

*Confidential*

**Independent Investigation into Brook House**

**Wednesday, 25 July 2018**

**Interview with  
Dave Roffey (DCM)**

*This transcript has been prepared from a recording taken during the interview. Whilst it will not be attached in full to the final report, extracts from it may be included in the report. It forms part of the evidence to the Investigation and as such, will be relied on during the writing of the report and its conclusions. When you receive the transcript, please read it through, add or amend it as necessary, then sign it to signify you agree to its accuracy and return it to Verita. If the signed and agreed transcript is not returned within two weeks, we will assume that you accept its contents as accurate.*

## Independent Investigation into Brook House

Wednesday, 25 July 2018

Interview with  
Dave Roffey (DCM)

Investigators: Mr Ed Marsden (Verita)  
Ms Kate Lampard (Verita)

1. **Ms Lampard:** Dave, very nice to see you again and thank you for saying you'll speak to us. Let's just do a bit of background stuff. Can we have your employment history at BH, what your position is now?
2. **A.** I joined here in January 2015 as a DCO. I completed my initial training course and I went live in the March time of that year. I was initially employed on B Wing as a B Wing officer, which was not at the time the induction wing. It was just treated as a normal wing, the induction wing at the time was A Wing. Within seven to eight months, a position came up for a seconded residential DCM which I went for and successfully got, and I started my career as a DCM in late November/December 2015.
3. **Mr Marsden:** What had you done before you came here?
4. **A.** If I go back to day dot, as a 16-year old lad, I was working in a sports centre. I then joined the Royal Marines at the age of 17½ and I did seven years' service in Her Majesty's Royal Marines and left in 1987. I then became a sales rep for a sports nutrition company throughout the London and Southeast area. I left there in 2003 and had a year of doing building work, working with builder friends of mine. I was then employed by Parcellforce as an area manager on the sales side of Parcellforce, and I took redundancy from there in 2010/11, end of that year, start of the next year. I took the redundancy package as they were clearing out lines management at the Royal Mail, and the package at the time was fairly substantial and it was quite nice to take. The year previous to that, my wife and I had set up a business in **DPA** where we own a tanning studio for our sins, which is still going to this day. I then pursued that as my job for a few years. A few things happened to me that gave me a nudge into this job. At one point, I was on the verge of becoming a personal bodyguard for Bruce Springsteen, which was just after I had a Chief Constable's commendation for bravery in **DPA** - I grabbed an armed man outside of Coral's.
5. **Ms Lampard:** I bet you didn't think you were going to do that when you woke up that morning in **DPA**.
6. **A.** No, I didn't! It turned out to be a BB gun and when the armed police turned up, they said it wouldn't have mattered, they would have possibly rendered him fairly useless. From there I decided that I wanted to get back into the operational side of things again, and I applied for a job with Immigration. I didn't make the initial sift, even though I had x amount of good stories, I didn't put it in the right way. I applied at the same time to G4S and that is where I am now. I started in the residential side of it, it went on for about a year I suppose that I was resident manager. The structure at the time was different:

we had a resident manager at each end of the building running either A, B and E end or C and D end. I was running alongside James Begg who is now one of the directors. Then due to staff shortages, I was sort of pushed into taking over the Oscar One role every now and again, and then in January 2017 I became full-time as an Oscar One and that's where I have been ever since.

7. Q. Great. Before we move on to any specifics, just tell us how it's been here. You tell us what you want to tell us about how this place has worked and been run since, say, the beginning of 2017?
8. A. *Pre-Panorama*?
9. Q. *Pre-Panorama*, in the Benn days, what was going on?
10. A. At that time, there was a lot of experienced staff here, experienced officers, experienced DCMs. With the staffing module at the time, more often than not we would end up with two people running a wing. It felt as if it was being run on a tight scale.
11. **Mr Marsden:** Dave, was that a management decision, or was that because we can't recruit people and we have lost people?
12. A. Obviously, there were not as many courses as are going through now. At the time, one ITC would finish and there would be a break before the next one started, whereas at the moment it seems to be a rolling conveyor belt of staff. At the start of 2017, the population in the centre changed over the last few years where the percentage of FNOs has gone up, which changed the whole demographics of the centre. You had some hardened criminals in here and there wasn't any of the pettiness, the young offender mentality going on. If there were incidents, more often than not they were fairly serious, which has changed to what it is today and post-*Panorama* where there was niggly sort of stuff, fire-fighting all round the building. It disappeared at the time, there was more -
13. Q. It would serious rather than -
14. A. Yes. Unfortunately, the introduction of PS changed the game in this place as well. My mindset when I first came here - with the conditions with lots of people and the prison officers you speak to, people would say how can you get drugs into these centres, and you think you must be able to stop it. You then understand how these things get in, it's a numbers game, it's percentages coming in.
15. **Ms Lampard:** What's your view of where PS comes? We have been told by others that there are four ways really: there is the mail, the staff, there's detainee visitors. That's it. Where do you think it's most coming from?
16. A. From my point of view, quantity-wise, if someone is bringing it in through visits, the quantity couldn't possibly be that much because they are trying to pass something under the view of the camera, under the view of staff. When we have major incidents of PS, the worst day I had was 16 responses in one day to PS-related incidents and a few days later it was 28.
17. **Mr Marsden:** Was that in December 2016, that Christmas?
18. A. Around that sort of time. In my eyes, if it is coming in in that quantity, it must be being brought in by other means, which I would say is staff. It's shocking to say it but that is the nature of the beast. I know it's a big business and it's worth a lot of money to someone out there.

19. Q. There is much more searching now isn't there?
20. A. There is more searching, it's more robust and that has even changed where people come to the gate-house, there would be someone stood there, and they come straight through, get the keys, sort their stuff out, get them into the sterile area, now you are going straight upstairs to be searched. Every time you seem to catch up, it seems to run in front of you again, so now they are bringing it in sheets of paper doused in stuff and everything else, so it's becoming even harder to trace. I have been involved in a couple of incidents in the last three months with stuff with drugs with staff, which didn't end successfully unfortunately.
21. **Ms Lampard:** What do you mean by that?
22. A. I think it was when I spoke to you two guys, you came in one morning looking at the detail and I spoke to you, which was on a Wednesday and this was the previous Sunday. We had a very difficult situation with a member of staff who I believed at the time to be under the influence of something. That has been investigated, one person was relieved of their job and the other person is still employed at Tinsley House. If I am honest, I was doing my job to the ultimate that day, I was treading on eggshells, challenging the whole situation. I challenged the welfare side of things, I was concerned with people's welfare: have you been in the room with someone smoking something, every opportunity was given to give an explanation. It was on camera, I had healthcare there, I had other witnesses, it was pushed up to the duty director at the time and then to Gold Command, where I was instructed as to what the next moves were, which we did to the letter. It would appear that other people changed what they said in their statements from what they actually said in interview, and it came back as inconclusive that this guy was under the influence, whereas any intelligent human being would say there was something wrong with that person.
23. Q. And the person who didn't get relieved of their job and is at Tinsley House, do you think that is the sort of person who is at risk of bringing stuff into the centre?
24. A. Absolutely. There is a wider package there as well. In the past, where staff members were again alleged to be bringing in drugs, obviously security knew about it. There are certain weekends where I was in as Oscar One and there were no security staff in at the weekend, and a lot of staff were submitting SIRs about people. I am trying to keep a lid on the whole thing saying, okay, that's excellent, that's good work, you need to keep reporting stuff like that, but it was mounting up, mounting up and mounting up. I reported up the chain of command as to what I thought was happening and a person was suspended. Then later they didn't get their accreditation back from the Home Office, G4S didn't fire her at the time - I believe there was a wider network with that situation as well. On the drug side of things, if there are large amounts coming in, personally I think it's down to staff.
25. Q. You're not alone in that view. Dave, we have just touched on the staffing issues and how it felt before *Panorama* with very few staff, quite tense, and that went on for some time after *Panorama*. What do you put the *Panorama* thing down to, that sort of casual abusive behaviour that nobody was challenging. What do you think that was about?
26. A. The whole *Panorama* thing, from my point of view, was that from my side of the shift at the time, the filming was predominantly done on the opposite side

of the shift. The behaviour of some people I could never condone, it was totally unprofessional. The mindset, from my point of view on my side of the shift, even with sometimes limited managers and limited staff, every incident we used to go to we always used our cameras, and the cameras weren't as available to everybody as they are now. From our side of the shift, the guys I was working with at the time, so myself and probably Jack Bannister as Oscar One team, always professional with detainees, always respectful, no matter what sort of situation we would be in. So it was quite shocking for me to see some of the behaviour on what would appear to be the other side of the shift. It also appeared that certain people were singled out to be filmed but, if they're doing something wrong, they're doing something wrong, let's leave it at that.

27. **Mr Marsden:** As in Callum knew he could get good footage of Nathan saying something inappropriate because he had seen him saying those things?
28. **A.** Yes. The same happened to me in January this year when there was a list of allegations made to me to do with the woman who lost her job allegedly for the drugs issue, and some other people involved with loads of allegations against me, which are completely unfounded. As part of that, people have asked questions about me and nothing but good reports came back. As part of that, these people have said to me that, at the time of *Panorama*, I was on holiday in June last year and I picked up a tropical disease and pneumonia, and I was off for eight weeks including my holiday. They were asked questions from Callum directly, 'has Dave ever said anything to you?' - it was like he was after me as well. I thought, that's great, he can probe as much as he likes, and it was quite a shocking time for me.
29. **Ms Lampard:** Dave, when you look at the film, one of the things that strikes you is that there are people behaving inappropriately but they obviously have an understanding that, as far as those people they're talking to, they can get away with it with them. There is that stuff about Nathan telling people to give it to them on the stairs. Of course, that raises the question about what sort of friendship groups there might be within the centre, and there are friendship groups within any working environment. Do you think there has been an issue, though, of perhaps some slightly over-tight groups that might influence other people in a poor way? There were younger people present in some of those discussions, who didn't feel that they could speak up and say to anybody: do you know what, that's not a good thing to say. Leaving aside *Panorama*, just generally.
30. **A.** A lot of it was geared around E Wing, obviously that's where a lot of stuff is going to happen; that's where you have the more challenging individuals coming down that you have to deal with on a day-to-day basis. There was not so much of a rotation of staff as there is now around different wings. There was a set-in-stone six or eight members of staff who would be the E Wing staff on different sides of the shift, they would cross over every now and again. Yes, in my eyes, they are going to bond as a group because they are dealing with stuff day in, day out. They are going to bond as a group to get their days to go through. Would that sometimes be seen as menacing by younger people, as officers? Possibly yes.
31. **Q.** The other thing too is that, in a sense, you don't have to be menacing? They don't have to have said anything to anybody like 'pipe down, you shut up and do what we're doing!' but, if younger people see quite strong friendship groups, they will be sensitive to that and they won't want to get themselves

- into trouble with one, because they will be fearful - we all know how group dynamics are. I just wonder if there are quite strong social ties between members of staff outside the centre: do people socialise quite a lot together? Are there groups of people who are identifiably getting on with each other quite well, have a strong friendship group, which might also intimidate people a bit? I don't mean intimidate in a bad sense.
32. A. From my point of view, and to be fair, in the three and a half years I have been here, I could count on two hands the amount of times I have been out with colleagues from work, which over that period of time is quite few to be fair. At the start, I was coming to do my job, be professional, go home, deal with my other stuff. I don't do social media, Facebook and stuff like that, I'm a bit archaic in that way.
33. Q. Join the club!
34. A. I don't want to display myself in the public realm as some people do - they tell you they've just been to the toilet or whatever! It's not my style so often I'll find out on a Monday morning that everyone has been out at the weekend and I'm like yeah? Oh, it was on Facebook - was it? That's me out of the game then.
35. Q. We get the impression that there is a bit of that that goes on here?
36. A. There possibly is a bit that does go on and in my eyes if it is between sides of the shift, because you obviously work opposite shifts - most people will go out on a weekend as well, so things will be arranged for the weekend. One lot will be working and one lot won't be working, it's the way it sort of pans out.
37. Mr Marsden: You have worked in a number of places. Is any of that more extreme here than anywhere else you have worked?
38. A. Bearing in mind, my background was with the Marines which is a very tight group.
39. Ms Lampard: And has to be.
40. A. The let-off of steam from the Marines in the 90s was possibly different from what would be seen as correct in this day and age. From that point of view, I am used to a tight group of people, so the question as to whether there are tight groups here, in my eyes not as tight as I have had in the past where you're trusting others.
41. Q. But might be perceived as such by other people, do you think?
42. A. Yes, it could be. From my point of view here, with guys I have worked with doing the shifts, you go through some major incidents and everything else, if you are going back to early 2017, you used to go to incidents and think, okay, we've got enough staff here, this is what the incident is. You start working through the incident and you knew that you had officers there you could trust to back you up, you could trust them to do the job and sort the situation out. From my personal point of view, at the moment, I have rocked up to certain things where I've looked round and I have nobody behind me, so I'm thinking I'm on my own here until people start arriving.
43. Q. That takes us very neatly on to 28 November and what happened there. Would you like to talk us through it, because you gave a very powerful description of it and I would quite like to have that?
44. A. As far as the timings and everything else, I'm going to work through the day. There was a call to C Wing very early after the unlock in the morning, and

there was a detainee - Mr **D1159** - who had been creating, he was a well-known nominal in the centre and he was performing, in my eyes, to show he is the man of the wing. He had jumped onto the netting, jumped off the netting, being encouraged by other people and it ended up down the end -

45. Q. You were Oscar One that day?

46. A. I was Oscar One that day. I ended up down the end of the wing with him.

47. **Mr Marsden:** He was FNO?

48. A. Yes. I was fairly much surrounded - I didn't realise at the time - by quite a few detainees. He was very, very aggressive. I am in a situation where I've looked round and I've got no-one with me, and I was thinking that if he goes for me, I'm going to be right in it because there was no back-up behind me. I was also very mindful of the fact that, if he did that, any form of restraint the other detainees there would take me out as part of the equation. So there was a negotiation going on between me and him, he was still very aggressive and puffing his chest, for want of a word, in front of his fellow detainees. I had officers there but not directly around me. I think Steve Skitt arrived on the scene as well at the same time, and I was trying to usher him away from the situation, trying to get him to the door, to the stairwell, so that we could take him away from everybody else.

49. **Ms Lampard:** When you say to the stairwell, do you mean out of the wing?

50. A. Out of the wing, down the stairwell. That negotiation went on for as long as it did. He then started moving around, other people got involved, there was probably a group of three or four at the time who were getting involved with the conversation. He then went back to his room and I think he might have jumped back on the netting again just to prove something. He went into his room and we were asking him to calm down, to chill out a bit here. I can't remember whether his room was locked for him to calm down for a minute or not. This was between eight and nine in the morning. It was rumbling up to lunchtime when, again, there were quite a few detainees involved - I would say to the tune of 20-plus, possibly 30 - that didn't lock up for lunchtime. We now had a situation that was starting to escalate to something more serious. We cracked on with the regime as much as we could to try to disrupt and to feed everybody. I remember over the lunchtime period, **D1159** went down there and thrust himself to the front of the queue. He was aggressive in front of the detainees and it was quite clear to me that there were detainees on the wing who were in fear themselves. The situation carried on during the day. The detainees were allowed off the wing after 1.30 so, again, there was a nucleus of guys who seemed intent on disruption.

51. **Mr Marsden:** Did the control room open at this point?

52. A. If I remember, the command suite was opened over what should have been the lunchtime lock-up. After that I think it was open then, if I am correct.

53. Q. With Steve?

54. A. It was with Steve, I think Michelle Brown was involved. I can remember Michelle Brown being on the wing and talking to people. The command suite was opened after that period for the afternoon. It then got to the evening and dinner-time lock-up, again there was a nucleus of people who didn't lock up. It started to escalate a bit over that dinner-time period where there were things getting smashed up on the wing. Throughout the day, there were conversations going on with staff and interaction with detainees.

55. Q. Some of them locked up did they?
56. A. Yes, some of them locked up. Then, again, we tried to keep to the regime as much as we could for the evening meal and, during that period, it was decided at half-past six that we wouldn't be unlocking the wing, so everyone on that wing would be staying on that wing for the foreseeable future. It started to ramp up from there, the pool table got turned over, there were weapons being made.
57. **Ms Lampard:** What were the weapons? You told us about the discs off the feet.
58. A. It was the feet off the pool table which were eventually found in **D1159**'s room after he was removed down to CSU. They are very heavy inverted discus, that sort of shape, which would have been absolutely horrendous if it was thrown at anybody. There were mop handles and other stuff around, so they were getting as many weapons as they could.
59. Q. Did they put them in their rooms?
60. A. We found the four discuses in **D1159**'s room. At the time, from my point of view, I thought that because there was a nucleus of six to 10 of them, it would only take one wrong move or one of those to really overstep the mark and, if we had to protect ourselves, or other detainees not involved, if we used force on anyone, that would have been the catalyst for absolute destruction on the wing. In the end, the command suite was opened. I think Lee was Gold Command that day, he was on site but he was back seat from Silver Command as he should be. At one point, we were told in no uncertain terms by detainees to remove all female staff from the wing, which said to me that there was real concern that discipline was about to begin. Discussions were had up in the command suite, there were officers who shared their thoughts and concerns with me about their wellbeing and their safety. From my point of view, there was a lot of fear in the officers' faces, and we were told to hold the situation as was and I know that, if we had retreated out of there, that wing would have been lost.
61. Q. Did they remove the females?
62. A. Yes, we did. There were a lot of conversations going on around the wing with detainees who were not involved in the situation and some that were. There were little pockets everywhere of people trying to talk to people. The main thing for me was I had quite a big group of disgruntled people that wanted to get off the wing at half-past six and, unfortunately, I was trying to explain to them that, as it stands at the moment, you can see the situation we've got, you've been through this all day, we're not letting you off at this moment in time. I was surrounded by people, some of them quite vocal. There was a big Jamaican guy who was being fairly vocal to me at the time.
63. Q. Were you fearful?
64. A. No.
65. Q. We've spoken with other staff who have told us how fearful they were.
66. A. Yes, but it's not really my make-up to be fair. This guy was right in my face and giving me abuse, saying he wanted to go to the shop and everything else, so I just got out a piece of paper and a pen and started taking orders for the shop. I ended up with about 10 orders, I had their ID cards, their orders and I said I'm going to get this stuff for you, give me half an hour to 45 minutes and I'll get it all back to you. I said I've got your order, I'll take your



cards to your bag, when I come back I'll give you your bag, give you the receipt and there's your shopping for the evening, if I can ask you after that, if you don't mind, because we need to resolve the situation, would you mind locking up early? I went back for a couple more orders, there was other stuff going on at the time with staff interacting with detainees. It was the start of the catalyst that started the lockdown and that was probably quarter to seven/seven o'clock. Over the next hour, with the staff group that was there, we slowly started locking people down until it got to the stage where it was the hard core of people causing it being disciplined and a few stragglers that were just on the periphery, putting their words in here and there. Even when they started locking up, the main hard core thought 'we're the only ones left out here now' and, eventually, they were locked up, which was totally amazing. It was as if, from my point of view, there was safety for everybody, safety of staff, safety of the detainees that weren't involved. When that last person went behind the door, I went phew!

67. **Mr Marsden:** The evidence suggests that the SMT knew about the likely possibility of trouble on the wing before the 28th, and Steve had asked Joules to move D1159
68. **A.** Steve Laughton?
69. **Q.** No, Steve Skitt. Did you know any of that?
70. **A.** No. I knew D1159 from E Wing possibly when he first came. When he first came in, he was a very challenging individual - very challenging! From my personal point of view, him on a large wing, the word that comes to my mouth - wow! He could put a fire-lighter into any situation and start anything off and quite a dangerous man as well. Quite a fit, young individual. His rule of thumb was fear and in any situations you had with him, his top would be straight off.
71. **Ms Lampard:** Did he go back to prison?
72. **A.** Yes, he went back to - was it Kent?
73. **Q.** One of those on DPA
74. **A.** I removed him from there because he was on ?CSU at the time.
75. **Q.** Dave, since then there hasn't been an incident quite like that, has there? Have there been other serious incidents? We heard about a couple of incidents with detainees who barricaded themselves in their room.
76. **A.** That was in February this year with three guys, one of which was -
77. **Mr Marsden:** A man who was going back to DPA.
78. **A.** I think it was D4888 who caused all the damage.
79. **Q.** He then went to Heathrow.
80. **A.** Yes, he was released and then stabbed somebody. He is in prison now on remand.
81. **Ms Lampard:** During those incidents, were officers injured?
82. **A.** In the one with the three barricaded in the room, it started off when they weren't locking up at lunchtime, so there were negotiations going on. They were on E Wing and sat at the pool table. There was a Somali, there was D4888, D4889 was one of them.

83. Q. Was he called [D3322]- he came to one of our -
84. Mr Marsden: The three of them came to one of our -
85. A. It was an ongoing situation, we fed the other guys on the wing in their rooms. Obviously, the command suite was opened and I think Joules was DD that day, if I am correct and I think Michelle Brown ran the command suite. We had a discussion - the command suite needs to be opened. Eventually, these guys went into the room, all three of them went into the same room and the door was locked. I can't remember the officer who did it but, at the time, I thought wow! - we've now got three guys in the room. The escalation from there was the fact that we now have to remove these guys from that room. We had discussions in the command suite and people had been negotiating with them for a while. I was told to go away and do a brief to remove these three guys from the room and, as it stood, there would be no negotiation because that negotiation period had ended. I went away with Dan Robinson, the Security Manager, we typed up a briefing script for some teams.
86. Previous to that, I already got 14 or 15 people to get kitted up. Knowing the seriousness of the situation and the type of people we were dealing with, I had selected a lot of guys and it was male officers, because of the violence that these guys can inflict and they were guys who have done removals with me before. That was then changed by the SMT, some guys were taken out of the team to go back to the wings to oversee the regime on the wings, and other people were brought in to be part of the teams. Also, when we had done the brief, it came down from Gold Command, who at the time was Pete Small, that there were certain stipulations he wanted to make. When we entered that area, he wanted the door drilled from this side, so they could open it out of the barricade. He also wanted me to give a verbal command to the three guys in there to get onto their knees at the back of the room and put their hands on their head, which, at the time, I thought was very prison-orientated; it was not something that I would normally do but it was coming direct from Gold. That was all put into my report that I was told to do that.
87. So we entered and the first three-man teams were organised. It was a case that we decided that, if force was needed, we would need to make as much room as we can. We obviously needed to get into the room and to take control of the men in there and with that amount of people in there, it would be an absolute nightmare. Part of the briefing was that you need to get your individual out onto the landing, so that we can deal with the situation more easily. When I plan a removal or anything, I always plan for the worst case scenario and anything less than that is a bonus, and I always prepare my teams for the same.
88. We got there and the facilities guy at the time tried to drill the door, which was making quite a lot of noise. The noise coming from inside was quite vocal and quite expletive, basically 'bring it on beep, beep, beep!'. The door couldn't be drilled out. I had also challenged in the command suite previously that, if we are going through the door and are going to have to restrain, I prefer to have the momentum of the door going in, so I gave the order for them to get onto their knees and put their hands on their heads, to be met with an absolute hurl of abuse. That was then my requisite to go okay, we're going in, the key was put in the door and I sent the teams in. Ultimately, it came down to my decision on the floor at the time, I didn't take guidance from anybody else. Because of the safety of the team going in, we are going to

have to remove these guys and then we went in. It was slippery, absolutely horrendous, there were people crawling on their knees, it was a fight going on in there to try to gain control.

89. Eventually, individuals were coming out with teams on them, being restrained in individual areas, and I took control. I took supervision of a team that were on the left-hand side on the floor. The guys who were trying to restrain them were covered in baby oil and so on, I was trying to give instructions to sit him up to restrain him. I was looking at handcuffing because he was being very refractory. We then put him in to the prone position, the guy that I had and, again, the officers were really struggling. I told the left arm officer to get away, I then restrained the left arm to gain control and it was a swap-over sort of situation. The whole thing was done totally professionally, we handcuffed him and up he stood - okay, we're now in control, now we can deal with this. We took him through to CSU and searched him while the other individuals were dealing with their bits. From my point of view, it worked really well apart from the fact that there were officers injured.
90. **Ms Lampard:** Any serious injuries or was it falling over and bashing themselves sort of injuries?
91. **A.** There was a knee injury - I think ?Kirsty Cane had a knee injury. Who else got injured? I think Barry Timms who has now left, he was the audits guy, had some sort of bash which, again, was down to slipping. There is a guy who is still off - Nathan Williams - who has a long-standing shoulder injury, which came on after the event. I can't remember the other two.
92. **Q.** That's fine.
93. **A.** From my perspective, this comes back to the training, we are all trained the same, we are all taught the C&R techniques and everything else, but sometimes the way people deliver that or, if they haven't done a lot of restraint in the past, they are a bit new to the situation, some people don't take it as seriously as they should do. Perhaps they are a bit reluctant, like a challenge on a football pitch: you see some pretty horrendous challenges on the football pitch where a guy cuts someone else in half and they fall over, then you see two guys go hammer and tongs at each other, both full bloodied and they get up and walk away.
94. **Q.** Do you think there is some reticence sometimes?
95. **A.** Absolutely.
96. **Q.** That that makes things worse?
97. **A.** Yes.
98. **Mr Marsden:** More prone to injury.
99. **A.** Yesterday, a member of staff was grabbed in a room during the ?fabric checks. She picked up a lighter, the guy grabbed her hand, she told him to get off, he got off and put another hand on her, still grabbing her hand. This didn't get reported to me until later in the afternoon, which was quite horrendous. I said to her, you have been taught personal protection techniques, did you tell him to get off? The words came back to me, which was shocking and we have started dealing with it this morning straight away with a staff briefing: 'I didn't want to touch him because I was fearful of losing my job'. I was like, wow! I did the briefing this morning to the staff and tagged onto the end of my brief, I said yesterday a member of staff was

assaulted, didn't instruct the guy well enough to get off. I said you need to remember your personal protection training, what you can do and what you can't do. You need to say to the person, get off. If you are on the street and someone attacks you, under common law you have the right to use proportionate force to get someone away from you. I said that is the same in this place and you need to know -

100. **Ms Lampard:** 'I was fearful of losing my job' - that takes us back to something quite a lot of staff have said to us while we were here about their fearfulness of losing their job a lot of the time. It has been quite a punishing regime and there have been quite a lot of people finding themselves subject to investigation, suspended for long periods of time, rather than having what you might expect: hang on, let me have a quick word with you about that, don't do that again; or is there anything I can do to help you?
101. **A.** That side of this company is vile. Some of it is absolutely disgraceful, the way staff are treated in instances like that. When I do stuff, when I am on the floor, dealing with incidents, when things are happening, I know what I can do with the use of force with personal protection, and I understand it because I write a lot of reports about it and everything else. Regarding the fear factor, every other day there is something being churned out: notice to staff, don't do this or that. They end up going, what can I do?
102. **Mr Marsden:** A lot of the stuff in the gatehouse is like that isn't it? As you come in, where the key press is - when you go into some centres, there are quite a lot of positive messages but there are quite a lot of exhortations not to do things or you will get into trouble.
103. **A.** It seems that way at the moment.
104. **Ms Lampard:** Where does that come from?
105. **A.** It's the control from SMT. Sometimes I think, let us get on with our jobs.
106. **Mr Marsden:** Is that a Steve thing?
107. **A.** It's a Steve thing and sometimes it's a collection. Some things that come out, you think - wow! - you really are putting staff on the back foot straight away.
108. **Ms Lampard:** We have been to other places where you see the senior management team on the floor a great deal, they are very approachable, people understand them, they feel they can raise things with them and so on - I don't like that, or could we do this differently? Here we seem to have the problem that, in parallel with this quite punitive 'get that wrong and you'll be investigated, suspended and, by the way, there are an awful lot of rules about what you can and can't do', people aren't having that tempered by seeing their senior management team around, by being able to talk to them and perhaps say, 'I did this thing and got it wrong, what would you do in those circumstances?'. That sort of thing doesn't seem to happen.
109. **A.** The problem is the duty director has their rounds and that's what they do. You don't see a lot of coming down from upstairs, as I call it.
110. **Mr Marsden:** And just sort of walking around - they do their rounds.
111. **A.** Yes. Back in the period of 2017, there was hardly any of that going on. A lot of things are put on the Oscar One position and every department comes to us, every officer comes to us, we need to sort the detail out - it's us. The recruitment guys sometimes go wow, sorry, we've got an HR department - have we? Okay, we have an HR department, why am I doing this? It just

goes back to the Oscar One. Ultimately, in my eyes, if it went wrong in this place during the operation 24/7, the finger is going to get firmly pointed at the Oscar One.

112. **Ms Lampard:** How volatile, how risky, how unsafe do you think that makes this place with the management structure, the newness of so many staff, the lack of enough staff?
113. **A.** When I was an officer, you rarely called on a manager to come and deal with a situation, because you had a rapport with the guys. My workstation was B Wing and I had a rapport with the core of detainees that were on there, so you would deal with situations yourself. If it became a problem, you would call a manager. There is a lack of confidence among staff now to deal with a minor situation because it starts to progress into something bigger, when someone loses their rag because they haven't been given the soap that they wanted or, as it was last night, some potatoes. Someone got badly assaulted last night. The confidence is not there -
114. **Mr Marsden:** - to nip those small things in the bud and deal with them.
115. **A.** Yes, there's not a lot of staff confidence there. It seemed for a long period of time that the banding of - dare I say it - the white shirts, we'd have to deal with every minor incident, every little argument, not a first response type of thing. It would all come to us, it all comes to Oscar One - that's the focal point for it. They are trying to plaster over the cracks at the moment with getting new DCMs in. In the past, I ran one end of the building and James ran the other end of the building, it was fine and we used to do the paperwork as well, it was all part of it. We employed the workers, we would pay the workers, we would have more of a relationship with the detainees, because we were doing quite a lot of stuff but we were involved. Whereas, at the moment, there is little snippets of involvement by so many people. These guys, given a good regime, have a rapport with people which is helpful for their time in detention. I gained a lot of respect when I was on B Wing as an officer and the same when I started as a manager, because I help people out. I don't do favours for anybody but I am professional: okay, you've got this problem, we can sort this out, and the word gets round.
116. **Ms Lampard:** I don't want you to forget what you were going to tell us in confidence. You were going to say something?
117. **A.** Yes, confidence. That comes down to the level of people we are employing in this place, especially post-*Panorama*. In my eyes, we need more professionals.
118. **Q.** What do you mean by that?
119. **A.** More operators, more people who have more life skills, who are able to talk to people. In the sort of job we are in here, we're detaining people and it's not a great time for them and, at times, we have some very young officers with very immature attitudes and an age limit. We can't do that any more - 25 plus - we need people who are able to talk to somebody. I can talk to most of the detainees in here as I have life experience.
120. **Q.** Do you think that pay is the issue?
121. **A.** In my eyes, I don't think the pay for an officer is too bad for what they actually work. I think the structure of the whole thing needs to be done differently and some ideas they are coming up with now I probably don't agree with. I think there should be three pay structures for an officer and three pay structures for

a manager, culminating in the officers being an ACO type duty wage, a basic DCO duty wage and then an operational sort of support group who are the people who go around and do all the stuff with room searching, security etc, more mature people, more experienced who can deal with this sort of stuff. Then management-wise, your wing manager or activity staff, and then the Oscar One role. The SMT turn round to everyone and say 'you're all the same, you're white shirts', but when it comes to rostering and stuff like that, can I have a day off this week? No, you can't have that because there are no other Oscar Ones in. We're not all the same. We are the same in some eyes but not in others, which is the really frustrating thing about Oscar Ones, because we carry the can.

122. Q. Then there is the other issue that long service is not recognised?
123. A. Absolutely, absolutely! There is a line of management above us as such of the SMT, the Jules grade, which is where I believe an Oscar One should sit, but that is a G4S thing across the board as we are told. If we wrote down what we actually do on a week-to-week, day-to-day basis and you compare that with the prison service, talking to Daniel who used to be in the prison service, the level 4/5 management coming up to governor and, wow, that's a bit silly really.
124. Mr Marsden: Dave, if you were thinking of *Panorama* and today in terms of safety, how safe does the centre feel, if you use the scale of 1 as safe and 10 as right on the edge - where would you put it?
125. A. At this moment in time, and the demographics change from month to month, we are only running at about half capacity at the moment.
126. Ms Lampard: Why is that?
127. A. The only IRC here is ... I put it down to that mob in the Home Office, what they are doing with their jobs or whatever they are doing with the immigration side of things. People tend to blame the Windrush side of things but, if you know more about it, it doesn't involve very many people as a matter of fact. There is a lot to do with challenges that have been made in the courts and length of time in detention and this sort of thing, so you see more people get released. There are not so many moves coming into the centre. If the centre was in the 400s at this moment in time, or as it has been a few months back, it's not a very safe place. With 400 on a scale of very unsafe being 10 and everyone is walking around happy and everyone is getting on nicely, playing nicely being 1, I would say with 400 in here you are looking at a 6 or a 7. It has been fairly quiet lately. I have done a lot of night shifts and you understand a lot more on night shifts about the moves going on or not a lot of moves going on but my team are going a ?hit at the moment, there are not many people coming in. It's just the flow through the centre and the flow out of the centre. Some nights you would talk to reception and ask, how many have you got coming in tonight? Twenty-five - wow!, that's a lot of people to process overnight.
128. Mr Marsden: What is the current role - 200 or so?
129. A. What was it last night when I left? It was 237 last night when I left, then you have a wing shut at the moment, they are cleaning C Wing. It's like the Forth Bridge at the moment in terms of cleaning. They do something to a wing - they're putting inundation points into the room doors, do a few other bits, that wing's done. Do another wing, we need the floors polishing, the floors ripping up. The planning is a bit mystifying to me, to be fair. I can see that, in the not

too distant future, there will be some closures of immigration centres. Hopefully, this place will stay as is or whatever they do, and just pack people into it. The issue I have with that is that there are some moves that come to us overnight and when you get to look at them as they are coming in, and you speak to the reception staff, there was a guy when I was on nights last who gave a really bad story to immigration at the airport coming from America and this guy quite clearly should be going to Tinsley House, ...firm are bringing them here because it's easier.

130. **Ms Lampard:** You mean it was a vulnerable person?

131. **A.** Yes, in my eyes.

132. **Q.** Mentally unwell?

133. **A.** Not mentally unwell but someone who lived in Florida. I see a guy in reception and I say, 'hi fella, how are you? I know you're here for a period until tomorrow morning, we'll try to make your stay as comfortable as possible' and you use kind of brass tacks. I said, 'Look, my friend, this place looks like a prison, it will probably feel like a prison but then you've probably never been in prison before?', and he said, 'I haven't, sir'. I said, however, you will be safe and you will get a room until the morning and then your flight is at this time, we'll come and get you and move you. The guy was clearly distressed but I'm thinking, that's a Tinsley House thing, so somewhere in the scheme of things, something is going a bit wrong. Why is this guy coming to me? If a guy comes kicking and screaming off a van, I can well understand why he is coming here, but there you just think, wow!

134. Going back to last year, we had the Romanian guy who came in here, you know the story about him, and that was just prolonged - not restraining - preventing him from harming himself. It was absolutely immense and I felt let down at the time, because I thought the NHS don't want him, no-one else wants him mental health wise, you're sleeping here with us because we have the ability to lock him up behind a door. We didn't because it would have been detrimental to his wellbeing at the time and, when we did find out about him and that he had been trafficked and drugged, it made the story even worse. There is some great work done in this place by some really great people, officers, and that was some great work. I was sat with him one day for two or three hours and he was trying to -

135. **Q.** Dave, we are nearing the end of our time. I just want to ask you about one officer who I know is no longer here, called ?Gayathri. Do you remember an officer called Gayathri?

136. **A.** Yes.

137. **Q.** What was her game?

138. **A.** She was very manipulative, very controlling, didn't come out and visit a lot, that was her domain, she was very bossy to officers. She did one thing to me once where she wasn't based in visits and there were newer staff based in visits who were doing a fine job. There were a load of extra appointments brought down from the Home Office, *ad hoc* ones shall we say, and the timescales on them can be stretched to get the detainees to the interviews. I had been to check the book, as I do, to see if there have been any late visits and it was about six o'clock at night and there were none at that time. I went back at half-past eight/quarter to nine and suddenly I've got 25 lates and I thought, wow, what's happened there. It would appear that she had written

hard and fast times down when they were given the appointments to make it appear that these guys had mucked everything up and there were hefty fines from that.

139. Q. She was obviously a very disruptive creature. How long did it take to get rid of her?
140. A. I can't remember when she went now. It was after *Panorama* wasn't it?
141. Q. Yes.
142. A. I don't know if someone else was looking out for her. She is one of those people who smiles to your face and when you turn round, you've got a range of stuff coming towards you.
143. Q. She has popped up, at all angles people have mentioned having had an issue with her. She was abusive to detainees, she was abusive to officers, she was abusive to her colleagues and she abused the system, and I just wonder whether she should have been got rid of rather more quickly than she was?
144. A. Yes, in my eyes possibly. She was like a silent assassin - all smiley and lovely with management but you are actually working there. I think there was a fear among other staff that, if you said anything about Gayathri, things could happen to you.
145. Mr Marsden: You could be in the firing line.
146. A. Yes, she could turn something onto you. There was one guy who had a lot of problems with Gayathri, Dave Waldock, and I did nothing but support Dave throughout the time that he was there. He had his problems and she was one of the catalysts of his problems.
147. Ms Lampard: Do you think that senior management were not as quick to notice that sort of stuff as they should have been?
148. A. Absolutely.
149. Q. Why is that?
150. A. I don't know.
151. Mr Marsden: Who would have been responsible?
152. A. She would have had a DCM as her line manager, it definitely wasn't one of mine, she was part of the visits team. The visits team SMT-wise has changed hands a few times, bearing in mind it is one of the places where we pick up the most fights, you would think that would be one of the most scrutinised, micro-managed areas in the centre to make sure we are doing stuff on time. I think it was the length of service and, ultimately, she was a bully.
153. Q. Was she dismissed or did she leave, or don't you know?
154. A. I couldn't say but I know she's not here. Whether she was dismissed or she walked of her own accord - I think she was taken out of visits and put somewhere else to work, back to the wings and that was the sort of catalyst for her to go.
155. Ms Lampard: Dave, thank you very much indeed. Unless there is anything else you wanted to tell us, that's it.
156. Mr Marsden: We have been at it for an hour and 15 and reached the end of our time.



157. **Ms Lampard:** That was very helpful, thank you very much indeed.
158. **Mr Marsden:** It was and interesting to hear your view about current safety with 400.  
We'll get this typed up and send you a copy.
159. **A.** Could you send it via Lorraine.
160. **Q.** It will be password protected so it will arrive in her email inbox password protected, so shall I leave you to talk to her about whether you want to sit at her computer and print it off for yourself or whatever you want to do with it?
161. **A.** Yes, or you could send it to my -
162. **Ms Lampard:** Why don't we send it to your home address?
163. **A.** It is DPA
164. **Mr Marsden:** Nicola, would you take note of the fact that Dave would like his transcript sent to that email address rather than to a G4S email address.

*[Interview concluded]*