

OFFICIAL – SENSITIVE

STATEMENT

STATEMENT

Statement of: Kelly Harris

Occupation: Detainee Custody Officer – Security Collator

This statement, consisting of three pages each signed by me, is true to the best of my knowledge and belief.

Date: 05/02/2018

On the 29/10/2015 the DAT system shows that I processed
[D687] prison file and made the following note on his
observation page.

[Sensitive/Irrelevant] for [Sensitive/Irrelevant] for [Sensitive/Irrelevant]
[Sensitive/Irrelevant] for [Sensitive/Irrelevant] / Mappa X /
*Previous ACDTs in 2012 and 2014 Suicidal thoughts by hanging. Stated
he would rather die than return to Somalia /* [Sensitive/Irrelevant]

Sensitive/Irrelevant

*user / Alcohol abuse / Threats to prisoners / Escape Risk Jumped on to
a contractors vehicle in grounds May 2011 /* [Sensitive/Irrelevant] *Assaulted
by another prisoner / Gang culture / Mobile phone intel / Violent*

*** By: HarrisK on 29/10/15 11:00 ***

I do not recall processing this prison file due to the amount of files we read
and the length of time that has lapsed since this was completed.

[D687] was transferred to the Verne on the 13/05/2017 and his Prison
File would have gone with him so I am unable to provide evidence of what I
saw within the file that stated he had [Sensitive/Irrelevant]

A lot of information is gathered from a prison file that is not known to us on a
detainees' arrival to the centre. For example [D687] movement order
does not show the following that I gathered from the prison file when
processed

*Previous ACDTs in 2012 and 2014 Suicidal thoughts by hanging. Stated
he would rather die than return to Somalia /* [Sensitive/Irrelevant]

Sensitive/Irrelevant

user / Alcohol abuse / Threats to prisoners / Escape Risk Jumped on to

(Signature)..... **Signature**

OFFICIAL - SENSITIVE

OFFICIAL – SENSITIVE

STATEMENT

a contractors vehicle in grounds May 2011 / Sensitive/Irrelevant / Assaulted by another prisoner / Gang culture.

(A copy of D687 movement order will be attached to this statement highlighting the information that he arrived with.)

Information that is gathered is noted on the DAT system for staff to take note of and to aid risk assessments. For example security collators and security managers have access to information that other officers and managers are not privy to. If D687 was to have left the centre for an emergency escort to the hospital when security staff were not present, a manger would be required to conduct the security assessment on the route order. For this reason comments such as I have noted on his DAT are added to each detainee so that an informed risk assessment can be completed which ultimately decides on whether the detainee will be handcuffed or not. The information can also have implications on what officers conduct the escort.

Information that is collated from the prison file is treated as a trusted source, so no validation takes place. The only exception to this would be if a detainee was to have a restriction order such as a L1 – No contact with children that did not provide an end date. In this case every effort would be made to ascertain if this was still in force.

You have asked for a response to D687 allegation that this information was shared with other detainees. Obviously I would like to say no however I am unable to confirm or deny either way. This information along with every comment that is made on the DAT system or mentioned on a shift handover is confidential and officers are aware that anything they read or are told is not to be discussed with any detainees.

You have asked for my recollection of any conversations that I had with staff at the time or since the validity of the DAT observation I made with reference to the sexual assault. I do not recall any such conversations or discussions. I do recall there was an issue amongst a number of Somali detainees who were not permitted access to the cultural kitchen for a number of different reasons which included sexual offences and weapons history. I believe this occurred at around the same time that a change was made regarding risk assessments for the cultural kitchen. Prior to the change any detainee that had a history of weapons was not permitted in the cultural kitchen because the detainees would have access to knives. The risk assessment was adapted following the complaint from a number of Somali detainees and sessions in the cultural kitchen were offered without them being permitted access to knives. The arrangement was made with Aramark the catering company that all the food detainees requested during these sessions would be provided chopped up.

(Signature).....

Signature

OFFICIAL - SENSITIVE

OFFICIAL – SENSITIVE

STATEMENT

The following DAT observation made by DCO Barry Timms on the 06/07/2016 suggests that the Head of Safety and Security at the time Mr Neil Davies validated the truth behind the sexual assault. I would suggest that a conversation happened between them and that Barry Timms may be able to provide the information on how this occurred

***** Detainee is allowed to use the cultural kitchen as there was no conviction for sexual assault. He is not allowed to work with knives or in the kitchen. This has been authorised by HOSS N Davies. ******

***** By: timmsb on 06/07/16 15:06 *****

You have asked for my response to the sexual assault comment I made on DAT being incorrect. I can categorically say that whatever document I saw the sexual assault comment on did not have NFA next to it. As I no longer have access to the prison file I cannot provide evidence of this. Had the document have said NFA I would still have listed this but would have added that D687 was not convicted of this crime and that it was only alleged.

I have no other information to add that is relevant to your investigation

*****This concludes my statement*****

(Signature).....

Signature

OFFICIAL - SENSITIVE