

# **BROOK HOUSE INQUIRY**

---

## **Second Witness Statement of Andrew Jolyon Lyden**

---

I provide this statement in response to a request under Rule 9 of the Inquiry Rules 2006 dated 29<sup>th</sup> December 2020.

I, Andrew Jolyon Lyden

, [ of DPA ] will say as follows:

### **Introduction**

1. I applied for the role at Brook House in late 2008 I was being made redundant from a job at Gatwick Airport and saw this job advertised for Detainee Custody Officer .I took up the role of Detainee Custody Officer in early 2009.I think we covered Making of witness statements in the initial Training course in 2009 but apart from that and writing statements during my time at Brook House I have no other experience or training in compiling witness statements.

### **[Evidence]**

#### **Background**

1. I am no longer employed at Brook House
2. I was being made redundant from a job at Gatwick Airport and saw the Job advertised , knowing I was going to be made redundant I applied for this role and was successful , during the time of being made redundant and the role commencing I took up the role of a baggage handler until training commenced in January 2009. I knew very little of the job before I applied but at the time I think there were very few jobs about in the local area that were on similar salaries to which I was being made redundant from.

Witness Name: Andrew Jolyon Lyden  
Statement No: One  
Exhibits: Zero

3. My employment commenced in January 2009 and the training course started at Effingham Park Hotel where the assessment day was. The training course took place to start with at a Hotel in Crawley and then about half way through the training it was moved to onsite at Brook House although this was still under construction. We were split up into groups for training and I think there was around 20 in each classroom. As the training courses were being taken by employees of G4S from different sites I thought the training would have been sufficient for staff to carry out the duties of Detainee Custody officers.
4. During the relevant period I cannot remember what the staffing levels were like, there has always been periods where G4S offered overtime to staff to cover shortfall I am unsure if one of these schemes was in place during this time , the staff daily detail would be produced every day to let staff know where they would be working for their shift. Staff would be used for escorts , Constant supervisions and bed watches and you would normally have to take staff away from their roles to cover these duties this would sometimes have an impact on the areas that these staff were taken from.
5. The roles and responsibilities of the Oscar 01 and Oscar 02 ,  
Oscar 1 , would generally oversea the day to day running of the centre for the Duty Director, responsibilities would include morning staff briefings where I think took place in one area , reading to staff the daily handover , attending the 08:30 Senior Management meeting , visiting all areas of the centre to check on staffing and documents corresponded with the handover , that observations in the ACDT documents were correct and reviews were correct and detail other managers to conduct these, report back to the Duty Director if there were any discrepancies or staff shortages. Attend rule 40/42 reviews with Duty director, supervise on occasions Use of Forces.  
Collate roll counts though out the day, update the handover for the following day and handover to the night Oscar  
Oscar 02 , although I have never done this role full time I have covered it if detailed to do so, would be to oversee admissions and detainee discharges, during the relevant period I am unsure if they were covering the induction wing also.

Witness Name: Andrew Jolyon Lyden  
Statement No: One  
Exhibits: Zero

6 I think the general attitudes were positive and a lot of staff had good relationships with a lot detainees

7 I had no concerns about G4S or its culture , managing staff was difficult due to different shift patterns, trying to line manage someone that was on different shifts proved to be challenging.

8 reading the report I believe that changes made were completed , but unsure of the time frame to which they were completed I am unsure whether all staff received training set out in the report. VER000116

9 I do not remember every being asked to investigate a complaint relating to a detainee being victimised by a staff member.

10. Brook House is a very compact site with very little outside space ,a lot of the disagreements in the past related to lack of IT and fax machines readily available to detainees, CJS004587

11i do not remember the impact of the increased capacity had on staffing or detainees when extra bed spaces were put in place, although theses beds were put in I don't think they were used very often.

12 these policies and procedures have not been made available on egress workspace.

05.02.2022 – you have now stated the policies and procedure are available but I cant find them uploaded.

13

14

15

16 in reference to my first statement, what I meant was that you spend 8 weeks in a class room learning but spending 8 weeks in a class room is not the same as spending time on the units interacting with detainees dealing with real time incidents. During the training you were not allowed to enter Brook House to see the environment that you would be working in. Training

17, training for the role as a Custody Manager was very limited , I believe this has got better in recent years with training and shadowing managers already in the role.

18 I believe I attended personal protection course when I joined G4S , all refresher courses attended would be in my Control and restraint log book which is held by Serco.

19, I thought the control and restraint training was up to date and instructors knew the content that they were teaching.

20 I do not have access to document HOM001953. If I had attended this would have been recorded in my Control and Restraint log book, as would the refresher training in 2017. Reviewed document, this email does not confirm either way, please refer to my training records.

21 I believe the quality of the training and trainers was of a good standard.

22 document CJS004296 does represent a fairly accurate role for DCM, although have time to carry out this was sometime a challenge, ie when asked to conduct audits this took you away from the operation side of the job and was never given time to conduct pieces of work like this you had to fit in it around the operation.

23 A duty director would be present for constant supervision reviews, I feel this was adequate as a duty director had to be present in the review for observations to be reduced if they felt at the time the detainees no longer needed to be on a constant supervision.

24 reading the review , the detainee in question had just arrived at Brook House , on arrival at Brook House a detainee on an open ACDT must have a review , this review took place in the reception area during the booking in process , my role was of an attendee rather than member of staff from unit. im not sure how often case managers changed but if the primary case manager was off when a case review was due then another manager had to conduct the review. CJS001049

25 the role of the case manager is to conduct ACDT reviews , coordinate the review for other agencies to attend, if they could not attend then gather information relevant to the detainee , during the review listen to the detainees needs and work out a plan best to help them, update the care plan. CJS001171

26, Oscar 01 coordinated the information from SLP for the handover , a member of healthcare or residential staff member would open them , reviews would be carried out by the residential mangers. CJS001174

27 CJS 004894 I have not been given this document. Document now received and reviewed 06.02.2022 – I reported it, how successful any resulting action was, I do not recall.

29 I was not aware of any homophobic or misogynistic behaviours amongst staff.

30 I did not experience bullying by other members of staff during my time employed at Brook House.

30 I do not recall dealing with any staff complaints regarding bullying.

31 I do not recall the incident, but we must have been informed that there might have been a visitor arriving at Brook House with suspected drugs pass to take place, police attended site and drugs were found either by police or by staff searching the detainee. CJS001174

32 Home office would have been invited to any ACDT case reviews regarding this detainee, where his protest would have been discussed, they also received copies of the handover everyday and this would have been discussed in the morning SMT meeting. CJS001301

33 I have never had problem with Senior Managers at Brook House, I have always been able to approach any of them if needed.

34, I believe I managed Naz for a period of time, and he is right staff and managers do get moved around a lot and due to the difference in shifts catching up with staff was difficult, I cant remember what steps I took for him to become Advanced control an restraint trained , as part of the contract was a small percentage had to be trained and until spaces became available then others could not be sent on the course. I remember he did complete his course and I think he was still advanced trained when I left Brook House. VER000259, PAGE 5

35 document CJS001174 has a S Loughton as the incoming Oscar 01 and not myself

36 I would say if the information had of been passed to someone earlier then the handover would have been useful to inform staff but in this instance the SIR was submitted on the 4.4.17 and email received on 9.4.17 , there were no guide lines on how long information should stay on the handover for. CJS005350

37 , this information would have been put on the handover and the detainee in question put on the list of “at risk if Rds are served” staff would receive a morning



briefing every morning and handover sent to the Home Office who would inform managers when Rds are to be served in future . CJS005479

38 I do not recall attending one of these meetings. management committee

39 by UOF Meetings I presume its meant by UOF briefings prior to an intervention they would attend give information regarding the detainees healthcare, if he had any current or old injuries or any medical grounds which would prevent force being used.

40 I do not recall conducting or being interviewed regarding any grievance investigations.

41, the detail would be done either the day before or the night before by the Oscar 01, during this period im not sure if central detail had started to complete the daily detail then. If there was a bedwatch off site or escort this would impact staffing or sickness leaving areas short.

42if there was sickness , bedwatches or emergency escorts out off site then this would impact other areas of the centre.

43 I think staff shortages had an impact on morale as did the shift pattern 13.5 hour days leaving people tired , then being offered overtime on your limited days off which a many number of staff took up as this was at an increased rate making it attractive to come in on your rest days.

44i think it was easy to recruit staff at times due to the loss of jobs at Gatwick airport in recent years.

45 as a manager we were not on a 46hr contract ours was 42 I think, staff prior to this new contract were on 48hr week contract so I think this would have been positive for some but not others as was the shift pattern some people liked working longer days to get more time off others didn't like the long days.

46 im not sure how you would retain staff levels a Brook House.

47 I believe this document was followed by staff CJS006042

48 I do not recall if a detainee asked for a rule 35 assessment if they had I would of informed healthcare for an appointment to see the doctor.

49 I have not been given document CJS005553

Access to this now received and reviewed 06.02.2022 – I do not remember the specific incident from the report provided, and do not recall where the healthcare assessment took place – circa 5 years ago.

50 I have not been given document CJS 005563 – access to this now received and reviewed 06.02.2022, I can't recollect this incident specifically, Annex A is use of force on a detainee, I did not believe I had to fill out Annex A as I did not use force on this detainee.

51 I have not been given document CJS 005648 – access to this now received and reviewed on 06.02.2022. – I do not recall the incident so cannot provide any further information, as it was planned removal this would have been recorded.

52 any detainee would be referred to Healthcare if they stated any issues regarding Mental health. If healthcare said there were no issues raised then I think wing managers and staff would have been informed of the outcome.

53 I am unsure of the sufficiency and availability of the healthcare team to see individuals with mental health needs, they did have RMNs on site and talking therapy room is in one of the rooms in visits.

54 Oscar 01 involvement would mainly be in the evening or a night duty where you would visit the wings check the wing diaries for food refusals, if a detainee was on an open ACDT document then this would also be checked for and observations to see if the detainee had eaten during the day. Shop accounts would be checked to see if they are purchasing items from the shop. Healthcare would give Oscar 01 a BRAG rating report, all this information would then be added to the handover for the following day. documents CJS001173 and CJS001188

55 Healthcare would have a list of detainees who would be refusing food and fluid, they would see these detainees every morning and compile their BRAG rating report, a copy of this report would be given to the day Oscar 01, if any immediate concerns were raised then that would be discussed with healthcare DD and home office, BRAG report would be used to update daily handover. CJS001294

56 reading paragraphs 8.20-8.21 reports were received into the incident a consultation had taken place with the Duty Director and rule 40 was agreed home office were notified prior to the detainee being placed onto rule 40. CJS003348

Changes that have been made in recent times I believe that any pre authorised use of rule 40 must be authorised and signed by a member of the Home office.

57 prior to 2017 I am not sure if there was any training packages for placing detainees onto rule 40 I know in recent years I am unsure when this took place there was a training day held by the Home office on rule 40/42 [CJS001640]

58 a decision to end rule 40 would have been decided during rule 40 review we would of spoken to the other detainee involved , possible have meeting between the two detainees spoken to security to see if there was any reason to why he could or could not go to a certain wing , this would have in influence to which wing the detainee would be returning too. [CJS001841]

59 SIR would have been completed about threats being made by both detainees, I do not remember the sir but both detainees were on rule 40 and must have been shouting at each other through the gaps in the doors, I reported what I had heard via an SIR and submitted it to security , as both detainees were on rule 40 at that time they would not. Have come into contact with each other. [CJS004661]

60 the Oscar 01 of the day would of put this information onto the handover for staff to be made aware the email was addressed to all of healthcare for them to be made aware, I believe that there is an officer present during medication times in healthcare. [CJS004689]

61 I am not mentioned in this report that I can see , if I was on duty and it was reported to myself then it would have been reported by the officer on the wing to the Oscar 01 as it states both parties were separated and placed into separate rooms healthcare would have been called and incident reported to police using 101 this call would have been logged at brook house and the was a police call log in the Oscar 01 office where once call had been made a note of the crime number was made, an incident report would have been completed by the officer that was on the unit and incident added to the handover for staff the following morning. [SXP000084]

62i do not recall concerns of verbal or physical of individuals whilst working at Brook House.

63 there had been many changes since panorama I think with the new contracts staffing levels had increased I think , shift patterns had changed and I think the



reduction in hourly contracts had decreased again , prior to leaving there appeared to be more activities for detainees to partake in

<b><u>Statement of Truth</u></b>	
I believe that the facts stated in this witness statement are true. I understand that proceedings for contempt of court may be brought against anyone who makes, or causes to be made, a false statement in a document verified by a statement of truth without an honest belief in its truth.	
I am content for this witness statement to form part of the evidence before the Brook House Inquiry and to be published on the Inquiry's website.	
Name	Andrew Lyden
Signature	<div style="border: 1px dashed black; padding: 2px; display: inline-block;">Signature</div>
Date	17/01/2022

Witness Name: Andrew Jolyon Lyden  
Statement No: One  
Exhibits: Zero