. Everything on the bed and on the back of the table, were in a mess on the floor, same for [D3238]. When they came back everything on the table was on the floor and the same for [D3238]'s stuff. It was a shock.

IO Wilkinson stated that she understood that this was another example of an issue that Mr [D668] has raised with officers and nothing has been done about it. They have not tackled the person who has done it. Mr [D668] agreed.

Mr [D668] asked IO Wilkinson to look at the last complaint, he said that they called him, asked him what his worry was about what happened to him and everything. This was about 16 September. IO Wilkinson has a document from G4S about this, a review. Mr [D668] explained that a woman talked to him and explained what happened about all his complaints going nowhere, and she wrote down about one of his friends who had been assaulted in the gym. Mr [D668] had gone there to protect his friend in the gym by taking him away from the gym and 3 detainees. He said don't fight him, I am going to take him away. They went back down onto their wing. The 2 person who assault him, would do the same with him, so they went straight to their wing and made a complaint. They didn't take action until now, that is this guy, he is still at Brook House. His name is there, his Home Office reference. G4S didn't give any feedback.

IO Wilkinson stated that again that she can't investigate...

Mr [D668] stated that it wasn't him. Since then they haven't taken any action. So they don't care.

The representative asked [D668] to clarify, it's in relation to just him. Mr [D668] agreed. The representative continues, so this document was given to you after [D668] had a meeting with the care officer, on 16th September and you can see at paragraph 21, we talk about this document. So he raises the complaint but then nothing was done after, even after putting it on paper.

Mr [D668] stated that was the proof and he was sorry to say that they do not do their job. They do not make them feel safe. You can take a copy if you want. IO Wilkinson asked Mr [D668] if he wanted her to take it, he agreed, he confirmed he had his own copy and the representative confirmed they had their own copy.

IO Wilkinson made a note that she had taken that from Mr [D668]. The representative asked Mr [D668] to explain what he complained about on the form, what did he write

Mr [D668] read the form. Does the detainee have bail appeal to date – no. Has it been set – no. Does the detainee have any problem on the wing? IO Wilkinson said yes, issue with a female member of staff, who was that member of staff? Mr [D668] stated it was Bonnie. IO Wilkinson confirmed that this was what she was saying before, it's Bonnie, in relation to the lock down that day when she was rude with him.

Mr [D668] said that he did not get any feedback, they did not go to him about this, nothing.

IO Wilkinson asked Mr [D668] if he had given them the details of the female officer, he confirmed that he did. He told them it was Bonnie.

Mr [D668] continues to read from the form – Does the detainee feel safe on the wing – He said no. People, everything was there, they did nothing. IO Wilkinson said she was grateful for that. She said that she could use that as evidence, as he had written it down that nothing was done, she could ask what was done regarding this and get feedback from G4S. The next review was the 16 October so IO Wilkinson wanted to know what date this was done. It was date the 16th September and dated for a review in a month's time. Which was after he had left because he left on 4th.

IO Wilkinson asked who was the female officer who did this [the form] with him, he had mentioned a care officer. Mr [D668] said it was a security officer. IO Wilkinson noted that the name field had been left blank although there was some sort of signature at the bottom but it was a bit unclear.

Mr [D668] said they had his file, they still had his file there, so she could have access to his file. As she had not put her name. IO Wilkinson asked for a description, Mr [D668] explained that she was British of English origin, very calm, wearing a G4S uniform, she was an officer who worked on his wing. She called his name in the library, to urgently come to reception, so he went there. He was waiting and she said ok come in, that it was just routine, they wanted to ask him some questions, and that was when she went through the form.

IO Wilkinson confirmed that the officer worked on his wing, but he was called to reception wing to see her and she went through those questions. Mr [D668] agreed. He told her about something which she didn't write down, because that one he was very depressed. He was down, so he just answered their questions. He wanted to get out of detention, he read the paper and he realised that there were some things that she didn't write down there. When she asked him a question, he would explain to her, he would talk about things from the past, the water pouring one, the threatening people, the Spice and drugs, even on D wing, people, the cleaners, putting water under the door. He called the officers to complain, say that they have to take the cleaners job away, but they didn't take it away, he complained about that. He is not there now.

IO Wilkinson confirmed that the cleaner was a detainee doing the cleaning job. Mr [D668] agree. The water came under the door. He and a security guard, he can open the door and use a mop to clean the water and close the door.

IO Wilkinson clarified that the witness statement was written quite a while ago. The representative agreed. IO Wilkinson said that it was a shame that this wasn't put in to her earlier, but it didn't matter really. She suggested they write in again, regarding those areas of the witness statement not in the original letter and IO Wilkinson would mark up that complaints are made and aren't being followed up. She could incorporate it in that, but they would just have to see.

The representative clarified that the incidents that could not be investigated fully without a follow up letter would be; the incident involving Bonnie... IO Wilkinson said yes, because it wasn't in the original terms of reference, and because it is about a specific member of staff it would start another investigation.

The representative stated that the incident with Bonnie happened after she had written the Letter Before Action, things kept happening and [D668] would call her and tell her about them. So that incident and the incident regarding Mr [D668]'s belongings on the floor, could IO Wilkinson investigate that or not? IO Wilkinson said, no not really, because it is not in the original terms of reference from that original letter. IO Wilkinson would ask the question and mention it to a manager, show the witness statement to a manager and say there are a couple of things post that, but they are commissioned so they can only investigate what the terms of reference are. So unless they can send that witness statement in and ask for the terms of reference to be expanded slightly, but she would have to check, she can't just say that yes she will take that into account, she would need to check that and she will check. IO Wilkinson asked if they had the email electronically, the representative confirmed that they did. IO Wilkinson asked if they could email that to her only because she was travelling about with the witness statement and she could get it to the manager earlier.

IO Wilkinson stated that they had now looked at everything within the original letter. She wanted to go back now. Mr [D668] said there was a last thing, on 7th September. IO Wilkinson said yes, the healthcare, she thought she had covered that earlier, when he had gone for his Rule 35 appointment. Mr [D668] said that that story is different, because one day she didn't open the door. In July he got in. On 7th September he didn't get in because she didn't open the door. On that day his solicitor had an injunction to the attempt to deport him, despite his claim. So when Mr [D668] called him on 6th he was very upset, so he told Mr [D668] that on the 6th, so on the 7th he called Mr [D668] back, and said that they had put in an injunction the day before. Before midnight on 6th and on the same 6th, later, another colleague, said you going to deport me, why is that? He didn't sleep, imagine, he has depression, he didn't sleep, he had a headache, stomach ache, he was vomiting from night until morning. He called Healthcare, they gave him paracetamol and to wait until 9:30 for him to go to hospital. On 7th he called her, she said go to hospital, they have got to give him something. He waited for 9:30. At 9:00 someone called him

and said they had put in an injunction and later the Home Office said all removals were cancelled, so he felt a bit good. He didn't see this not until morning, he received a Home Office letter so he went to bed and fell asleep. He put his alarm on to wake up at 10:30. At 10:30 he went to take his shower, then he went to healthcare because his head was hurting and he had stomach pain, he was very, very down, very bad. He said if they come to get him this time on 7th morning, because they come early morning, sometimes 4 or 5 o'clock, they have got to do something terrible and he had to be ready to be honest. So he came for, like the criminal they used to do. I had the weapon. Sorry about that. He took a can and he was waiting for them, he had one on him. But they didn't come. When he fell asleep and then went to healthcare. When he arrived, it was at least 11:05, they locked the door. The same nurse she came in, she came in first, she didn't bother herself, she was sitting down there. He put his head.. there was one seat empty there are six. There were 5 inside, there was one empty, so she didn't bother to look up at him, so he stood by the door to get her attention to look at him, so she looked at him and didn't answer the door. So he was stood there and started to kick the door. She was not bothering herself, so he stood there. Something told himself in his head "don't mess up" if she keep going he would do something very bad. So he told himself not to do anything bad, calm down, not to mess himself up. He was talking to himself in his head to move away and he called his solicitor, but Sheroy (solicitor) did not answer the phone. When he spoke to his solicitor they said to please go to healthcare later on. He told his solicitor that so far his head was "boil" (sic) hurting, and his stomach. They said to go to his wing and get some paracetamol. He said that paracetamol wouldn't do anything. She said don't do anything, he had to wait. So he went back to his wing still in pain, he was in his bed, crying in pain, crying because of neglect. So he was really, really on fire and to speak about it today brings his mood back again. He didn't know why healthcare did that.

IO Wilkinson brought out the Healthcare records, which Mr [D668] gave consent for her to have, and noted that there was a record of the nurse who came earlier and gave him the paracetamol and then him going along to the surgery. The time that is on there is 11:47 and she was aware the surgery only runs until 11:30. Mr [D668] said that the record was a lie. They said something like, I have an appointment, the ones who have an appointment are booked in ready, they brought their appointment slip to the door, if you didn't bring it with you, you bring it to the induction I have been before. I didn't go there because...

IO Wilkinson clarified that they had sent Mr [D668] an appointment for induction because they thought he was going there because of a removal, when he was still on D wing.

Mr [D668] stated that he was waiting for his appointment, it was a couple of days, it didn't come so he went there the next day, it was a couple of days. They said that

they had booked him an appointment and he had not attended it. So his complaint was about the sleep appointment. They showed him the appointment, in reception wing and he told them that they know how he is on D Wing, if he had an appointment he would deal with it. He said he had told them "OK, you made a mistake, you need to correct it" They said they were going to correct it but they didn't. Because if they said have you made an appointment, he didn't go to an appointment.

IO Wilkinson, clarified that the appointments were in July, where it said that appointments had been made but he had not gone, but the one on the 7 September, where it says that you arrived at 11:47 which is outside hours, that's wrong? Mr [D668] stated that was a lie.

IO Wilkinson clarified that an appointment was made and the slip was given and then he saw the a different nurse on 8th and she referred him to the doctor. But that nurse on 7th when she said that he arrived late and that he was not happy? Mr [D668] stated that was not true. He asked who had written that, IO Wilkinson stated that it was the nurse who had written it, but that Mr [D668] had 10:55 written down so she would have a word with the nurse about the timing differences on that and why the door was locked.

Mr [D668] stated he knew the rules and that even it was 11:30 they would open the door.

IO Wilkinson clarified that people could just go to nurse appointments in the morning. Mr [D668] confirmed it was an open surgery from 9:30 to 11:30.

IO Wilkinson clarified that if he wanted to see a doctor he would need to get an appointment slip. Mr [D668] clarified that first he would need to go to the open surgery and see the nurse, explain why you want to see the doctor, they will book a week later or 10 days later, they give you a slip straightaway. Or if you are not sure about the appointment or you have to see the doctor first, then when the doctor agrees to see you, he puts the appointment slip in an envelope and gives it to security staff and they put it under your door.

IO Wilkinson clarified that they had given Mr [D668] an appointment slip but it had gone to induction instead of D wing.

IO Wilkinson asked Mr [D668] if the nurse came to the wing to see him on 7th for stomach pain. He said that was on 6th.

IO Wilkinson read out the medical notes:

"On the 7th, early in the morning at 5:30, the nurse went to see you on the wing. Then you went to the surgery obviously with that issue with her. Then on 8th the

nurse who had seen you the day before had referred you to the GP.” She made that note at 6am and IO Wilkinson wondered if that nurse had seen Mr [D668] and she had just done the slip at that point.

Mr [D668] said that he had pain, a headache and pain so he had to go late to see healthcare, that is not true.

IO Wilkinson said that was fine, and that was why she asked those questions. She can now ask that nurse why that note was put on at that time. Mr [D668] asked if that was the same nurse. IO Wilkinson stated that this was the nurse on 7th, who put the note on, so she would need to check with her whether she was the only one on duty or if there were others there. Mr [D668] asked if she was the one who didn’t open the door. IO Wilkinson stated that was why she wants to check with her and obviously she had Mr [D668]’s description as well. If she meets with her, she can see whether it was that nurse or not.

Mr [D668] stated that there was a camera in the healthcare sitting room, that IO Wilkinson had the date of 7th, if she got the camera she would see what took place on that date. IO Wilkinson stated that CCTV footage is only kept for 30 days. Mr [D668] stated “without them keeping a record?” and asked why they did that, they did that on purpose. The representative asked whether that was G4S policy, IO Wilkinson stated that she thought that was pretty universal.

Mr [D668] asked how IO Wilkinson was going to see what went on, what was put on him, that meant they don’t have the camera as well. IO Wilkinson stated that is why when they get a complaint, the first thing they do is ask for CCTV, so normally they can find out if something needs investigating, as long as they get it fairly quickly, which they normally do, if they can secure the CCTV within that timescale, within 30 days. It’s only because some of these are going back quite a long time.

Mr [D668] stated that the 30 days has gone so he won’t have the camera. IO Wilkinson confirmed that she won’t have the camera, that was what she was saying. Mr [D668] said that what happened in July, August, September.

IO Wilkinson said that the only way she would get that information was if G4S had investigated, they would have taken a copy of that CCTV and would have to hand that over to her. Mr [D668] said that they didn’t investigate, look at what the nurse said, the only thing to confirm that, is to take the camera on the 7th in the room. If it was empty, one seat, or if it was full.

IO Wilkinson asked who else was present on the 7th. Mr [D668] stated that other detainees were present. They were sitting in the sitting room waiting. There were 6 seats, 1 was empty. IO Wilkinson clarified that as long as there was an empty seat,

someone could go in and wait. Mr [D668] confirmed exactly. The nurse did not open the door, she didn't bother herself, he was in pain. He did not know the detainees present.

IO Wilkinson said that she would speak to her and the other nursing staff on duty. And that would be face to face as she had his description and IO Wilkinson would try to identify her.

Mr [D668] said to look at the scenario, he didn't get in, they didn't open the door, if someone came after hours they wouldn't make a note that they had arrived late, why have they made a note that he came late. IO Wilkinson confirmed that she would talk to the nurse.

Mr [D668] confirmed that he did not have an appointment.

IO Wilkinson stated that the nurse said that he had arrived late complaining of stomach ache and that he was not happy to wait until the next week to see the doctor with a slip, that she had advised him to take paracetamol, and he had advised her that she had already taken that. Mr [D668] asked who had said that. IO Wilkinson advised that this was the note made by the nurse. Mr [D668] asked how the nurse spoke to him, the door was closed. IO Wilkinson clarified that she didn't open the door, Mr [D668] confirmed that the nurse didn't speak to him because she didn't open the door.

IO Wilkinson confirmed that she had his account and everything that he said, already on the recorder, she had a few things to clarify, to assist the investigation.

In Mr [D668]'s solicitor's letter, it says that he was in Brook House from 17 May, from IO Wilkinson's understanding he was only taken there 28 June. Mr [D668] stated that he was there 17 May and then he was sent to The Verne on 18th. He was there for one day and there was no complaint on that day. They were looking from 28 June onwards for these incidents.

IO Wilkinson stated that she had the officers names: Darren, who was rude asking him to pack his things, that was fine she would speak to him about that. When he came back and there were 2 officers who were laughing, was there anybody else there, were there any other staff laughing? Mr [D668] stated yes, there were 2 officers laughing and there were 3 or 4 more colleagues at the back, doing paperwork, checking something. The 2 officers who laughed were sitting on the desk. When you are coming out they open the door, they take your bags, they put you in the sitting room. On his way to the sitting room, they started [laughing]. The other people were at the back. Mr [D668] described the layout. When you come through they put you in the sitting room. When you come first you need to go to the

desk, they take your pictures, they give you a bag and put you in another room, where security come to collect you and take you to the wing. The other 3 officers, when they came from outside, one of the officers sat him down. They were security officers. They were not the officers who took him to his room. Mr [D668] described the reception process.

IO Wilkinson confirmed that these 2 officers were the only ones laughing. Mr [D668] confirmed this and said that when he went to the airport these officers were not there because when you leave you use another door.

IO Wilkinson asked how these 2 officers knew he was coming back. Mr [D668] explained that the officers knew him, that when he returned from the airport they knew the officer who had taken them to the airport, so when the officer returned from the airport with detainees, they knew that he didn't fly. It was simply that the officer had come back with somebody. The officer that takes people to the airport is a special type, so they know each other, so if they came for one detainee, they know they didn't fly and have come back.

IO Wilkinson confirmed that she had asked for statements from the officers who had brought Mr [D668] to Brook House, because they were present, to see what they knew. Mr [D668] stated that they opened the door, they told him to bring his stuff, that they needed to pass him away, they had to get back, so when he was being passed over they were laughing so he did not know if they were talking to him, or someone, realising, who was coming back. Mr [D668] did not know if those officers would have seen or heard who was doing the laughing, but once they had got in there, they said they had to step back outside, the van was waiting for them, they don't stay long.

IO Wilkinson asked how soon the comments were made after Mr [D668] had entered Brook House. Mr [D668] stated that he went in with one officer, she spoke to her, she stepped back, he was crossing to go to the sitting room, down there, he heard that. IO Wilkinson asked if the escort officer was near him when the comment was made, Mr [D668] stated that they were not near. IO. Wilkinson stated that she would ask them the question anyway.

Mr [D668] stated that he was so distressed about the fact that they do not have the proof about the camera, because the only things to be verified, the only knowledge to be very solid, because when they say other things, it is all on the camera. So if it is a very fragile situation, people are getting assaulted, that is a situation, it is fragile, they have to keep the camera for minimum 3 or 6 months. Because 1 month is too short. It's too short to be honest.

IO Wilkinson stated that there was not really a lot that she could do about that, she could make a suggestion, and within the investigation she would try to speak to everybody who was present and try to build a picture. That way without the CCTV... Mr [D668] was worried that they abused the detainees, for them they have no proof, that's why all of the proof, they are holding against word. IO Wilkinson said she would speak to everyone he had told her about, Dember and some of the detainees to get a full picture.

IO Wilkinson stated re the comment about coming back, that Mr [D668] felt the comment was derogatory. IO Wilkinson asked Mr [D668] how he felt when he heard the comment. Mr [D668] stated that he had tears there, for him they don't treat people like that, someone coming from a very difficult situation, in pain? That's not their job.

IO Wilkinson clarified that Mr [D668] felt that they were poking fun at someone who had already gone through a difficult and stressful situation. Mr [D668] stated that that was not fair, there was no detainee respect and you feel you are useless. They were derogatory to him as a human being. Don't do it. They know how difficult it is for someone coming from the airport, how difficult, depressing, stressful it is. You come there and they are laughing, not thinking how the person will feel.

IO Wilkinson stated she would feed these feelings back to the officers, who can become de-sensitised and get their reactions how their actions had affected you. IO Wilkinson asked the name of the gentleman from the church, Mr [D668] did not know it but he would find out and tell IO Wilkinson. She asked for details of any witnesses, names and addresses so she could write out to them formally.

IO Wilkinson said that when Mr [D668] said he did not feel safe and secure regarding these incidents, what could staff have done to make him feel safe and secure, after the incidents had happened. Mr [D668], said that those people involved, who were doing that, was to take them off the wing and be put them on another wing. So when he made the complaints about these people, they were moved off the wing so he knew that action was being taken. So, that happening that way, it would make him feel secure, seeing them take action would make him feel safe and secure. That was not the case, you can see the same people carry on.

IO Wilkinson understood that when he made complaints, other than the one she had there, he always went to the office and made a verbal complaint. IO Wilkinson asked that if Mr [D668] had anything written down, to please send that into her, if he had any notes. Mr [D668] stated that he did have one note. He went down to G4S he didn't have any feedback. IO Wilkinson asked that if had anything like that to send it in. Mr [D668] stated that he had an application form, he had to put it in, the date, the complaint form, with your name and you put it in the box. He did it once. He

didn't have any feedback. He stopped it. On the application form, you had to put your name, the complaint form, the date, and you put it in the box. He did it once but he did not have any feedback, he stopped it. Some of the detainees knew that and didn't do the complaint.

IO Wilkinson explained that the box was used by the Home Office, not G4S, to make people feel free to complain. Mr [D668] explained that one of his friends was beaten up at the airport. He put in a complaint to the Home Office. The Home Office said they would take action. They didn't. The last thing he heard from them, they came to pick him up at 4 o'clock to take him back to his country. So that was the worry. Sometimes the Home Office abuses you as well sometimes. Mr [D668] did not have a copy of the form that he put in the box. Mr [D668] explained how you get the form from the library, fill it out and put it in the box. He put the form in the G4S box. He said there was a box for the HO and one for G4S. You have this form there, you are supposed to have feedback. They call you in and tell you why you don't feel safe, why you are scared, they do that, you feel that they care about them. He had no feedback about the one he did on 16th September he didn't get called in to discuss what he had put on the form. His friend [D500] was assaulted by 2 detainees, Mr [D668] went with him to make the complaint, they didn't take action, they didn't call him until he was being released. So he had his feedback, they took action against 3 guys, who tried to assault him. 1 guy was from the second floor, from Congo, he was the one who tried to assault him. He was a drug user, nothing.

The representative asked what the date was of the letter he put in the box. Mr [D668] stated that he thought it was the first week of August. The representative asked if it was possible for IO Wilkinson to check. IO Wilkinson stated that she had already checked and they did not have anything.

Mr [D668] stated that they have to keep all their paper. IO Wilkinson stated that she investigated whether there were any reports done or any complaints made and they haven't got anything. Mr [D668] stated that they have to give her that, they have his file. IO Wilkinson stated that she had seen that before, they have provided her with that, but they haven't given her any information relating to complaints made against G4S. Mr [D668] stated that all detainees have a file, that they keep the file on the security wing. So when she has it, you have detainee names and their HO number, so they are supposed to hand over the detainees file with the paper inside, so IO Wilkinson can read it.

IO Wilkinson stated that she had asked for that and when she goes to Brook House she will read that. The representative asked if they just said they didn't have a copy of Mr [D668]'s complaint to G4S. IO Wilkinson clarified that she had been told that there were no complaints or incident reports regarding Mr [D668], that was the information that she had, but before she said that for definite, she hadn't looked at

his file, so let her go down and look at that, which would probably be the second week in January. So she did need to look through that herself.

IO Wilkinson confirmed that Mr [D668] was going to give her the name of the detainee on the stairs so that she could speak to that person as well. On 24th there was that other female officer present and the other detainee who was present.

IO Wilkinson raised that Mr [D668] made some comments about the Rule 35 application that hadn't been covered yet. From what she could see on his medical records Mr [D668] saw a doctor about a Rule 35 application when he was in The Verne in June. and then he saw the doctor in July, when he was in Brook House. So she just wanted to check, when Mr [D668] was saying about the doctor, who did the Rule 35 report, was he referring to the doctor on 24 July in Brook House? Was this the doctor who said he had been told about Rule 35, not to put in about a body map, or about the effects of detention. Mr [D668] confirmed that it was. When he did the Rule 35, the nurse gave Mr [D668] a copy the same day. He told Mr [D668] that the nurse had to send a copy to the Home Office and that he had to sign the 3 copies, they gave him one, they sent one to the Home Office, they kept one. The one they sent to the Home Office, the next day the Home Office replied. They answer and sent it to Mr [D668]'s solicitor.

IO Wilkinson asked what the doctor actually said. Mr [D668] said that the doctor had said that he had to answer to the Home Office regarding Rule 35, his solicitor told him to book an appointment and go back and see the doctor, show the letter from the Home Office. When he went to see him, Dr Chaudhary, was 28th July (medical notes confirmed). He asked what he could do for Mr [D668], who said he had a letter from the Home Office. The doctor read it. The Home Office said that 'they' hadn't put the mark on the body map and didn't describe the psychological effect, to the detainee, so his solicitor told him to come back to see the doctor, regarding what the Home Office had said. The doctor said he couldn't do anything, the Home Office know that they don't do a body map and do not do a psychological assessment, and hadn't done for the past year and the Home Office know that. He is not allowed to do that. Mr [D668] looked at him and felt that he was not allowed to say that and looked like he knew he shouldn't have said that and had made a big mistake. He asked him if the Home Office knew that body maps had been stopped a year ago, why the Home Office have asked for it. And now it was an excuse to block his release from detention. The Doctor said that he couldn't do anything and the only advice he could give was to refer it to his solicitor, who would know what to do to get him out of detention.

IO Wilkinson clarified that when Mr [D668] raised with the doctor that he had not done a body map, or anything about the effects of detention, staying in detention given this, that he told Mr [D668], that the Home Office have told him not to do a

body map and not to make an assessment about whether he should remain in detention, given that he had made this Rule 35 assessment as a victim of torture. He said that it was the Home Office that told him that you don't do those things. Mr [D668] stated that IO Wilkinson would need to take his word that the doctor said to him, the Home Office know about that you don't make body maps, for the last year. If it was more than a year ago, then you don't do a body map. So why they asked, why they said, that they don't make the body map, if they use that, then it is like he didn't do his job.

IO Wilkinson mentioned in his report that he did mention the scarring, he just didn't put it on a body map. Mr [D668] stated that IO Wilkinson must understand about the medical report, the way that you show the scar, you make the body map, and he didn't make it. you look at the Rule 35, page 4 or 3, where it is supported by a body map, it is blank. Where you have to describe how being a victim of torture affected the detainees in detention, there was nothing. So the Home Office used it to say the doctor did not do a psychological assessment or a body map, but the doctor is saying the Home Office know that you don't do a body map as the scarring is over 12 months old.

IO Wilkinson asked Mr [D668] why the doctor would not do an assessment about the effect of detention. Mr [D668] said that he asked the Doctor, he didn't want to do it and he stopped there, he didn't want to do it.

IO Wilkinson clarified that it was the doctor who did not want to do it, rather than as suggested in the letter, that the Home Office told him not to do it. Mr [D668] stated that the doctor did not want to do that. He said the Home Office knows that they do not do a body map.

IO Wilkinson clarified that he didn't do the body map because they don't do them, but the Home Office shouldn't have said something negative about it, because they know they don't do the body map. Mr [D668] stated that the doctor said they used to do that but they stopped that a year ago and the Home Office know that they do not do a body map any more. IO Wilkinson clarified that it was not that the scarring was over 12 months old, it was that they hadn't done any body maps for 12 months. There shouldn't have been a negative comment by the Home Office as they knew they wouldn't get that. But then the assessment of the affect of detention on Mr [D668], which he didn't commented about as well, was more that the Doctor didn't want to do that, rather than he had been told not to do that. Mr [D668] agreed.

IO Wilkinson stated that she would ask the doctor why he did not want to make that assessment, because she thought that on the form it did say "what are the affects of continued detention?" so if he has chosen not to fill that in, she needs to ask him why, because obviously that has affected Mr [D668]'s application.

IO Wilkinson clarified her understanding from what Mr [D668] had said, that most of the officers were alright, there was just a group of them, like Bonnie, Darren Tomsett and the ones who laughed, but some of the officers on the reverse were nice as well. She wanted to check it wasn't every officer and it wasn't a general culture across Brook House. Mr [D668] stated that on A wing, some of the officers behave the same as Darren. He doesn't go there because it is not his wing. They are bad like Darren.

IO Wilkinson asked about D wing, apart from Bonnie who was shutting the doors that day, what were the other officers like. Mr [D668] explained there was a lady there, she came for only 2 days, she was changed onto another wing. He does not know her name because she was only there for 2 days. She did something, because you know, the detainees on the wing, she knew Mr [D668]'s room, that was in September around 20/22nd, he came in from outside, he had his badge from the library, so he forgot his ID badge. He came in. She was standing on the door to the wing, she asked him to show his badge. He said that he forgot his badge on the wing. She said sorry you can't get in. He told her that she knew he was on the wing, she said no. He said ok, let him call all the other detainees, some are coming back. He said to her to ask them if he came from that wing. She said "No badge, no entry". This lady behaved against certain detainees, who she used certain words, shout all the day, addressed some as stupid. After a few days she left. Some are good some are not.

IO Wilkinson clarified that on the wing it was generally ok, apart from these 2 female officers, and it was on the reception and on the visits that Mr [D668] had the concerns. Mr [D668] agreed.

IO Wilkinson stated that in terms of the time he was forced to spend in his room when it was locked up and in terms of the toilet facilities, within his letter, what did he want to tell her about that. They would be picked up in the general reviews, but she wanted his point of view. To get some comment from him.

Mr [D668] stated that right now, Brook House, he was sorry to say, that Brook house was not fit for purpose, regarding the way they had been, regarding the way they keep detainees, for weeks or months, because 2 detainees in a room, in certain rooms there are 3. When you go to the toilet, there is no cover, it's open. The window is the same. It is like you can't breathe. The window is closed. When he asked them, they said it was to block all the noise from the planes. But it is not true, because when it is quiet, from midnight until the early morning at 5 o'clock, you hear no noises. So it is a form of torture, the Home Office putting someone in there for a week or month. Two detainees. No door, no window. He was always crying when his roommate had to use the toilet, because he had the bed beyond the toilet, so

whoever had the bed beyond the toilet, whatever the smell, when you use your toilet properly, and the food is not good, anything you eat is not good. Imagine when you get that out. The smell.

IO Wilkinson asked if there were other toilets they could use or if there were just those toilet in their room. Mr [D668] said there were no other toilets. So his bed is opposite. So when a roommate uses the toilet [tuts].

IO Wilkinson understood that it was embarrassing if you have to use the toilet, it was embarrassing if somebody else had to use the toilet. Mr [D668] said it was more than embarrassment, it was torture, to be honest. Look at someone who is make a pooh, it is smelly, you have to lie there and smell it. It's not good, it's not nice. It's like you have to smell a chemical. Then when they close the door he has to keep it in and that was torture. Because he felt like he could not use the toilet in the room.

The representative added that it was also that they were locked in for 13 hours a day.

IO Wilkinson clarified whether it was that they didn't have the choice to use a different toilet, Mr [D668] agreed. Because the room is locked and they don't have an option. Mr [D668] stated that he was also crying because for him it was a prison. He still hears the locking of the key, it sent him back to what happened in prison. Because when you heard the key, that was the time when they picked you up to beat you up, wanting... some information. So when you hear the door, that means that you are going to be beaten up. So when he heard the keys in the door, his head 'bull'.

The representative asked if Mr [D668] wanted to talk about the layout of the toilet, there was no seat. Mr [D668] stated that since he had been there the toilet wasn't cleaned. The cleaning staff didn't come to use a chemical for the bathroom area. You could see the colour of the toilet was white, but the colour of the seats was brown, with built up bacteria. IO Wilkinson clarified that the inside of the toilet was brown because it hadn't been cleaned. Mr [D668] agreed. He said that for him, when he had to use the toilet, he held on and waited until they opened the door.

IO Wilkinson clarified that the only toilets available for use, were the ones in the rooms.

IO Wilkinson noted Mr [D668]'s concerns and which parts were being fed into the wider review, and had his perspective.

The representative stated that this was linked to Mr [D668]'s mental health. He has a flashbacks because this has brought him into a torture circle. It is a reminder of what he has been through before. IO Wilkinson recalled that Mr [D668] had been

placed on medication whilst in Brook House. She asked whether he was still on this medication, he confirmed that he was. He said he was still in trouble. She asked if he was receiving support from his doctor as well as medication. Mr [D668] stated that he had been referred to the NHS mental health.

Mr [D668] stated that regarding the toilet, he said that he had to wait in his room until they opened the door, when he wanted to use the toilet he told his roommate to go out. When in the room he doesn't sit down on it because it is not clean and has to stay stood up. It is torture, it is physical torture. Even at home when he sees the toilet he feels like he is in Brook House, he has difficulty realising, so to use the toilet, he feels it is quite difficult to use it. IO Wilkinson said that she would comment on that in the report, but the main thing is it will go into the wider review. Mr [D668] stated that the thing is Brook House was not built for detainees to stay for more than 1 or 2 weeks. Maybe for 2 or 3 days if they have to send you back, even now they have to put you in another detention, because the toilet is inside. If the toilet is inside the room, it should be only for 1 person. If there are 2 people in the room, because you are sharing, personal to you. Even the lock in, it's not open, they have to lock in morning and they start from the evening. 8:45pm everyone has to get in their room, 9pm it is locked. You have to wait until 8am the next day. At 8am they open. You come back around 11:45am, they lock you in at 12. They open at 12:30, for the lunchtime, you come back at 3:45, they lock you in again. And then 5:30 they open again, you come back for your evening meal. So it's quite traumatic.

IO Wilkinson thanked Mr [D668] for giving her this information. She asked that his solicitor informed her of any witnesses so that she could speak to them. She asked if there was any paperwork he wanted her to have he could give that to her today or send it in through his solicitor. Mr [D668] put forward papers detailing his friends complaints. IO Wilkinson asked him to keep hold of those, and encourage his friends put in their complaints in and he would be called forward to give his witness account. He could provide those papers then.

IO Wilkinson informed Mr [D668] that she did not have any more questions that she wanted to ask him, and asked if he had any questions that he wanted to ask her. Mr [D668] asked whether the G4S staff who had abused detainees would be coming back again, because if they lost their job or were suspended, that was not going to solve the problem. They had to go to jail. If their colleagues saw that these people went to jail, it will make them have a radical change in their behaviour. If they broke the law and don't fear the law, their colleagues will feel that nothing will happen to them, it is the catalyst encourage them to carry on. Because they broke the law, that is a criminal offence, if they commit a criminal offence they have to go to jail, they don't have anyone walk away with that, or they will carry on. The only solution they have, if they ever catch us, they sue him or he would lose his job, so he had to find

another job. But if they had a proper sanction like a criminal offence, that they would feel the law, they would change their behaviour, their character.

IO Wilkinson said that when Mr [D668] was saying about getting another job, she clarified that if they were dismissed, they would not be able to work as a Detainee Custody Officer again, the HO would take their accreditation away from them, so they would not be able to work in that field again. In terms of being a criminal, only the police could prosecute in terms of being a criminal, but in terms of their jobs and hopefully in terms of a deterrent, hopefully if they are dismissed, they won't be working in a detention centre again, or even the Prison Service, she would have thought. Mr [D668] stated that the security job was very wide and they might go and work somewhere else in security. IO Wilkinson said that they would cover the detention area.

Mr [D668] said that about the drug stuff. They sell drugs, because the camera, people will sell drug, we know that carries on. That is negligence because of those eyes. It affects the detainees. It affected [D1249]. They did not put him in there to witness drug dealers, to witness people who took Spice and were like zombies. If he had been put there, it was because it was safe to keep him there. His pressure there, with his immigration matters going on. But you went there and saw the opposite. You realise that you had been put somewhere unsafe, a jungle. The abuse. It was like you are in fear of the Home Office but criminal happen right now.

IO Wilkinson clarified that Mr [D668] had mentioned about the drugs. That was something that they were also looking at. Mr [D668] stated that several officers know who is putting the drugs there, because, some officers befriend the detainees. They have their number. The drug dealer is outside of the detention centre. They give their number to their friends who make the drug. They contact security, give them the drugs. The drugs are coming through accomplices in security. For example if staff are sent to the visitors area because a visitor has to come in, you know that the staff is there, so they bring the drug. They don't check properly, so they get the drug in easily. When the detainee comes to visit them they give them the drug, to the detainee, they can put it on the table.

IO Wilkinson clarified that there were certain staff from security who worked on the visits area, who were not checking visitors, when they knew that they were bringing drugs in, and then they could freely pass the drugs over. Mr [D668] stated that some security people had the detainees' number. IO Wilkinson asked how Mr [D668] knew this. Mr [D668] stated that he witnessed it, he knew it. He does not take drugs but when he was there he knew the dealers. They don't hide it, you can see them, who takes the drugs, who sells the drug. He saw it. If you tell security, they know who the dealers are, if you went to the wrong security person, and told

him who the dealers were, he would go and tell the dealers, that detainee would report you.

IO Wilkinson asked who the staff were that were facilitating bringing the drugs into Brook House. Mr [D668] knew that when he was there he knew who was dealing the drugs. The security staff were friends with the dealers. He knew one who took the drugs. But when he asked him, he only confirmed what he knew already, that it was this guy from Jamaica. When he got the drug he gave it to a number of detainees, instead of room by room.

IO Wilkinson asked for the names of G4S staff involved. Mr [D668] said he did not have it. The one he knew, he did not have his name, because he asked for one guy, it's a usual name and he hid his badge.

IO Wilkinson clarified that whilst it is known that it is going on, he was not able to identify the G4S staff involved. Whilst this might not form part of her investigation, she will pass back that the drug dealing is done on the stair case, there is a camera there and the officers should be aware. She would flag that up, as that was something that needs to be monitored.

IO Wilkinson said she would end today's interview because Mr [D668] had a doctor's appointment and asked if he would get there in time, was it nearby. Mr [D668] stated it was in **DPA** and he would call them.

IO Wilkinson stated she would end the interview, if there was anything he wanted to hand in, after today, the witness list his solicitors would send in to her and she would carry on her investigation. She would be in touch beginning to mid February, she would write to him and let him know what the outcome of her investigation was, so he had something in writing to say what has happened. She did say at the beginning, she would listen to the recording and put together a detailed summary, it won't be verbatim but it will be fairly close to verbatim, what evidence he has given today. IO Wilkinson asked if he would like a copy, Mr [D668] stated he would. The representative also asked for a copy. IO Wilkinson stated she would post a copy out to Mr [D668] and email a copy to his solicitors so that they also have a copy.

IO Wilkinson asked Mr [D668] if he was happy with how IO Wilkinson had spoken with him today. Not happy. He said that he still feels the pain and has a headache. IO Wilkinson said she knew it was a stressful situation but asked whether he was happy with her conduct, when she had been speaking to him. [no audible answer]. IO Wilkinson continued, "Yes. Alright, thank you very much for that."

IO Wilkinson made a note of the time 4.06. That was the end of the interview.
[Recording finishes]

